



**FLORIDA
BUILDING
COMMISSION**

"STRONGER CODES THROUGH SCIENCE AND CONSENSUS"

Florida Department of
Business
Professional
Regulation

**FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORT OF THE
FEBRUARY 21, 2014
FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION MEETING
ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA**

PROCESS DESIGN, CONSENSUS-BUILDING AND FACILITATION BY



CONSENSUS CENTER

**REPORT BY JEFF A. BLAIR
FCRC CONSENSUS CENTER
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY**



jblair@fsu.edu
[http:// consensus.fsu.edu](http://consensus.fsu.edu)

*This document is available in alternate formats upon request to DBPR, Codes & Standards,
1940 North Monroe Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399-0772, (850) 487-1824.*

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 21, 2014 FACILITATOR'S MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>TABLE OF CONTENTS</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>TABLE OF ATTACHMENTS</i>	<i>2</i>

I. MEETING SUMMARY OVERVIEW	4
II. WELCOME AND ATTENDANCE	4
III. MEETING OBJECTIVES	5
IV. MINUTES APPROVAL	5
V. CHAIR'S DISCUSSION ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	6
VI. ACCESSIBILITY WAIVER APPLICATIONS	7
VII. PRODUCT AND ENTITY APPROVALS	7
VIII. ACCREDITOR AND COURSE APPROVALS	7
IX. PETITIONS FOR DECLARATORY STATEMENTS	7
X. NOTICE OF CORRECTION, PRODUCT APPROVAL, RULES 61G20-3.001 & 61G20-3.002 ...	8
XI. LEGISLATIVE REPORT	8
XII. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	9
XIII. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT	11
XIV. COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS AND ISSUES	11
XV. NEXT MEETING OVERVIEW AND ISSUES	12

***TABLE OF ATTACHMENTS* 12 - 109**

1.	MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS	14
2.	KEY TO COMMON ACRONYMS	16
3.	COMMISSION HISTORY AND OVERVIEW	17
4.	COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA (DECEMBER 13, 2013)	19
5.	COMMISSION’S UPDATED SCHEDULE	21
6.	ACCESSIBILITY WAIVER SUMMARY	22
7.	LEGAL REPORT	24
8.	PRODUCT AND ENTITY APPROVAL REPORT	25

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 21, 2014 FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORT



**FLORIDA
BUILDING
COMMISSION**

"STRONGER CODES THROUGH SCIENCE AND CONSENSUS"

OVERVIEW OF COMMISSION'S KEY ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2014

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS OF NEW AND REAPPOINTED COMMISSION MEMBERS

Chairman Browdy welcomed the Commission, DBPR staff and the public to St. Augustine and the February 21, 2014 plenary session of the Florida Building Commission. The Chair noted the primary focus of the February meeting, in addition to considering regular procedural issues including product and entity approvals, applications for accreditor and course approvals, petitions for declaratory statements, accessibility waivers, and recommendations from the Commission's various committees, was for the purpose of getting briefed on final steps pertaining to rule adoption for Product Approval rules, and to receive an update on proposed legislation of interest to the Commission.

The Chair noted that there were buff colored "*Public Comment Forms*" on the speakers' table to be used for providing written comments, and all written comments would be included in the Facilitator's Summary Report.

The Chair explained that if one wished to address the Commission on any of the issues before the Commission they should sign-in on the appropriate sheet(s), and as always, the Commission will provide an opportunity for public comment on each of the Commission's substantive discussion topics. The Chair explained that if one wants to comment on a specific substantive Commission agenda item, they should come to the speaker's table at the appropriate time so the Commission knows they wish to speak. The Chair noted that public input is welcome, but should be offered before there is a formal motion on the floor.

Chairman Browdy explained that some of the licensing boards located within the Department of Business and Professional Regulation, have adopted rules regarding continuing education credits for

attending Florida Building Commission meetings and/or Technical Advisory Committee meetings. Participants whose board participates may sign-in on the laptop kiosk station located in the meeting room.

I. PLENARY SESSION SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW

At the February 21, 2014 meeting the Commission considered and decided on Chair's issues and recommendations, product and entity approvals, applications for accreditor and course approvals, petitions for declaratory statements, accessibility waivers, and recommendations from the Commission's various committees. The Commission received briefings on proposed legislation relevant to the Commission and the Florida Building Code; and JAPC requiring DBPR to file a Notice of Correction to add language relating to legislative ratification to the Summary of Statement of Estimated Regulatory Costs and Legislative Ratification pertaining to Product Approval Rules 61G20-3.001 (Scope) and Rule 3.002 (Definitions). Specific actions included: approving dates for 2014 Legislative teleconference Commission meetings.

(Attachment 1—Meeting Evaluation Results)

Commentary:

Jim Richmond cautioned Commissioners that the table microphones are live, and that Commission meetings are recorded and webcasted live, and as a result sidebar conversations may be picked up and amplified to those participating on-line.

II. COMMISSION ATTENDANCE

The following Commissioners attended the Friday, February 21, 2014 meeting:

Dick Browdy (Chair), Hamid Bahadori, Steve Bassett, James Batts, Bob Boyer, Donald Brown, Oscar Calleja, David Compton, Jay Carlson, Nan Dean, Kevin Flanagan, Robert Hamberger, Brian Langille, Beth Meyer, Darrell Phillips, Brad Schiffer, Jim Schock, Frederick Schilling, Drew Smith, Jeff Stone, Brian Swope, and Tim Tolbert.

(22 of 25 seated Commissioners attended).

Absent Commissioners:

Charles Frank, Herminio Gonzalez, and Jeff Gross.

DBPR STAFF PRESENT

Robert Benbow, Chris Burgwald, Jim Hammers, April Hammonds, Mo Madani, and Jim Richmond.

MEETING FACILITATION

The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair from the FCRC Consensus Center at Florida State University. Information at: <http://consensus.fsu.edu/>



CONSENSUS CENTER

PROJECT WEBPAGE

Information on the Florida Building Commission project, including agenda packets, meeting reports, and related documents may be found in downloadable formats at the project webpage link (URL):

<http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/index.html>

Commission Webpage link (URL): <http://floridabuilding.org/c/default.aspx>

III. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

The Commission voted unanimously, 22 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda for the February 21, 2014 meeting as posted/presented. Following are the key agenda items approved for consideration:

- To Consider Regular Procedural Issues: Agenda Approval and Approval of the December 13, 2013 Facilitator's Summary Report and Meeting Minutes.
- To Consider/Decide on Chair's Discussion Issues/Recommendations.
- To Consider/Decide on Accessibility Waiver Applications.
- To Consider/Decide on Approvals and Revocations of Products and Product Approval Entities.
- To Consider Applications for Accreditor and Course Approval.
- To Consider/Decide on Legal Issues: Petitions for Declaratory Statements.
- To Approve Notice of Correction to Add Language Relating to Legislative Ratification to the Summary of Statement of Estimated Regulatory Costs and Legislative Ratification Pertaining to Rules 61G20-3.001 and 61G20-3.002, Product Approval Scope & Definitions.
- To Receive an Update on Relevant Legislative Issues.
- To Consider/Decide on Technical Advisory Committees (TACs): Accessibility; Mechanical; and Roofing TAC Report/Recommendations.
- To Consider/Decide on Program Oversight Committees (POCs): Education and Product Approval POC Reports/Recommendations.
- To Receive Public Comment.
- To Discuss Commissioner Comments and Issues.
- To Review Committee Assignments and Issues for the Next Meeting—April 17, 2014 in Kissimmee, Florida.

Amendments to the Posted Agenda:

There were no amendments to the posted/presented Agenda.

(Attachment 4—February 21, 2014 Commission Agenda)

IV. APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 12, 2013 FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORT AND MEETING MINUTES

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 22 - 0 in favor, to approve the December 13, 2013 Facilitator's Summary Report and Meeting Minutes as presented.

Amendments:

There were no amendments offered.

V. CHAIR'S DISCUSSION ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Appointments

Chairman Browdy made the following appointment at the February 21, 2014 meeting:

Ken Cureton was appointed to replace the retiring Phillip Wisely on the Special Occupancy TAC. The Chair thanked Phillip for his service and welcomed Ken to the TAC.

Legislative Conference Call Meetings Dates

The Chair noted that each year the Commission schedules a series of teleconference meetings to receive updates and provide any needed guidance and/or recommendations to staff pertaining to proposed legislation of interest to the Commission. Typically the calls are on Mondays and start at 10:00 AM. Chairman Browdy explained that it is important for Commissioners to participate and to ensure the Commission has a quorum for each meeting. The Chair thanked the Commission in advance for their commitment. Following is the approved schedule for the 2014 Legislative Session teleconference Commission meetings schedule: March 10, March 24, April 7, April 28, and May 12, 2014.

Commission Actions:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 22 – 0 in favor, to approve the 2014 Legislative Session teleconference Commission meetings schedule as proposed.

Commission's Role in the Legislative Process

The Chair asked Jim Richmond to explain the Commission's role in the Legislative process. Jim explained that the Legislature has the authority to legislate the Florida Building Code, and has delegated authority to the Commission to develop and maintain the Code. Jim noted that the Commission is an executive agency administered by the Department of Business and Professional Regulation (DBPR). As the administrative agency DBPR handles the Agency's legislative agenda including issues relevant to the Commission. Jim explained that the Commission does not get involved directly with the legislative process, but will be briefed on relevant issues as needed by DBPR during meetings. The Commission may be asked to provide recommendations on specific issues as they arise during the Legislative Session, and relevant legislative issues will be discussed during the Commission's scheduled Legislative teleconference meetings.

Commission Meeting Dates/Locations FY 2014-2015

Chairman Browdy noted that the remaining Commission meeting dates and locations for the current fiscal year (2013-2014) ending June 30, 2014 are:

April 17, 2014 at the Gaylord Plaza Orlando

June 19-20, 2014 at the Hilton Daytona Beach

The Chair reported that the Commission meeting dates for fiscal year 2014-2015 are as follows:

August 22, 2014

October 17, 2014

December 12, 2014

February 20, 2015

April 17, 2015

June 19, 2015

The Chair also explained that Commission meeting dates and locations are posted to the Building Code Information System (BCIS) and can be accessed by selecting the “Florida Building Commission” tab, and then by selecting the “Meeting Locations” tab.

