

## Madani, Mo

---

**From:** Bigelow, Joe  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 14, 2018 2:07 PM  
**To:** Williams, Kendrick  
**Cc:** Madani, Mo  
**Subject:** FW: Binding Interpretations Comment

Kendrick,

Can you unsuppress id\_comment=58 for binding Interpretations. Somehow it came in with a id\_submitted\_by=0  
Also can you suppress my test comment id\_comment=59 in the system. Thanks



**Joe Bigelow** | Planning Analyst

☎ T: 850.717.1829 | ✉ E: [joe.bigelow@myfloridalicense.com](mailto:joe.bigelow@myfloridalicense.com)

State Product Approval Team [procodesproductapproval@myfloridalicense.com](mailto:procodesproductapproval@myfloridalicense.com)



**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL REGULATION**

*License efficiently. Regulate fairly.*

2601 Blair Stone Rd | Tallahassee, Florida | 32399

Codes and Standards | [www.floridabuilding.org](http://www.floridabuilding.org) | [www.myfloridalicense.com](http://www.myfloridalicense.com)



---

**From:** Bigelow, Joe  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 14, 2018 12:15 PM  
**To:** Madani, Mo  
**Subject:** Binding Interpretations Comment

Mo,

Here is the text of the comment that came in. It is hidden because it got an error , user is set to 0 who submitted it.

**The information presented indicates three different sources of metal roofing: 1) The permit for Union Corrugated, 2) An invoice for Phoenix Metals (what is understood as what is actually installed on the roof), and 3) A letter from an Engineer for Sheffield Metals. The issue is whether the metal on the roof meets code. It is reasonable that based on the information provided that Phoenix metal has been installed on the roof. With no product approval or engineer letter relevant to Phoenix, the answer is no. The instructions and steps outlined by the Building Official to the applicant appear to be in alignment with statutory requirements and the Building Official is within his regulatory purview to match the installed product with an approval path whether via product approval or as-built site installed engineer certification. An interpretation in favor of the applicant would be ratifying an approval defective in process with a mis-matched installed product and engineer letter. My comment/opinion/recommendation would be to deny the application and remand to the local Building Official for approval in accordance with current statutory process and procedure which has not been demonstrated to have exhausted or unachievable.**