**STRUCTURAL TAC MEETING NOTES** - S - FBC-B - Ch. 2 – Glitch #1

**Change to Wind-Borne Debris Region Definition**

Joe Belcher - FHBA:

Apologize for impact on home builders and owners this change could have on the code. There are so many lakes in excess of 5000 feet. Major negative impact on homebuying public. This change generates severe circumstances on WBD area. There was no discussion at TAC or Commission meeting regarding this change. Proponent of the I-Code change said no increase in cost with change. Builder in lake county whose cost for windows and doors up $25k. In another county – increase of $4130 for windows and doors. Adoption will have major negative impact on affordability in state of Florida. it will result immediately in 9573 families priced out of the market completely.

If TAC decides to not approve this change as a glitch – please note it does have technical merit and should be considered.

ASCE 7-22 does define high water line and limits to tsunami load and effects of that.

Scott McAdams – BOAF:

if the proposal can’t be approved as glitch - let’s keep it similar – go with Joe’s suggestion and go with Exposure D and greater than 130, it will incorporate central part of state but will leave out coastal areas. It will have direct financial impact. Also, Joe mentioned, there are 157 letters of support.

Eric Stafford – IBHS:

Not really in opposition but not in support either. We supported this which is correlation of ASCE 7-22. We had a pretty good understanding of the reason statement and knew it was going to apply to inland bodies of water. The phrase, “high water line” has been around since the 90’s’. It made sense to move the windspeed lines around and add some lines and some taken away, but we didn’t realize the number of lakes that meet the criteria in central Florida. It’s stunning! Florida is the only place that has this many lakes in this region that meets this criterion. It does not apply where windspeeds less than 130 – just on 140 and above. It expands the WBD region. Leaving outcome to TAC and Commission. Don’t believe this change received the proper hearing. Stakeholders have proven that this is impactful to many more. If you vote to not be a glitch and doesn’t meet criteria – it should be forewarded to the Commission and should be reviewed and we support Joe’s comments.

David Compton – TAC Member:

Understand severity – but is it possible at this time to do something – can we put this on hold to consider over time in this situation like we did with Section 718 of the FBC -Plumbing.

Jim Schock – TAC Member:

The proposed glitch doesn’t meet criteria for glitch /errata – bad precedent to take national standards design of wind and reduce it – when arguably it is a most critical design element. Opposed to be a glitch/errata and opposed to adopting.

Jaime Gascon – TAC Member:

Want to state obvious - in Florida, wind is prevailing source of damage often caused in hurricane high wind events. Water intrusion is a problem that keeps reoccurring. This provision is clearly laid out in ASCE 7 and is clearly defined – we have lakes across the state and it is a condition of topography that effects windspeed – wind picks up debris and causes damage all across state. Standard is indicating that protecting these structures in these conditions is warranted. Does not satisfy glitch in this moment.

Do Kim – TAC Member:

More brief – we are taking right approach for the most part – Eric stated that standard to ASCE 7-22. We all knew about it, but impact was surprising – I agree with Jaime – very technical issue – I was in support of the code change – but technical conditions applying to lakes – having tough time seeing how it affects a mile inland from lake – not a glitch.

CW Macomber – TAC Member:

Agree with previous comments, does not meet glitch.

Julie Lowery – TAC Member:

Support - does not meet requirements of glitch but should be considered fully via another avenue.

Jim Schock – TAC Member:

Unless any other comments, I move this does not meet glitch/errata and comments should be forwarded to Commission for further action – 2nd CW Macomber. Unanimous 11-0 support.