VI. CONSIDERATION OF ACCESSIBILITY WAIVER APPLICATIONS

April Hammonds, Accessibility Advisory Council legal advisor, presented the Accessibility Advisory Council’s recommendations for all applications, and the Commission reviewed and decided on the Waiver applications submitted for their consideration. A complete summary of accessibility waiver applications and Commission actions is included as an attachment to this Report.

(Included as Attachment 6—Accessibility Waiver Summary Report)

VII. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR PRODUCT AND ENTITY APPROVAL

Commissioner Stone presented the Committee’s recommendations for entities and product approvals on the consent agenda for approval, and the recommendations for product approvals with comments and/or discussion. The complete results of Commission decisions regarding applications for product and entity approval are included as an attachment to this Report.

(Included as Attachment 8—Product and Entity Approval Report)

Commentary:

Mo Madani introduced Robert Benbow, a recently hired DBPR staffperson who is an engineer. Mo noted that Robert is working with the Product Approval System and will be providing staffing for Product Approval application reviews.

VIII. CONSIDER APPLICATIONS FOR ACCREDITOR AND COURSE APPROVAL

Commissioner Dean presented the applications, and the Commission reviewed and decided on the accreditor and course applications submitted for their consideration as follows:

Commission Actions:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 22 – 0 in favor, to approve advanced course #635.0.

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 22 – 0 in favor, to approve administratively self-affirmed course #477.0.

(See Committee’s Next Agenda for Linked Committee Report)

IX. CONSIDERATION OF PETITIONS FOR DECLARATORY STATEMENTS

Legal Report

Petitions For Declaratory Statements

April Hammonds, Commission Legal Counsel, presented each declaratory statement in turn. Following are the actions taken by the Commission pertaining to petitions for declaratory statements.

DS 2013-123 by Garland Patterson, PE

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 22-0 in favor, to dismiss the petition as general in scope and not meeting the declaratory statement criteria for a specific set of facts and circumstances.

DS2014-002 by Gulf Coast Supply and Manufacturing, LLC.

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 22-0 in favor, to approve the Roofing TACs' recommendation on the petition.

(Included as Attachment 7—Legal Report)

X. NOTICE OF CORRECTION, PRODUCT APPROVAL, RULES 61G20-3.001 AND 61G20-3.002

Chairman Browdy reminded the Commission that at the October 18, 2013 meeting the Commission conducted a rule development workshop pertaining to Product Approval Rules 61G20-3.001 (Scope), 3.002 (Definitions), and voted to proceed with rule adoption for Product Approval Rules 61G20-3.001 (Scope) and Rule 3.002 (Definitions), to approve the Statement of Estimated Regulatory Costs (SERC), and to conduct a rule adoption hearing only if requested.

The Chair reported that in the course of reviewing the final rule the Joint Administrative Procedures Committee (JAPC) noted that the Commission needs to correct a technical deficiency in the notice published in the Florida Administrative Register (FAR). In order to finalize rule adoption DBPR has filed a Notice of Correction to add language relating to legislative ratification to the Summary of Statement of Estimated Regulatory Costs and Legislative Ratification pertaining to Product Approval Rules 61G20-3.001 (Scope) and Rule 3.002 (Definitions).

Following is the language filed to correct the technical deficiency:

The agency has determined that the proposed rule is not expected to require legislative ratification based on the statement of estimated regulatory costs or if no SERC is required, the information expressly relied upon and described herein: The Department conducted an analysis of the proposed rule's potential economic impact and determined that it did not exceed any of the criteria established in Section 120.541(2)(a), F.S.

XI. LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Jim Richmond provided the Commission with a briefing regarding proposed legislation of interest to the Commission for the 2014 Legislative Session. The primary bill of interest is HB 593, a bill to be entitled: "An act relating to building construction." Jim reported as follows:

- Section 1 amends s. 162.12, F.S.; providing an additional method for local governments to provide notices to alleged code enforcement violators.
- Section 2 amends s. 514.03, F.S.; requiring application for an operating permit before filing an application for a building permit for a public swimming pool or bathing place.
- Section 3 amends s. 514.031, F.S.; providing an additional requirement for obtaining a public swimming pool operating permit.
- Section 4 amends s. 553.37, F.S.; specifying inspection criteria for construction or modification of manufactured buildings or modules.

Commentary: Jim noted that this change will reflect actual field practices, and DBPR has no objections to the clarifications.

- Section 5 amends s. 553.721, F.S.; revising the allocation of funds from the building permit surcharge.

Commentary: Commissioner Schock indicated that instead of providing a dollar amount for funding allocations from the permit surcharge fees collected, a percentage would be a better approach in case of future economic downturns impacting the amount of funds received. Jim Richmond reported that the allocation is subject to an annual appropriation by the Legislature and could be adjusted as needed by the Legislature based on current economic factors.

- Section 6 amends s. 553.775, F.S.; authorizing building officials, local enforcement agencies, and the Florida Building Commission to interpret the Florida Accessibility Code for Building Construction; specifying procedures for such interpretations; deleting provisions relating to declaratory statements and interpretations of the Florida Accessibility Code for Building Construction, to conform.

Commentary: This change will implement a Commission Legislative recommendation.

- Section 7 amends s. 553.79, F.S.; prohibiting a local enforcing agency from issuing a building permit for a public swimming pool or bathing place without proof of application for an operating permit; requiring issuance of an operating permit before final inspection is completed.
- Section 8 amends s. 553.841, F.S.; revising education and training requirements of the Florida Building Code Compliance and Mitigation Program; providing an effective date.
- Section 9 provides an effective date of July 1, 2014.
- Jim reported that the Senate's companion Bill (SB 1106) has an amendment in Section 8 that would amend s. 553.841, F.S. to expand the requirement for education on the requirements of the Florida Building Code and Florida Fire Prevention Code from the current requirement for those licensed in the design and construction industries to include persons employed in the design and construction industries. Jim noted that the word "employed" should be discussed and clarified, as well as how verification of this requirement would be implemented.
- Jim also noted that SB 1044 proposes to add a 27th Commissioner to serve as a representative of the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services' Office of Energy.

XIV. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chairman Browdy requested TAC and POC chairs confine their reports to a brief summary of any key recommendations, emphasizing any issues requiring an action from the Commission. The Chair requested if the TAC/POC requires Commission action, to frame the needed action in the form of a proposed motion. This will ensure that the Commission understands exactly what the TAC/POC's are recommending, and the subsequent action requested of the Commission. The Chair explained that the complete reports/minutes would be linked to the committees' subsequent agendas for approval by the respective committees. Committee reports are available at the following URL (linked to Commission's December 13, 2013 Agenda):

http://www.floridabuilding.org/fbc/commission/FBC_1213/index.htm

Accessibility TAC and Accessibility Advisory Council Joint Meeting

Jim Richmond presented the TAC's and Council's report and any recommendations.

Commentary:

Commissioners expressed the importance of involving building officials in accessibility waiver requests that are within their jurisdictions. Staff agreed to contact building officials whose jurisdictions are subject to an accessibility waiver request received through the on-line process once adopted by rule. This will ensure that building officials are involved in the process from the beginning.

Commission Actions:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 22 – 0 in favor, to accept the Accessibility TAC's and Accessibility Advisory Council's joint report as presented/posted (February 10, 2014).

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 22 – 0 in favor, to approve the electronic waiver application form and process that will be posted to and submitted through the BCIS, and to proceed with rulemaking to adopt the electronic submittal application form and on-line process.

(See Committee's Next Agenda for Linked Committee Report)

Education POC

Commissioner Dean presented the POC's reports and any recommendations.

Commission Actions:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 22 – 0 in favor, to accept the POC's report as presented/posted (February 13, 2014).

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 22 – 0 in favor, to approve all technical changes requested by the Office of Fiscal Accountability Rule Reform (OFAR), made to the already proposed language changes to Rule 61G20-6.002, F.A.C.

(See Committee's Next Agenda for Linked Committee Report)

Mechanical TAC

Commissioner Bassett presented the TAC's report and any recommendations.

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 22 – 0 in favor, to accept the TAC's report as presented/posted (February 7, 2014).

(See Committee's Next Agenda for Linked Committee Report)

Product Approval POC

Commissioner Stone presented the Committee's report and any recommendations.

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 22 – 0 in favor, to accept the POC's report as presented/posted (February 6, 2014).

(See Committee's Next Agenda for Linked Committee Report)

Roofing TAC

Commissioner Swope presented the TAC's report and any recommendations.

Commission Actions:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 22 – 0 in favor, to accept the TAC's report as presented/posted (February 6, 2014).

(See Committee's Next Agenda for Linked Committee Report)

OTHER COMMISSION ACTION

There were no additional Commission actions.

XV. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public were offered an opportunity to provide comment during each of the Commission's substantive discussion agenda items. In addition, Chairman Browdy invited members of the public to address the Commission on any issues under the Commission's purview.

Public Comments:

- Jack Glenn: noted that currently an on-line matrix of staff contacts is missing and should be added to the BCIS. The list should include staff names, areas of responsibility, phone numbers and e-mail addresses.

XVI. COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENT AND ISSUES

Chairman Browdy invited Commission members to offer any general comments to the Commission, or identify any issues or agenda items for the next Commission meeting.

Commission Member Comments:

- Bassett: exclaimed that it unusual to have such a short Commission meeting, and noted that in the early days of developing the Florida Building Code the Commission met once a month for up to 5 days at time.
- Tolbert: noted that the Florida State University Seminoles won the 2013-2014 National Championship for football with an undefeated season. Go Noles!
- There was a rousing response of "Go Noles!" from a number of Commissioners, the Facilitator, staff (particularly April Hammonds) and the public.

XVII. NEXT COMMISSION MEETING OVERVIEW AND ISSUES

The April 17, 2014 Commission meeting in Kissimmee, Florida will focus on routine Commission procedural matters including Chair's issues and recommendations, updates of the Workplan, product and entity approvals, applications for accreditor and course approvals, petitions for declaratory statements, accessibility waivers, and recommendations from the Commission's various committees. In addition, the Commission will conduct any needed rule development initiatives (Accessibility on-line waiver application process and form).

STAFF ASSIGNMENTS FROM JUNE AND OCTOBER 2013 MEETING

- Schedule Commission discussion regarding paperless permitting.
- Draft a letter encouraging building departments to support staff participation in code development.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chair thanked Commission members and the public for their attendance and participation, and adjourned the meeting at 10:35 AM on Friday, February 21, 2014.

ATTACHMENT 1

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS

FEBRUARY 21, 2014—ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA

Average rank using a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 means totally disagree and 10 means totally agree.

