

JANUARY 12, 2023 - BORA BUILDING SUBCOMMITTEE
DIGITALLY SIGNED PLAN SUBMISSIONS
Agenda Detail

ACCEPTABILITY RANKING EXERCISE OVERVIEW AND RANKING SCALE

During the meetings, Subcommittee Members will be asked to develop and rank options. Once ranked for acceptability, options with a 50% or greater number of 4s and 3s in proportion to 2s and 1s (\geq a 2.0 average ranking) will be considered preliminary consensus recommendations for inclusion in the final package of recommendations to BORA.

This is an iterative process, and at any point during the process any option may be reevaluated and re-ranked at the request of any Sub-Committee member or staff. The status of a ranked option will not be final until the final Sub-Committee meeting on the specific assignment for Recommendations in *Standardizing the Digitally Signed Plan Submissions for Permitting*, when a vote will be taken on the entire package of consensus ranked recommendations to the BORA.

Sub-Committee members should be prepared to state their minor and major reservations when asked, and to offer proposed refinements to the option to address their concerns. If a Sub-Committee member is not able to offer refinements to make the option acceptable (4) or acceptable with minor reservations (3) they should rate the option with a 1 (not acceptable).

CONSENSUS SOLUTIONS OPTIONS EVALUATION PROCESS

- The Sub-Committee’s Chairperson will introduce each category.
- The public may comment on options being considered by category/topical issue area (not individually) and will be limited to 3 minutes per person.
- Option Categories/Topics: Digital Permitting Procedural Recommendations, Private Provider Digital Plan Review Recommendations, and Design Community Digital Submission Recommendations.
- Proponent will have an opportunity to provide a summary of the option.
- Sub-Committee members may ask clarifying questions only (no discussion).
- The option will be ranked, each in turn using the following scale:

ACCEPTABILITY RANKING SCALE	4— Acceptable, I agree	3—<i>Acceptable, I agree with minor reservations</i>	2—<i>Not Acceptable, I don’t agree unless major Reservations are addressed</i>	1—<i>Not Acceptable</i>
------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	---	--------------------------------

- Sub-Committee members may briefly summarize their minor and major reservations.
- Options that achieve a ranking score of \geq 2.0 will be deemed to have a preliminary consensus level of support and will be further evaluated for recommendation.
- Options may be refined to enhance support across stakeholder interests.
- This process will be repeated iteratively during each meeting until a comprehensive and holistic package of recommendations has achieved a consensus level of support.
- The only vote taken will be at the end of the last meeting in support of the consensus package of recommendations. A 50% or greater level of support will be used for consensus.
- All ranking results are preliminary until the vote is taken at the end of the last meeting.

JANUARY 12, 2023 - BORA BUILDING SUBCOMMITTEE
DIGITALLY SIGNED PLAN SUBMISSIONS
Agenda Detail

ASSIGNMENT:

Consider Recommendations to Standardize the Digitally Signed Plan Submissions for Permitting

Category I: DIGITAL PERMITTING PROCEDURAL RECOMMENDATION OPTIONS

1. [BCAD]: Require digitally submitted documents to have a space on the first sheet where supplemental marks can be made that do not void the designer of record’s signature. (Similar to process used for shop drawings.)

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— <i>Acceptable</i>	3— <i>Minor</i> <i>Reservations</i>	2— <i>Major</i> <i>Reservations</i>	1— <i>Not</i> <i>Acceptable</i>
January 13, 2023					
Comments:					
•					

2. [FBPE]: Pint out and copy the report and then scan and attach it to the confirmation statement which is then digitally signed/sealed with the attachment being referenced in the confirmation statement. There is nothing in the Rules that requires a confirmation statement signature to be digitally placed upon the sealed/signed document that it confirms. An attached copy which is then conformed is fine. Of course, if the AHJs are requiring both docs to be originally signed/sealed doc then your 2-signature issue comes into play. The Board has discussed this issue and ultimately the AHJs can require what they want and if only one program can provide the service, then that is what exists today. All we can do is hope that the market will respond to what the regulators are mandating if you can’t get them to change their process in a manner like I discussed above.

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— <i>Acceptable</i>	3— <i>Minor</i> <i>Reservations</i>	2— <i>Major</i> <i>Reservations</i>	1— <i>Not</i> <i>Acceptable</i>
Comments:					
•					

3. [A. Fraga]: All digitally sealed and signed documents that are prepared, sealed, and signed in accordance with the Laws and Rules of the State of Florida regulating the practices of engineering, architecture, and interior design must be acceptable to the Authority Having Jurisdiction.