Number of Respondents: 19 of 22 Commissioners present completed meeting evaluations.

1. OVERALL MEETING ASSESSMENT.

- 9.6 The background information was very useful.
- 9.8 The agenda packet was very useful.
- 9.7 The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.
- 9.7 Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.

2. MEMBERS LEVEL OF AGREEMENT THAT THE MEETING OBJECTIVES WERE ACHIEVED.

- 9.8 Chairs Issues and Recommendations.
- 9.8 Accessibility Waiver Applications.
- 9.7 Approvals and Revocations of Products and Product Approval Entities.
- 9.7 Applications for Accreditor and Course Approvals.
- 9.7 Petitions for Requests for Declaratory Statements.
- 9.7 Approval of Notice of Correction pertaining to Rules 61G20-3.001 & 61G20-3.002, Product Approval.
- 9.8 Update on Relevant Legislative Issues.
- 9.8 TAC, POC and/or Committee Reports and Recommendations.

3. HOW WELL THE FACILITATOR HELPED THE MEMBERS ENGAGE IN THE MEETING.

- 9.7 The members followed the direction of the Facilitator.
- 9.7 The Facilitator made sure the concerns of all members were heard.
- 9.7 The Facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
- 9.7 Participant input was documented accurately in Facilitator's Report (previous meeting).

4. MEMBERS LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE MEETING.

- 9.8 Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
- 9.8 I was very satisfied with the services provided by the Facilitator.
- 9.8 I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

5. HOW WELL THE NEXT STEPS WERE COMMUNICATED.

- 9.8 I know what the next steps following this meeting will be.
- 9.8 I know who is responsible for the next steps.

6. WHAT MEMBERS LIKED BEST ABOUT THE MEETING.

- Organization of Agenda.
- Short and sweet.
- Good job.

7. COMMENTS REGARDING HOW THE MEETING COULD HAVE BEEN IMPROVED.

- The microphones need to be improved. Some didn't work.

8. OTHER GENERAL COMMENTS.

- Facility was excellent.
- Thank you all for all of your hard work!
- I had difficulty hearing some of what was being said by staff and members.

COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC AGENDA ITEMS

None were offered.

PUBLIC-MEETING EVALUATION AND COMMENT RESULTS

None were offered.

ATTACHMENT 2

KEY TO COMMON ACRONYMS

ACRONYM	DEFINITION
ADA	Americans With Disabilities Act
ADAAG	ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities
BCSA	Florida Building Code System Assessment
BOAF	Building Officials Association of Florida
DACS or FDACS	Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
DBPR	Department of Business and Professional Regulations
DCA	Department of Community Affairs
DEP or FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
DOH or FDoH	Florida Department of Health
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FACBC	Florida Accessibility Code for Building Construction
FAR	Florida Administrative Register (previously FAW)
FBC	Florida Building Code
FBC	Florida Building Commission
FECC	Florida Energy and Conservation Code
IBC	International Building Code
ICC	International Code Council
POC	Program Oversight Committee (Education and Product Approval)
SAD	ADA Standards for Accessibility Design
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee

ATTACHMENT 3

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION HISTORY AND OVERVIEW

HISTORY

Following Hurricane Andrew in 1992, Florida experienced record-breaking insurance losses resulting in a crisis affecting every homeowner in the state. The Governor appointed a Building Code Study Commission, The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium designed and facilitated a two-year study and deliberation process with the 28 members representing a range of interests in the public and private sectors, through which the Commission evaluated the building code system.

The study revealed that building code adoption and enforcement was inconsistent throughout the state and even local codes thought to be the strongest proved inadequate when tested by major hurricane events. The consequences were devastation to lives and economies and a statewide property insurance crisis. The Commission recommended reform of the state building construction system which placed emphasis on uniformity and accountability.

The legislature enacted the consensus recommendations into law in 1998. In late 1998, the Consortium was asked by the Commission's chair to assist the newly created Florida Building Commission in its effort to build consensus for a uniform building code proposal. A complex consensus building process was put in place that included designing and facilitating meetings of 12 balanced technical advisory groups of 11 members each appointed by the Commission, as well as the Commission's meetings. The Consortium continues to work with the Commission by providing facilitation and consensus-building services.

OVERVIEW

The Florida Building Commission is a 25 member Governor appointed representative stakeholder group who successfully created, implemented, and maintains the new statewide Florida Building Code. The Commission is comprised of the Governor's Chair, and 24 members appointed according to criteria established by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for representation. They are as follows: in the general interest category: four code officials, two state government representatives, a local government representative, a representative of persons with disability; in the consumer category: an architect, a structural engineer, a mechanical engineer, representatives of fire protection technology, the building management industry, and the insurance industry; and in the producer category: a general contractor, residential contractor, mechanical contractor, plumbing contractor, electrical contractor, roofing/sheet metal/air conditioning contractor, a manufactured building representative, a building product manufacturer, a swimming pool contractor, and a representative of the green building industry.

The Florida Building Commission (FBC) seeks to develop consensus decisions on its recommendations and policy decisions. General consensus is a participatory process whereby, on matters of substance, the members strive for agreements which all of the members can accept, support, live with or agree not to oppose. In instances where, after vigorously exploring possible ways to enhance the members' support for the final decision on substantive decisions, and the Commission finds that 100% acceptance or support is not achievable, final decisions require at least 75% favorable vote of all members present and voting. This super majority decision rule underscores the importance of actively developing consensus throughout the process on substantive issues with the participation of all members and which all can live with and support. The Commission's consensus process is conducted as an open public process with multiple opportunities for the public to provide input to the Commission on substantive issues.

At each Commission meeting, the public is welcome to speak during the public comment period provided for each substantive issue under consideration, as well as general public comment periods provided at the end of each day's meeting. In addition, most substantive issues before the Commission go through a workgroup process where consensus recommendations are developed by appointed representative stakeholder groups, providing additional opportunities for public input. Workgroup recommendations approved by the Commission usually require rule development to implement, affording at least two additional entry points for public comment.

Since its formation in July of 1998, The Commission has demonstrated a commitment to working with affected interests to build consensus on complex issues. The adoption of the first edition of the Florida Building Code (2001 Edition), developed from September 1998 through January of 2001, involved 27 Commission meetings, many dozens of facilitated public workshops, and hundreds of TAC meetings. The Commission has consistently worked with all affected interests to build the best possible consensus-based decisions for the citizens of Florida.

Through its committees and workgroups of experts, the Commission has always developed its decisions on the results of the best engineering-based science available. Although the Code is by law a minimum building code, the Florida Building Code is the strongest consensus and science based building code in the country.

In summary, the Florida Building Commission provides a forum for stakeholders representing key interests to participate in a consensus-building process where issues affecting the construction industry are discussed and evaluated on their technical merits and cost-benefits to the citizens of the State of Florida. In addition, as a result of the Commission's proven consensus-building process and success in developing consensus on tough issues, the Florida Legislature annually assigns policy issues to the Commission for evaluation and implementation.

ATTACHMENT 4
FEBRUARY 21, 2014 MEETING AGENDA

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 21, 2014
THE RENAISSANCE RESORT AT WORLD GOLF VILLAGE
500 SOUTH LEGACY TRAIL, ST. AUGUSTINE, FL 32092

OBJECTIVES

- To Approve Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda and Minutes)
- To Consider/Decide on Chair's Discussion Issues/Recommendations.
- To Consider/Decide on Accessibility Waiver Applications.
- To Consider/Decide on Approvals and Revocations of Products and Product Approval Entities.
- To Consider Applications for Accreditor and Course Approval.
- To Consider a Notice of Correction Published in Relation to Product Approval Rules 61G2-3.001 and 3.002.
- To Receive an Update of Legislative Activity Relating to the Commission and the Code.
- To Receive/Decide on Reports and Recommendations from Committees.
- To Hear Public Comment
- To Identify Needed Next Steps, Assignments, and Agenda Items For Next Meeting

MEETING AGENDA—FEBRUARY 21, 2014

All Agenda Times—including Adjournment—are Approximate and Subject to Change

Time	1.)	Welcome and Opening, Roll Call
	2.)	Review and Approval of Meeting Agenda
	3.)	Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes Minutes, December 13, 2013 Facilitator's Summary Report, December 13, 2013
	4.)	Chair's Discussion Issues Legislative Conference Call Meetings -- March 10, March 24, April 7, April 28, May 12
	5.)	Accessibility Waiver Applications
		a. KLKS, LLC, 7175 South West 47 Street, Miami b. South Beach Hotel, 236 21st Street, Miami Beach c. Delta Investment Group, 107 South West 7th Street, Gainesville d. Haddon Hall Hotel and the Campton Apartments. 1500 Collins Avenue and 1455 Washington Avenue, Miami Beach e. Fred Schweitz, Too Your Health Spa, 995 South Highway 27/441, Ocala

		f. Gould Business Center Buildout, 587 West Eau Gallie Boulevard, Melbourne g. Alpha Delta Pi Sorority, 537 West Jefferson Street, Tallahassee
	6.)	Applications for Product and Entity Approval
	7.)	Applications for Accreditor and Course Approval
	8.)	Petitions for Declaratory Statement
		a. DS 2013-123 by Garland Patterson, PE b. DS2014-002 by Gulf Coast Supply and Manufacturing, LLC.
	9.)	Rules 61G20-3.001 and 61G20-3.002, Product Approval Scope and Definitions: Notice of Correction to add language relating to legislative ratification to the Summary of Statement of Estimated Regulatory Costs and Legislative Ratification.
	10.)	Legislative Report
		HB593
	11.)	Committee Reports
		a. Accessibility Advisory Committee in conjunction with the Accessibility Technical Advisory Committee b. Education Program Oversight Committee c. Mechanical Technical Advisory Committee d. Product Approval Program Oversight Committee e. Roofing Technical Advisory Committee
	12.)	<i>Adjourn</i>

ATTACHMENT 5
COMMISSION'S UPDATED MEETING SCHEDULE AND WORKPLAN

(UPDATED FEBRUARY 21, 2014)

COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE

2014	LOCATION
February 21, 2014	St. Augustine (World Golf Village)
April 17, 2014	Kissimmee (Gaylord Palms)
June 19 - 20, 2014	Daytona Beach (Hilton Daytona Beach)
August 22, 2014	TBD
October 17, 2014	TBD
December 12, 2013	TBD
2015	LOCATION
February 20, 2015	TBD
April 17, 2015	TBD
June 19, 2015	TBD
August 2015	TBD
October 2015	TBD
December 2015	TBD

ACCESSIBILITY COUNCIL	EDUCATION POC	PRODUCT APPROVAL POC
February 5, 2014	February 10, 2014	February 6, 2014
April 7, 2014	April 10, 2014	April 3, 2014
June 9, 2014	June 12, 2014	June 5, 2014
August 11, 2014	August 14, 2014	August 7, 2014
October 6, 2014	October 9, 2014	October 2, 2014
December 1, 2014	December 4, 2014	December 4, 2014
February 9, 2015	February 12, 2015	February 5, 2015
April 6, 2015	April 9, 2015	April 2, 2015
June 8, 2015	June 11, 2015	June 4, 2015

ATTACHMENT 6

ACCESSIBILITY WAIVER SUMMARY

WAIVERS FROM ACCESSIBILITY CODE REQUIREMENTS—FEBRUARY 21, 2014

The Council met via webinar on February 10, 2014 at 2:00 p.m.

The Council reviewed and made recommendations for disposition of waivers for the following projects.

The Commission took the following actions regarding waivers.

A. KLKS, LLC, 7175 South West 47 Street, Miami

Recommendation: Grant the waiver request based on disproportionate cost.

COMMISSION ACTION: Commission voted (22 - 0 in favor) to grant the waiver request based on disproportionate cost.

B. South Beach Hotel, 236 21st Street, Miami Beach

Recommendation: Grant based on disproportionate cost and the historic nature of the building.

COMMISSION ACTION: Commission voted (22 - 0 in favor) to grant the waiver request based on disproportionate cost and the historic nature of the building.

C. Delta Investment Group, 107 South West 7th Street, Gainesville

Recommendation: Grant based on disproportionate cost.

COMMISSION ACTION: Commission voted (21 - 0 in favor) to grant the waiver request based on disproportionate cost.

D. Haddon Hall Hotel and the Campton Apartments. 1500 Collins Avenue and 1455 Washington Avenue, Miami Beach

Recommendation: Grant based on technical infeasibility and the historic nature of the building.

COMMISSION ACTION: Commission voted (22 - 0 in favor) to conditionally grant the waiver based on technical infeasibility and the historic nature of the building.

E. Fred Schweitz, Too Your Health Spa, 995 South Highway 27/441, Ocala

Recommendation: Defer until the next meeting. Applicant needs to provide an electronic version of the application.

COMMISSION ACTION: Commission voted (22 - 0 in favor) to defer action on the waiver until the next meeting to provide an opportunity for the applicant to provide an electronic version of their application.

F. Gould Business Center Buildout, 587 West Eau Gallie Boulevard, Melbourne

Recommendation: Grant based on technical infeasibility and disproportionate cost.

COMMISSION ACTION: Commission voted (22 - 0 in favor) to grant the waiver based on technical infeasibility and disproportionate cost.

G. Alpha Delta Pi Sorority, 537 West Jefferson Street, Tallahassee

Recommendation: Defer until the next meeting. Applicant needs to provide additional information: cost breakdown/determination of ownership of the property.

COMMISSION ACTION: Commission voted (22 - 0 in favor) to defer action on the waiver until the next meeting to provide an opportunity for the applicant to provide a cost breakdown and verification of ownership of the building.

ATTACHMENT 7

LEGAL REPORT

DECLARATORY STATEMENTS

PETITIONS FOR DECLARATORY STATEMENTS—FEBRUARY 21, 2014

A. DS 2013-123 by Garland Patterson, PE

Mechanical TAC's Recommendation:

Determination was made that the request is general in scope and does not meet the declaratory statement criteria for the specific set of facts and circumstances. The TAC recommended that the request be denied.

COMMISSION ACTION: The Commission voted unanimously, 22 - 0 in favor, to dismiss the petition as general in scope and not meeting the declaratory statement criteria for a specific set of facts and circumstances.

B. DS2014-002 by Gulf Coast Supply and Manufacturing, LLC.

Roofing TAC's Recommendations:

Q1: To the question #1: Does Table 153.2 set forth the minimum thickness requirements used on metal roof systems, even though thinner metal roofing panels are acceptable per Table 1507.4(3)?

Answer: Yes. Table 1503.2 is specific to the type and gage of flashing that it is to be utilized and does not differentiate based on types of roof covering to be used.

Q2: To the Question #2: Do what we in the industry call "Trims" (eve drips, wall trims, ridge caps, preformed valleys, etc.) qualify as flashings, seeing they are always installed at the locations listed in 1503.2.1?

Answer: Yes. As long as the items in question are covered within the scope of section 1503.2 of the *Florida Building Code, Building*.

COMMISSION ACTION: The Commission voted unanimously, 22-0 in favor, to approve the Roofing TACs' recommendation on the petition.

ATTACHMENT 8
PRODUCT AND ENTITY APPROVAL REPORT

ID	Manufacturer	Category	Subcategory	STAFF	POC	FBC	Comments	
Evaluation by Engineer/ Architect Method - Staff Reviewers Recommend Approval								
1046-R6	Johns Manville	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
2533-R10	CertainTeed Corporation-Roofing	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
3901-R6	TAMKO Building Products, Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
3915-R12	Soprema, Inc.	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
4930-R6	Seaman Corporation	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
8134-R11	Alside Window Company	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
8393-R3	MarlynMetals, Incorporated	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
8569-R2	Elegante Iron, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
8637-R6	StormWatch	Shutters	Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9201-R3	Summet Metals	Windows	Projected				Recommend Approval	Revision

9625-R9	Gentek Building Products	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9627-R9	Revere Building Products	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9930-R5	Johns Manville	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10238-R2	Kane Manufacturing Corporation	Impact Protective Systems	Operable	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10453-R6	Alside Window Company	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10463-R6	Gentek Building Products	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10464-R6	Revere Building Products	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10465-R6	Associated Materials Inc.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10991-R9	Alside Window Company	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11137-R9	Gentek Building Products	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11139-R9	Revere Building Products	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11141-R10	Associated Materials Inc.	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11269-R3	Berridge Manufacturing Co.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11288-R10	CertainTeed Corporation-Roofing	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11422-R3	Berridge Manufacturing Co.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

11475-R4	Johns Manville	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11480-R5	Solatube International, Inc	Sky Lights	Skylight	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11720-R9	Associated Materials Inc.	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11870-R3	JELD-WEN	Windows	Mullions	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
13806-R6	Soprema, Inc.	Roofing	Liquid Applied Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
13958-R3	Complex Industries	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
14215-R5	Soprema, Inc.	Roofing	Waterproofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
14381-R2	SR Products	Roofing	Cements-Adhesives-Coatings	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15189-R1	Kolbe Windows and Doors - Wausau	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
15332-R1	MI Windows and Doors	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
15386-R2	Amarr Garage Doors	Exterior Doors	Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15527-R3	Croft,LLC	Windows	Mullions	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15694-R3	Amarr Garage Doors	Exterior Doors	Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
15706-R1	Windoor Incorporated	Windows	Mullions	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15709-R1	Windoor Incorporated	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15727-R2	Andersen Corporation	Windows	Awning	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

15784-R1	Coral Industries, Inc	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
15794	Coral Industries, Inc	Panel Walls	Storefronts	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
16052-R1	KML Windows, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16054-R3	MI Windows and Doors	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16092-R2	Wincore Window Company, LLC	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16344-R2	Windoor Incorporated	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16347-R1	BITEC, INC	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16468-R3	JELD-WEN	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16546-R1	Clopay Building Products Company	Exterior Doors	Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16554-R1	YKK AP America	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16556	Doors Crafter Co.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16563-R1	Englert Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16591	Windoor Incorporated	Windows	Mullions	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16668	YKK AP America	Panel Walls	Curtain Walls	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16671	Nana Wall	Windows	Products	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New

	Systems, Inc.		Introduced as a Result of New Technology					
16689	Acme Panel Company	Structural Components	Roof Deck	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16699	Gallina USA, LLC	Shutters	Storm Panels	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16704	Carlisle SynTec Incorporated	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16708	JELD-WEN	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16709	CertainTeed Corporation-Roofing	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16712	Innova Eco Building System LLC	Panel Walls	Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16714	Acme Panel Company	Structural Components	Structural Wall	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16715	Kawneer Company, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16716	Willard Shutter Co.	Shutters	Storm Panels	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16724	Henry Company	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16726	Coastline Shutters & Manufacturing, LLC	Shutters	Storm Panels	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16729	Crown Building Products of Florida LLC	Roofing	Roofing Tiles	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New

16734	DORMA Door Controls Inc. dba DORMA Architectural Hardware - Reamstown, PA	Exterior Doors	Exterior Door Components	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16735	Custom Window Systems Inc.	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16736	Custom Window Systems Inc.	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16738	JL Protection Systems LLC	Shutters	Accordion	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16741	Hope's Windows, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16742	Absolute Aluminum	Structural Components	Pre-engineered AC Stands	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16750	CAOBA Doors	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16754	Whirlwind Building Systems	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16755	Windoor Incorporated	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16756	Whirlwind Building Systems	Structural Components	Roof Deck	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16764	Fenestra America LLC.	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16768	Luxbaum Windows and Doors	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16770	Englert Inc.	Structural Components	Structural Wall	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16771	Windoor	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New

	Incorporated							
Evaluation by Test Report - Staff Reviewers Recommend Approval								
8799-R3	Madison Ind., Inc. of Georgia	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
16727	GlassCraft Door Corporation	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16737	Hart and Cooley	Roofing	Roofing Accessories that are an Integral Part of the Roofing System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
Entities - Staff Reviewers Recommend Approval								
CER1508	Window and Door Manufacturers Association	Product Certification Agency		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
QUA3726	Pyramid1, Inc	Product Quality Assurance		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
QUA5922	R I Ogawa & Associates, Inc.	Product Quality Assurance		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
QUA7628	Quality Auditing- Institute Ltd.	Product Quality Assurance		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
QUA10269	Element Materials Technology St. Paul	Product Quality Assurance		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
TST1558	Architectural Testing, Inc	Product Testing Laboratory		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
TST1685	Construction	Product		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