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— <i>Acceptable</i>	3— <i>Minor</i> <i>Reservations</i>	2— <i>Major</i> <i>Reservations</i>	1— <i>Not</i> <i>Acceptable</i>
Comments:					
•					

JANUARY 12, 2023 - BORA BUILDING SUBCOMMITTEE
DIGITALLY SIGNED PLAN SUBMISSIONS
Agenda Detail

4. [A. Fraga]: Drawing sheets must be signed individually; revised sheets shall be submitted individually. Specification, report, calculation, and similar documents' pages must be concatenated and signed once on the first sheet; if the concatenated document is revised, the revisions must be noted, and the entire report must be concatenated again and signed and sealed once on the first sheet.

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
Comments:					
•					

5. [A. Fraga]: Files must be named in a descriptive manner, including sheet number and content description, e.g., "225493_P-1_PlumbingFlrPlan.pdf", not scan2039&nf#ioqph.pdf." Revised sheets must be submitted with unchanged file names.

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
Comments:					
•					

6. [A. Fraga]: Documents required to be sealed and signed by more than one individual must be submitted on paper and must be accepted on paper.

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
Comments:					
•					

7. [A. Fraga]: Private providers must be tasked with design professional signature verification, allowing the private provider's approval stamp to be applied, and requiring no additional signature verification by the authority having jurisdiction.

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
Comments:					
•					

JANUARY 12, 2023 - BORA BUILDING SUBCOMMITTEE
DIGITALLY SIGNED PLAN SUBMISSIONS
Agenda Detail

8. [A. Fraga]: The Florida Building Code is silent on presentational details that may constrain plan submittal to the AHJ more specifically than indicated on Items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 above. Plan presentational details, features, and quirks are not “filing requirements;” they do not constitute “other information” (per FBC – Building 107.1) and are not covered under “rules and regulations” (per FBC – Building 107.2.1) Therefore, no AHJ shall require additional variations on/of the foregoing. Variations include, but are not necessarily limited to: restrictive title block mandates, color keying, concatenation of documents, and inappropriate/illegal affidavits of any kind.

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— <i>Acceptable</i>	3— <i>Minor Reservations</i>	2— <i>Major Reservations</i>	1— <i>Not Acceptable</i>
Comments:					
•					

9. [A. Fraga] Include a note to alert users of the optimal browser to use when accessing the municipality’s web portal system.
 I.E. NOTE: THE ONLY BROWSER THAT WILL FUNCTION PROPERLY WITH THIS WEBSITE IS GOOGLE CHROME.

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— <i>Acceptable</i>	3— <i>Minor Reservations</i>	2— <i>Major Reservations</i>	1— <i>Not Acceptable</i>
Comments:					
•					

10. [Name]

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— <i>Acceptable</i>	3— <i>Minor Reservations</i>	2— <i>Major Reservations</i>	1— <i>Not Acceptable</i>
Comments:					
•					

JANUARY 12, 2023 - BORA BUILDING SUBCOMMITTEE
DIGITALLY SIGNED PLAN SUBMISSIONS
Agenda Detail

Category II: PRIVATE PROVIDER DIGITAL PLAN REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS OPTIONS

1. [BCAD]: Private Providers approving code compliance must not mark documents that void the digital signature of the design professional. Alternatively, the Private Provider can provide a separate document for code compliance clearly referencing the document(s) being approved.

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
Comments:					
•					

2. [Name]

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
Comments:					
•					

Category III: DESIGN COMMUNITY DIGITAL SUBMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS OPTIONS

1. [Fraga]: Dispense with the dwell time associated with “cycles.” Allow and facilitate uninterrupted dialog among plan reviewers and design professionals.

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
Comments:					
•					

2. [Fraga] Introduce a “chat” portal that allows collaboration and sharing of information between plans examiners and customers (not limited to design professionals). Make that chat portal part of the public record along with plans, calculations, and applications.

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
Comments:					
•					

JANUARY 12, 2023 - BORA BUILDING SUBCOMMITTEE
DIGITALLY SIGNED PLAN SUBMISSIONS
Agenda Detail

3. [Fraga] Allow for re-introduction of revised sheets individually without having to wait for a “cycle.”

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— <i>Acceptable</i>	3— <i>Minor Reservations</i>	2— <i>Major Reservations</i>	1— <i>Not Acceptable</i>
Comments:					
•					

4. [Name]

	SUPPORT LEVEL	4— <i>Acceptable</i>	3— <i>Minor Reservations</i>	2— <i>Major Reservations</i>	1— <i>Not Acceptable</i>
Comments:					
•					