	Consulting Laboratory International	Testing Laboratory						
TST4311	Architectural Testing, Inc. - Florida	Product Testing Laboratory		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
TST6049	Trinity ERD - South Carolina	Product Testing Laboratory		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
TST6485	ENCON Technology Inc	Product Testing Laboratory		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
Discussion Items								
16663-R1	Clark Hall Iron Doors, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
							The application as presented raised concern about the number of hinges and proper evaluation of arched and eyebrow shapes. Evaluator provided test report indicating testing with reduced hinges to allow condition similar to arched configuration.	
							The tributary areas for the components contained within the tested assembly are equal to or greater than the tributary areas for the components	

							contained within the system represented in the approval.	
							POC agrees with Mr. Rick Wright's explanation. No further action is needed.	
16749	Acadian Iron Works	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	c	c	c	Recommend Approval	Revision
							The application as presented raised concerns about the number of surface bolts and compliance with the configurations shown as compliant with tested specimens required. Evaluator provided test report indicating testing performed. A cursory review of test report noted the following: 1) Specimen 4 was tested with engaged surface bolts, but the installation drawings does not provide a proper notation of them. 2) Specimen 6 shows surface bolts engaged to an item not described. The installation drawings do	

							not show the surface bolts. This specimen configuration is very different from the others and it is subject to discussion whether more specimens should have been tested.	
							<p>The application as presented raised concerns about the number of surface bolts and compliance with the configurations shown as compliant with tested specimens required. Evaluator provided test report indicating testing performed. A cursory review of test report noted the following: 1) Specimen 4 was tested with engaged surface bolts, but the installation drawings does not provide a proper notation of them.</p> <p>All specimens were tested with surface bolts in order to maintain consistency with all the configurations. The intent to qualify "Options" between all</p>	

							<p>6 specimens would have been the shapes and the choice of a use of the kickplate or not.. Glass type, panel construction, Max SQ. FT. Area of Glass, hardware, Sill types, Framing, etc. were all maintain equal thru out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We agree that even though the surface bolts are shown on the elevation, proper notation has to be provided to match the notes from previous elevations. <p>2) Specimen 6 shows surface bolts engaged to an item not described. The installation drawings do not show the surface bolts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarly to specimen 4, proper notation has to be provided to match the notes from previous elevations. As noted on the test report as well. This specimen configuration is very different from the others and it is subject 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>to discussion whether more specimens should have been tested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We believe that the 6 specimens were the proper quantity to qualify the tested configurations as presented in this application. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Specimen 1, 2 and 3 are all Double Doors with same overall height. With the only difference being shape of panel. o Specimen 1 with the rectangular panels was tested with full lites to qualify maximum sqft of glass and specimen 3 was tested with full lites as well in order to qualify the full radius option. o Arch (Eyebrow) specimen 2, was tested with the kickplate options since the top corner condition is closer to the square condition on specimen 1 that was qualified with the larger glass. o If we were to qualify double doors only specimens 1 thru 3 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>would have been sufficient. As an alternate option we would include a single round top door to support the qualification of the door in specimen 3 as a single round top door. Specimen 6 has this single round top door that is constructed in the same manner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Specimen 4 was included as an alternate single door as well. Although wider it has a smaller sqft area that will be qualified by already qualified specimens 1 thru 3. o Specimen 4 additionally has a transom configuration and Horizontal mullion span of 84 inches o Specimen 4 also qualifies Vertical Mullions up to approximately 96" tall. o Specimen 5 intent was to qualify a round top transom that would be inscribed into the rectangular transom in specimen 4. o Specimen 6 contains 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>similar sidelites as specimen 4 with horizontal mullions at the springline point with a similar height of 96". The surround transom has a smaller sqft area than that tested on Specimen 4 and 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From our experience, when testing to TAS protocols, we are able to test individual configurations/options within the first three specimens and create additional specimens to qualify alternate options to qualify additional hardware or configurations. All specimens, contain the same hardware, panel construction and glazing compositions. Method of installation is also common throughout all the specimens. <p>Hope this information provides the information required to allow this application to move forward with this pending approval status and allow an</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							approval to be given for this cycle.	
							<u>POC recommends conditional approval with conditions of: 1. Specimens 4 and 6 – provide proper notation to show surface bolts as tested.</u>	
Public Comments								
15894-R2	Firestone Building Products Company, LLC.	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	c	c	Recommend Approval	New
							<p>The listed assemblies do not reflect all of the tested deck conditions as required. Specifically the deck conditions of the 12x24 uplift (test supported) assemblies as specified in TAS 114 Section 5.2 and TAS 114 Appendix J section 5.1 and 5.2.</p> <p>TAS 114 contains language that indicates the roof assemblies are to be installed as tested</p>	

							<p>and that the construction and application specification is to be reviewed to ensure a reliable installation. This information is needed in the product approval for an effective plans review and inspection process at any building department.</p> <p>The test specimen's deck construction needs to have been included in the uplift report and needs to be included in the roof product approval assembly. Else, indicate not for use in the HVHZ.</p>	
							<p>Mr. Gascon has provided Code references in TAS 114, wherein he asserts the language requires complete deck description information, i.e. thickness, strength, type, span (as applicable), and structural attachment requirements, must be</p>	

							<p>listed in the product approval.</p> <p>In review of these sections as well as limits imposed on the product evaluation, I respectfully disagree with this assertion on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. These product approvals are formed on the basis of evaluating an assemblage of products in a "Roofing System". The HVHZ specifically defines Roofing System as "A system of interacting roofing components, generally consisting of membrane or primary roof covering and insulation (not including the roof deck) designed to weatherproof, and sometimes to improve, the building's thermal resistance". The evaluation reports comply with this definition by providing roof deck information for the thickness, strength, type, and span. These</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>descriptions provide assurance that the performance of the installed roof system components will achieve the evaluated load resistance as demonstrated through testing conducted under TAS 114.</p> <p>2. Adding further detail to the deck attachment based on the deck construction used in the test would in effect create potential danger to public welfare. Neither the test methodology nor the practice of the test methodology is appropriately sophisticated to simulate the worst case loading conditions for the deck's structural attachment. Therefore in testing practice, the resistance of the deck's structural attachment is often varied, which if used directly in the approval, could lead to an unrealistic assessment of the performance of the deck's structural</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>attachment. For this reason, the evaluation specifically imposes a limit of use on the deck by requiring the deck to be designed by others in accordance with the Florida Building Code requirements. This further aligns with requirements of the HVHZ for cold-formed steel construction, which allows for the rational analysis of the deck attachment under 2222.4.2.</p> <p>In summary, the above rationale provides further clarification to the design intent of the product evaluation in question. It is my belief that the methodology for the specification of the roof components approved for use in the referenced Florida product approvals best serves the interest of public safety and complies with the Code.</p>	
							<p>There is a typographical error on</p>	

							the spacing of the membrane attachment for System Nos. S-M-2 and R-M-6 that needs to be resolved prior to approval.	
				c	c		<u>POC recommends Conditional Approval with conditions of: 1. to indicate correct spacing of membrane attachments. 2. Specify attachments as tested and type of deck otherwise indicate not for use in HVHZ.</u>	
16725	Drexel Metals, Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	c	c	<u>Recommend Approval</u>	New
							The QA Entity is incorrect. The QA contract was originally with Architectural Testing who has since been acquired by Intertek, so Intertek was selected. However, the companies are still acting independently at this time, so Intertek is not yet recognizing any contracts initiated with Architectural Testing. Therefore, the QA Entity should be set to Architectural Testing.	

				c	c		POC recommends Conditional Approval with the conditions of: 1. Indicate correct Quality Assurance Entity.	
3504-R5	Sun Metals Systems, Inc.	Windows	Single Hung	a			Recommend Approval	Revision
							For products .1, .2, .3, .4, .5, .6, .7, and .8, the glazing detail (gasket call-out) does not match the part drawn for the numbered part. Correct and correlate. Else, indicate not for use in the HVHZ.	
							<p>We have reviewed Product Approval Drawings and concur with the public comment for products 1., 2., 3., 4., 5., 6., 7. and 8.. While the gasket drawn is the correct one (as reflected in the test report) the Bill of Materials spelled the wrong part reference.</p> <p>We are in the process of correcting the part reference number in the Bill of Materials and will provide a new</p>	

							signed and sealed copy.	
				c	c		POC recommends conditional approval with the condition of: <u>1. Glazing detail is revised to match the part drawn for the numbered part.</u>	
15892-R3	Firestone Building Products Company, LLC.	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	c	c	Recommend Approval	Revision
							<p>The listed assemblies do not reflect all of the tested deck conditions as required. Specifically the deck conditions of the 12x24 uplift (test supported) assemblies as specified in TAS 114 Section 5.2 and TAS 114 Appendix J section 5.1 and 5.2.</p> <p>TAS 114 contains language that indicates the roof assemblies are to be installed as tested and that the construction and application specification is to be reviewed to ensure a reliable installation.</p>	

							<p>This information is needed in the product approval for an effective plans review and inspection process at any building department.</p> <p>The test specimen's deck construction needs to have been included in the uplift report and needs to be included in the roof product approval assembly. Else, indicate not for use in the HVHZ.</p>	
							<p>Mr. Gascon has provided Code references in TAS 114, wherein he asserts the language requires complete deck description information, i.e. thickness, strength, type, span (as applicable), and structural attachment requirements, must be listed in the product approval.</p> <p>In review of these sections as well as limits imposed on the product evaluation, I</p>	

							<p>respectfully disagree with this assertion on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. These product approvals are formed on the basis of evaluating an assemblage of products in a "Roofing System". The HVHZ specifically defines Roofing System as "A system of interacting roofing components, generally consisting of membrane or primary roof covering and insulation (not including the roof deck) designed to weatherproof, and sometimes to improve, the building's thermal resistance". The evaluation reports comply with this definition by providing roof deck information for the thickness, strength, type, and span. These descriptions provide assurance that the performance of the installed roof system components will achieve the evaluated</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							<p>load resistance as demonstrated through testing conducted under TAS 114.</p> <p>2. Adding further detail to the deck attachment based on the deck construction used in the test would in effect create potential danger to public welfare. Neither the test methodology nor the practice of the test methodology is appropriately sophisticated to simulate the worst case loading conditions for the deck's structural attachment. Therefore in testing practice, the resistance of the deck's structural attachment is often varied, which if used directly in the approval, could lead to an unrealistic assessment of the performance of the deck's structural attachment. For this reason, the evaluation specifically imposes a limit of use on the deck by requiring the deck to be designed by</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							<p>others in accordance with the Florida Building Code requirements. This further aligns with requirements of the HVHZ for cold-formed steel construction, which allows for the rational analysis of the deck attachment under 2222.4.2.</p> <p>In summary, the above rationale provides further clarification to the design intent of the product evaluation in question. It is my belief that the methodology for the specification of the roof components approved for use in the referenced Florida product approvals best serves the interest of public safety and complies with the Code.</p>	
				c	c	c	<p><u>POC recommends Conditional Approval with conditions of: 1. Specify attachments as tested and type of deck otherwise indicate not for use</u></p>	

							<u>in HVHZ.</u>	
16057-R1	Zion Tiles Corp.	Roofing	Roofing Tiles	a	c	c	Recommend Approval	Revision
							Gascon - The listed test data in the evaluation report lacks evidence of TAS101 for the mortar set tile. However, it is listed as an approved condition in the evaluation report. Provide the needed testing for the mortar set condition, or remove it as an option.	
							We would like to request a conditional approval for FL 16057-R1, based on the removal of the mortar set option. That option was introduced by mistake, based on a previous test that does not apply to the revised tile.	
				c	c		POC recommends conditional approval with the condition of: <u>1. The Evaluation Report is revised to remove the option for mortar set condition.</u>	
16707	Euro-Wall	Shutters	Colonial	a	c	c	Recommend	New

	Systems, LLC						Approval	
							Limits of use for the exterior structural panel of the shutter need to specify the rating per FBC 2315.2 or show proof of meeting FBC 2315.1.11. Else indicate not gor use in the HVHZ.	
							The structural wood component of the colonial shutters is GP Plytanium plywood sheathing. The attached specification sheet from GP contains the following classifications related to 2010 FBC conformance in Section 2315.2 and 2315.1.2. The panel used in testing was Exterior Grade Bond Classification Performance Category 23/32 which ranges in thickness of 0.688" to 0.75". Primary Species Southern Yellow Pine Testing Agency APA®-The Engineered Wood Association Exterior –	

							Plywood suitable for repeated wetting and redrying or long-term exposure to weather and other conditions of similar severity. Code Fire Classification Class III or C Flame Spread Rating 76-200, smoke-developed index <450 Building Code Compliance PS 1-09 or PS 2-10	
							We request conditional approval be rendered with the following caveat. Revise installation drawing no. EURO0009, General Note 6.2 on sheet 1 to read as follows. 6.2 EXTERIOR PANEL (STRUCTURAL COMPONENT OF ASSEMBLY) 6.2.1 PERFORMANCE CATEGORY 23/32, 5-PLY ENGINEERED WOOD PANEL, EXTERIOR GRADE BOND CLASSIFICATION IN CONFORMANCE	

							WITH THE 2010 FBC, SECTIONS 2315.1.2 AND 2315.2. Add requirement for structural pane shown above in note 6.2.1 to limits of use on product approval application.	
				c	c	c	<p><u>POC recommends conditional approval with the following conditions:</u></p> <p><u>1. Revise installation drawing no. EURO0009, General Note 6.2 on sheet 1 to read as follows.</u></p> <p><u>6.2 EXTERIOR PANEL (STRUCTURAL COMPONENT OF ASSEMBLY)</u></p> <p><u>6.2.1 PERFORMANCE CATEGORY 23/32, 5-PLY ENGINEERED WOOD PANEL, EXTERIOR GRADE BOND CLASSIFICATION IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE 2010</u></p>	

							<u>FBC, SECTIONS 2315.1.2 AND 2315.2.</u> <u>2. Add requirement for structural pane shown above in note 6.2.1 to limits of use on product approval application.</u>	
16717	POLYGLASS USA	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	c	c	Recommend Approval	New
							<p>The listed assemblies do not reflect all of the tested deck conditions as required. Specifically the deck conditions of the 12x24 uplift (test supported) assemblies as specified in TAS 114 Section 5.2 and TAS 114 Appendix J section 5.1 and 5.2.</p> <p>TAS 114 contains language that indicates the roof assemblies are to be installed as tested and that the construction and application specification is to be reviewed to ensure a reliable installation. This information is</p>	

							<p>needed in the product approval for an effective plans review and inspection process at any building department.</p> <p>The test specimen's deck construction needs to have been included in the uplift report and needs to be included in the roof product approval assembly. Else, indicate not for use in the HVHZ.</p>	
							<p>This is in response to the public comment received for the subject Florida Statewide Product Approval files, which asserts that the test protocol (TAS 114) requires that the Evaluation Reports contain more specificity as to the tested deck construction (i.e., the components beneath the roof covering). The Evaluation Reports tied to the subject files detail minimum decking material requirements</p>	

							<p>which are essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components, providing designers and building officials with information to ensure that the overlying roof cover components and methods of attachment meet the associated design pressures. The Evaluation Reports further state the following to ensure the deck construction (components beneath the roof covering) are properly addressed per code for a given project: Excerpt from Evaluation Reports: “The roof system evaluation herein pertains to above-deck roof components. Roof decks shall be in accordance with FBC (HVHZ) requirements to the satisfaction of the AHJ. Wind load resistance of the roof deck shall be documented through proper codified and/or FBC (HVHZ) Approval</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>documentation.”</p> <p>Please consider the following:</p> <p>1. The Product Approval Category and Subcategory, established by Rule 9N-3, for these filings are “Roofing” and “Single Ply Roof Systems”, respectively. FBC (HVHZ) Section 1513.1 specifically defines “Roofing System” as follows (underscore added by writer):</p> <p>Excerpt from FBC 1513.1: "A system of interacting roofing components, generally consisting of membrane or primary roof covering and insulation (not including the roof deck) designed to weatherproof, and sometimes to improve, the building's thermal resistance".</p> <p>The Evaluation Reports comply with this definition.</p> <p>2. To include specificity beyond the minimum deck</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							<p>materials themselves would circumvent other sections of the code (e.g., Chapter 22 for steel), potentially resulting in a false sense of security and putting the public at risk. A designer and/or building official could view a specific deck construction (components beneath the roof covering) as having been evaluated under all applicable sections of the code, when – in reality – that is not the case.</p> <p>3. There are a plethora of existing FBC HVHZ Product Approval files detailing roofing systems of all types Approved on the Building Code Information System (BCIS) today which detail minimum deck material requirements only. The majority of these are through Method 1A – Certification Method using Miami-Dade NOAs as the basis for compliance</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>documentation. To require specificity as to deck construction for submittals based on an alternate Method under Rule 9N-3 would seem biased.</p> <p>In summary our method of deck description, which provides information essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components while clearly delegating design of the deck to meet all codified requirements specific to the project, best serves the interest of public safety and code compliance.</p> <p>Based on the above response, we believe your original recommendation for Approval of the subject files remains valid and reasonable.</p>	
				c	c	c	<p><u>POC recommends Conditional Approval with conditions of: 1. Specify attachments as tested and type of deck otherwise</u></p>	

							<u>indicate not for use in HVHZ.</u>	
16718	POLYGLASS USA	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	c	c	Recommend Approval	New
							<p>The listed assemblies do not reflect all of the tested deck conditions as required. Specifically the deck conditions of the 12x24 uplift (test supported) assemblies as specified in TAS 114 Section 5.2 and TAS 114 Appendix J section 5.1 and 5.2.</p> <p>TAS 114 contains language that indicates the roof assemblies are to be installed as tested and that the construction and application specification is to be reviewed to ensure a reliable installation. This information is needed in the product approval for an effective plans review and inspection process at any building department.</p>	

							<p>The test specimen's deck construction needs to have been included in the uplift report and needs to be included in the roof product approval assembly. Else, indicate not for use in the HVHZ.</p>	
							<p>This is in response to the public comment received for the subject Florida Statewide Product Approval files, which asserts that the test protocol (TAS 114) requires that the Evaluation Reports contain more specificity as to the tested deck construction (i.e., the components beneath the roof covering). The Evaluation Reports tied to the subject files detail minimum decking material requirements which are essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components, providing designers and building officials with information to ensure</p>	

							<p>that the overlying roof cover components and methods of attachment meet the associated design pressures. The Evaluation Reports further state the following to ensure the deck construction (components beneath the roof covering) are properly addressed per code for a given project: Excerpt from Evaluation Reports: “The roof system evaluation herein pertains to above-deck roof components. Roof decks shall be in accordance with FBC (HVHZ) requirements to the satisfaction of the AHJ. Wind load resistance of the roof deck shall be documented through proper codified and/or FBC (HVHZ) Approval documentation.” Please consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Product Approval Category and Subcategory, established by Rule 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							<p>9N-3, for these filings are “Roofing” and “Single Ply Roof Systems”, respectively. FBC (HVHZ) Section 1513.1 specifically defines “Roofing System” as follows (underscore added by writer):</p> <p>Excerpt from FBC 1513.1: "A system of interacting roofing components, generally consisting of membrane or primary roof covering and insulation (not including the roof deck) designed to weatherproof, and sometimes to improve, the building's thermal resistance".</p> <p>The Evaluation Reports comply with this definition.</p> <p>2. To include specificity beyond the minimum deck materials themselves would circumvent other sections of the code (e.g., Chapter 22 for steel), potentially resulting in a false sense of security and</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>putting the public at risk. A designer and/or building official could view a specific deck construction (components beneath the roof covering) as having been evaluated under all applicable sections of the code, when – in reality – that is not the case.</p> <p>3. There are a plethora of existing FBC HVHZ Product Approval files detailing roofing systems of all types Approved on the Building Code Information System (BCIS) today which detail minimum deck material requirements only. The majority of these are through Method 1A – Certification Method using Miami-Dade NOAs as the basis for compliance documentation. To require specificity as to deck construction for submittals based on an alternate Method under Rule 9N-3 would seem biased.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							<p>In summary our method of deck description, which provides information essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components while clearly delegating design of the deck to meet all codified requirements specific to the project, best serves the interest of public safety and code compliance.</p> <p>Based on the above response, we believe your original recommendation for Approval of the subject files remains valid and reasonable.</p>	
				c	c	c	<p><u>POC recommends Conditional Approval with conditions of: 1. Specify attachments as tested and type of deck otherwise indicate not for use in HVHZ.</u></p>	
16722	Firestone Building Products Company,	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	c	c	<p>Recommend Approval</p>	New

	LLC.							
							<p>The listed assemblies do not reflect all of the tested deck conditions as required. Specifically the deck conditions of the 12x24 uplift (test supported) assemblies as specified in TAS 114 Section 5.2 and TAS 114 Appendix J section 5.1 and 5.2.</p> <p>TAS 114 contains language that indicates the roof assemblies are to be installed as tested and that the construction and application specification is to be reviewed to ensure a reliable installation. This information is needed in the product approval for an effective plans review and inspection process at any building department.</p> <p>The test specimen's deck construction needs to have been included in the uplift report and needs to be</p>	

							included in the roof product approval assembly. Else, indicate not for use in the HVHZ.	
							This is in response to the public comment received for the subject Florida Statewide Product Approval files, which asserts that the test protocol (TAS 114) requires that the Evaluation Reports contain more specificity as to the tested deck construction (i.e., the components beneath the roof covering). The Evaluation Reports tied to the subject files detail minimum decking material requirements which are essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components, providing designers and building officials with information to ensure that the overlying roof cover components and methods of attachment meet the associated design pressures. The	

							<p>Evaluation Reports further state the following to ensure the deck construction (components beneath the roof covering) are properly addressed per code for a given project: Excerpt from Evaluation Reports: “The roof system evaluation herein pertains to above-deck roof components. Roof decks shall be in accordance with FBC (HVHZ) requirements to the satisfaction of the AHJ. Wind load resistance of the roof deck shall be documented through proper codified and/or FBC (HVHZ) Approval documentation.” Please consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Product Approval Category and Subcategory, established by Rule 9N-3, for these filings are “Roofing” and “Single Ply Roof Systems”, respectively. FBC (HVHZ) Section 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>1513.1 specifically defines “Roofing System” as follows (underscore added by writer):</p> <p>Excerpt from FBC 1513.1: "A system of interacting roofing components, generally consisting of membrane or primary roof covering and insulation (not including the roof deck) designed to weatherproof, and sometimes to improve, the building's thermal resistance".</p> <p>The Evaluation Reports comply with this definition.</p> <p>2. To include specificity beyond the minimum deck materials themselves would circumvent other sections of the code (e.g., Chapter 22 for steel), potentially resulting in a false sense of security and putting the public at risk. A designer and/or building official could view a specific deck construction</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>(components beneath the roof covering) as having been evaluated under all applicable sections of the code, when – in reality – that is not the case.</p> <p>3. There are a plethora of existing FBC HVHZ Product Approval files detailing roofing systems of all types Approved on the Building Code Information System (BCIS) today which detail minimum deck material requirements only. The majority of these are through Method 1A – Certification Method using Miami-Dade NOAs as the basis for compliance documentation. To require specificity as to deck construction for submittals based on an alternate Method under Rule 9N-3 would seem biased.</p> <p>In summary our method of deck description, which provides information essential to the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							performance of the above-deck roof components while clearly delegating design of the deck to meet all codified requirements specific to the project, best serves the interest of public safety and code compliance. Based on the above response, we believe your original recommendation for Approval of the subject files remains valid and reasonable.	
				c	c	c	<u>POC recommends Conditional Approval with conditions of: 1. Specify attachments as tested and type of deck otherwise indicate not for use in HVHZ.</u>	
16723	Firestone Building Products Company, LLC.	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	c	c	Recommend Approval	New
							The listed assemblies do not reflect all of the tested deck conditions as required.	

							<p>Specifically the deck conditions of the 12x24 uplift (test supported) assemblies as specified in TAS 114 Section 5.2 and TAS 114 Appendix J section 5.1 and 5.2.</p> <p>TAS 114 contains language that indicates the roof assemblies are to be installed as tested and that the construction and application specification is to be reviewed to ensure a reliable installation. This information is needed in the product approval for an effective plans review and inspection process at any building department.</p> <p>The test specimen's deck construction needs to have been included in the uplift report and needs to be included in the roof product approval assembly. Else, indicate not for use in the HVHZ.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>This is in response to the public comment received for the subject Florida Statewide Product Approval files, which asserts that the test protocol (TAS 114) requires that the Evaluation Reports contain more specificity as to the tested deck construction (i.e., the components beneath the roof covering). The Evaluation Reports tied to the subject files detail minimum decking material requirements which are essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components, providing designers and building officials with information to ensure that the overlying roof cover components and methods of attachment meet the associated design pressures. The Evaluation Reports further state the following to ensure the deck construction (components beneath</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							<p>the roof covering) are properly addressed per code for a given project: Excerpt from Evaluation Reports: “The roof system evaluation herein pertains to above-deck roof components. Roof decks shall be in accordance with FBC (HVHZ) requirements to the satisfaction of the AHJ. Wind load resistance of the roof deck shall be documented through proper codified and/or FBC (HVHZ) Approval documentation.” Please consider the following:</p> <p>1. The Product Approval Category and Subcategory, established by Rule 9N-3, for these filings are “Roofing” and “Single Ply Roof Systems”, respectively. FBC (HVHZ) Section 1513.1 specifically defines “Roofing System” as follows (underscore added by writer):</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>Excerpt from FBC 1513.1: "A system of interacting roofing components, generally consisting of membrane or primary roof covering and insulation (not including the roof deck) designed to weatherproof, and sometimes to improve, the building's thermal resistance".</p> <p>The Evaluation Reports comply with this definition.</p> <p>2. To include specificity beyond the minimum deck materials themselves would circumvent other sections of the code (e.g., Chapter 22 for steel), potentially resulting in a false sense of security and putting the public at risk. A designer and/or building official could view a specific deck construction (components beneath the roof covering) as having been evaluated under all applicable sections of the code,</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>when – in reality – that is not the case.</p> <p>3. There are a plethora of existing FBC HVHZ Product Approval files detailing roofing systems of all types Approved on the Building Code Information System (BCIS) today which detail minimum deck material requirements only. The majority of these are through Method 1A – Certification Method using Miami-Dade NOAs as the basis for compliance documentation. To require specificity as to deck construction for submittals based on an alternate Method under Rule 9N-3 would seem biased.</p> <p>In summary our method of deck description, which provides information essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components while clearly delegating design of the deck to</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							meet all codified requirements specific to the project, best serves the interest of public safety and code compliance. Based on the above response, we believe your original recommendation for Approval of the subject files remains valid and reasonable.	
				c	c	c	<u>POC recommends Conditional Approval with conditions of: 1. Specify attachments as tested and type of deck otherwise indicate not for use in HVHZ.</u>	
16730	GAF	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	c	c	Recommend Approval	New
							The listed assemblies do not reflect all of the tested deck conditions as required. Specifically the deck conditions of the 12x24 uplift (test supported) assemblies as specified in TAS 114 Section 5.2 and TAS 114 Appendix J section	

							<p>5.1 and 5.2.</p> <p>TAS 114 contains language that indicates the roof assemblies are to be installed as tested and that the construction and application specification is to be reviewed to ensure a reliable installation. This information is needed in the product approval for an effective plans review and inspection process at any building department.</p> <p>The test specimen's deck construction needs to have been included in the uplift report and needs to be included in the roof product approval assembly. Else, indicate not for use in the HVHZ.</p>	
							<p>This is in response to the public comment received for the subject Florida Statewide Product Approval files, which asserts that the test protocol (TAS</p>	

							<p>114) requires that the Evaluation Reports contain more specificity as to the tested deck construction (i.e., the components beneath the roof covering). The Evaluation Reports tied to the subject files detail minimum decking material requirements which are essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components, providing designers and building officials with information to ensure that the overlying roof cover components and methods of attachment meet the associated design pressures. The Evaluation Reports further state the following to ensure the deck construction (components beneath the roof covering) are properly addressed per code for a given project: Excerpt from Evaluation Reports: “The roof system evaluation herein</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>pertains to above-deck roof components. Roof decks shall be in accordance with FBC (HVHZ) requirements to the satisfaction of the AHJ. Wind load resistance of the roof deck shall be documented through proper codified and/or FBC (HVHZ) Approval documentation.”</p> <p>Please consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Product Approval Category and Subcategory, established by Rule 9N-3, for these filings are “Roofing” and “Single Ply Roof Systems”, respectively. FBC (HVHZ) Section 1513.1 specifically defines “Roofing System” as follows (underscore added by writer): <p>Excerpt from FBC 1513.1: "A system of interacting roofing components, generally consisting of membrane or primary roof covering and</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							<p>insulation (not including the roof deck) designed to weatherproof, and sometimes to improve, the building's thermal resistance".</p> <p>The Evaluation Reports comply with this definition.</p> <p>2. To include specificity beyond the minimum deck materials themselves would circumvent other sections of the code (e.g., Chapter 22 for steel), potentially resulting in a false sense of security and putting the public at risk. A designer and/or building official could view a specific deck construction (components beneath the roof covering) as having been evaluated under all applicable sections of the code, when – in reality – that is not the case.</p> <p>3. There are a plethora of existing FBC HVHZ Product Approval files detailing roofing systems of all</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>types Approved on the Building Code Information System (BCIS) today which detail minimum deck material requirements only. The majority of these are through Method 1A – Certification Method using Miami-Dade NOAs as the basis for compliance documentation. To require specificity as to deck construction for submittals based on an alternate Method under Rule 9N-3 would seem biased.</p> <p>In summary our method of deck description, which provides information essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components while clearly delegating design of the deck to meet all codified requirements specific to the project, best serves the interest of public safety and code compliance.</p> <p>Based on the above</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							response, we believe your original recommendation for Approval of the subject files remains valid and reasonable.	
				c	c	c	<u>POC recommends Conditional Approval with conditions of: 1. Specify attachments as tested and type of deck otherwise indicate not for use in HVHZ.</u>	
16732	GAF	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	c	c	Recommend Approval	New
							<p>The listed assemblies do not reflect all of the tested deck conditions as required. Specifically the deck conditions of the 12x24 uplift (test supported) assemblies as specified in TAS 114 Section 5.2 and TAS 114 Appendix J section 5.1 and 5.2.</p> <p>TAS 114 contains language that indicates the roof assemblies are</p>	

							<p>to be installed as tested and that the construction and application specification is to be reviewed to ensure a reliable installation. This information is needed in the product approval for an effective plans review and inspection process at any building department.</p> <p>The test specimen's deck construction needs to have been included in the uplift report and needs to be included in the roof product approval assembly. Else, indicate not for use in the HVHZ.</p>	
							<p>This is in response to the public comment received for the subject Florida Statewide Product Approval files, which asserts that the test protocol (TAS 114) requires that the Evaluation Reports contain more specificity as to the tested deck</p>	

							<p>construction (i.e., the components beneath the roof covering). The Evaluation Reports tied to the subject files detail minimum decking material requirements which are essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components, providing designers and building officials with information to ensure that the overlying roof cover components and methods of attachment meet the associated design pressures. The Evaluation Reports further state the following to ensure the deck construction (components beneath the roof covering) are properly addressed per code for a given project: Excerpt from Evaluation Reports: “The roof system evaluation herein pertains to above-deck roof components. Roof decks shall be in accordance with FBC (HVHZ) requirements</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>to the satisfaction of the AHJ. Wind load resistance of the roof deck shall be documented through proper codified and/or FBC (HVHZ) Approval documentation.”</p> <p>Please consider the following:</p> <p>1. The Product Approval Category and Subcategory, established by Rule 9N-3, for these filings are “Roofing” and “Single Ply Roof Systems”, respectively. FBC (HVHZ) Section 1513.1 specifically defines “Roofing System” as follows (underscore added by writer):</p> <p>Excerpt from FBC 1513.1: "A system of interacting roofing components, generally consisting of membrane or primary roof covering and insulation (not including the roof deck) designed to weatherproof, and sometimes to improve,</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>the building's thermal resistance".</p> <p>The Evaluation Reports comply with this definition.</p> <p>2. To include specificity beyond the minimum deck materials themselves would circumvent other sections of the code (e.g., Chapter 22 for steel), potentially resulting in a false sense of security and putting the public at risk. A designer and/or building official could view a specific deck construction (components beneath the roof covering) as having been evaluated under all applicable sections of the code, when – in reality – that is not the case.</p> <p>3. There are a plethora of existing FBC HVHZ Product Approval files detailing roofing systems of all types Approved on the Building Code Information System (BCIS) today which detail minimum deck</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							<p>material requirements only. The majority of these are through Method 1A – Certification Method using Miami-Dade NOAs as the basis for compliance documentation. To require specificity as to deck construction for submittals based on an alternate Method under Rule 9N-3 would seem biased.</p> <p>In summary our method of deck description, which provides information essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components while clearly delegating design of the deck to meet all codified requirements specific to the project, best serves the interest of public safety and code compliance.</p> <p>Based on the above response, we believe your original recommendation for Approval of the subject files remains valid and</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							reasonable.	
				c	c	c	<u>POC recommends Conditional Approval with conditions of: 1. Specify attachments as tested and type of deck otherwise indicate not for use in HVHZ.</u>	
16733	GAF	Roofing	Built up Roofing	a	c	c	<u>Recommend Approval</u>	New
							<p>The listed assemblies do not reflect all of the tested deck conditions as required. Specifically the deck conditions of the 12x24 uplift (test supported) assemblies as specified in TAS 114 Section 5.2 and TAS 114 Appendix J section 5.1 and 5.2.</p> <p>TAS 114 contains language that indicates the roof assemblies are to be installed as tested and that the construction and application specification is to be reviewed to ensure a reliable installation. This information is</p>	

							<p>needed in the product approval for an effective plans review and inspection process at any building department.</p> <p>The test specimen's deck construction needs to have been included in the uplift report and needs to be included in the roof product approval assembly. Else, indicate not for use in the HVHZ.</p>	
							<p>This is in response to the public comment received for the subject Florida Statewide Product Approval files, which asserts that the test protocol (TAS 114) requires that the Evaluation Reports contain more specificity as to the tested deck construction (i.e., the components beneath the roof covering). The Evaluation Reports tied to the subject files detail minimum decking material requirements</p>	

							<p>which are essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components, providing designers and building officials with information to ensure that the overlying roof cover components and methods of attachment meet the associated design pressures. The Evaluation Reports further state the following to ensure the deck construction (components beneath the roof covering) are properly addressed per code for a given project: Excerpt from Evaluation Reports: “The roof system evaluation herein pertains to above-deck roof components. Roof decks shall be in accordance with FBC (HVHZ) requirements to the satisfaction of the AHJ. Wind load resistance of the roof deck shall be documented through proper codified and/or FBC (HVHZ) Approval</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>documentation.”</p> <p>Please consider the following:</p> <p>1. The Product Approval Category and Subcategory, established by Rule 9N-3, for these filings are “Roofing” and “Single Ply Roof Systems”, respectively. FBC (HVHZ) Section 1513.1 specifically defines “Roofing System” as follows (underscore added by writer):</p> <p>Excerpt from FBC 1513.1: "A system of interacting roofing components, generally consisting of membrane or primary roof covering and insulation (not including the roof deck) designed to weatherproof, and sometimes to improve, the building's thermal resistance".</p> <p>The Evaluation Reports comply with this definition.</p> <p>2. To include specificity beyond the minimum deck</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							<p>materials themselves would circumvent other sections of the code (e.g., Chapter 22 for steel), potentially resulting in a false sense of security and putting the public at risk. A designer and/or building official could view a specific deck construction (components beneath the roof covering) as having been evaluated under all applicable sections of the code, when – in reality – that is not the case.</p> <p>3. There are a plethora of existing FBC HVHZ Product Approval files detailing roofing systems of all types Approved on the Building Code Information System (BCIS) today which detail minimum deck material requirements only. The majority of these are through Method 1A – Certification Method using Miami-Dade NOAs as the basis for compliance</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>documentation. To require specificity as to deck construction for submittals based on an alternate Method under Rule 9N-3 would seem biased.</p> <p>In summary our method of deck description, which provides information essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components while clearly delegating design of the deck to meet all codified requirements specific to the project, best serves the interest of public safety and code compliance.</p> <p>Based on the above response, we believe your original recommendation for Approval of the subject files remains valid and reasonable.</p>	
				c	c	c	<p><u>POC recommends Conditional Approval with conditions of: 1. Specify attachments as tested and type of deck otherwise</u></p>	

							<u>indicate not for use in HVHZ.</u>	
16736	Custom Window Systems Inc.	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	c	c	Recommend Approval	New
							On product .1 the 1/4" edge distance for the #8 flange screws do not conform to NDS-2005 edition. (See installation instructions sheet 7 of 8.)	
							I disagree with the comment. The edge distance shown is to the unloaded edge of the wood buck and per Table 11.5.1A in NDS-2005 the Minimum Edge Distance in this case is 1.5D. D is the diameter of the wood screw, which per the NDS is 0.164" so $1.5 \times D = 0.246"$. 0.250" exceeds this minimum so it is acceptable.	
				c	c		POC recommends Conditional Approval with conditions of: 1. <u>Revise edge distance to be consistent with the NDS 2005 commentary (2.5D)</u>	

16739	GAF	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a			Recommend Approval	New
							<p>The listed assemblies do not reflect all of the tested deck conditions as required. Specifically the deck conditions of the 12x24 uplift (test supported) assemblies as specified in TAS 114 Section 5.2 and TAS 114 Appendix J section 5.1 and 5.2.</p> <p>TAS 114 contains language that indicates the roof assemblies are to be installed as tested and that the construction and application specification is to be reviewed to ensure a reliable installation. This information is needed in the product approval for an effective plans review and inspection process at any building department.</p> <p>The test specimen's deck construction needs to have been included in the uplift</p>	

							report and needs to be included in the roof product approval assembly. Else, indicate not for use in the HVHZ.	
							This is in response to the public comment received for the subject Florida Statewide Product Approval files, which asserts that the test protocol (TAS 114) requires that the Evaluation Reports contain more specificity as to the tested deck construction (i.e., the components beneath the roof covering). The Evaluation Reports tied to the subject files detail minimum decking material requirements which are essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components, providing designers and building officials with information to ensure that the overlying roof cover components and methods of attachment meet the associated	

							<p>design pressures. The Evaluation Reports further state the following to ensure the deck construction (components beneath the roof covering) are properly addressed per code for a given project: Excerpt from Evaluation Reports: “The roof system evaluation herein pertains to above-deck roof components. Roof decks shall be in accordance with FBC (HVHZ) requirements to the satisfaction of the AHJ. Wind load resistance of the roof deck shall be documented through proper codified and/or FBC (HVHZ) Approval documentation.” Please consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Product Approval Category and Subcategory, established by Rule 9N-3, for these filings are “Roofing” and “Single Ply Roof Systems”, respectively. 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							<p>FBC (HVHZ) Section 1513.1 specifically defines “Roofing System” as follows (underscore added by writer):</p> <p>Excerpt from FBC 1513.1: "A system of interacting roofing components, generally consisting of membrane or primary roof covering and insulation (not including the roof deck) designed to weatherproof, and sometimes to improve, the building's thermal resistance".</p> <p>The Evaluation Reports comply with this definition.</p> <p>2. To include specificity beyond the minimum deck materials themselves would circumvent other sections of the code (e.g., Chapter 22 for steel), potentially resulting in a false sense of security and putting the public at risk. A designer and/or building official could view a specific deck</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>construction (components beneath the roof covering) as having been evaluated under all applicable sections of the code, when – in reality – that is not the case.</p> <p>3. There are a plethora of existing FBC HVHZ Product Approval files detailing roofing systems of all types Approved on the Building Code Information System (BCIS) today which detail minimum deck material requirements only. The majority of these are through Method 1A – Certification Method using Miami-Dade NOAs as the basis for compliance documentation. To require specificity as to deck construction for submittals based on an alternate Method under Rule 9N-3 would seem biased.</p> <p>In summary our method of deck description, which provides information</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							essential to the performance of the above-deck roof components while clearly delegating design of the deck to meet all codified requirements specific to the project, best serves the interest of public safety and code compliance. Based on the above response, we believe your original recommendation for Approval of the subject files remains valid and reasonable.	
				c	c	c	<u>POC recommends Conditional Approval with conditions of: 1. Specify attachments as tested and type of deck otherwise indicate not for use in HVHZ.</u>	
16742	Absolute Aluminum	Structural Components	Pre-engineered AC Stands	a	c	c	Recommend Approval	New
							The scanned installation instructions in the notes sheet 1 of 4 are not legible; size of anchors called out is	

							important.	
							Absolute Aluminum will replace current installation instructions with clearer version and request Conditional Approval with condition being update with legible copy.	
				c	c	c	<u>POC recommends conditional approval with the condition of:</u> <u>1. The installation instructions are replaced with a clearer version.</u>	
16758	Johns Manville	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	c	c	Recommend Approval	New
							The listed assemblies do not reflect all of the tested deck conditions as required. Specifically the deck conditions of the 12x24 uplift (test supported) assemblies as specified in TAS 114 Section 5.2 and TAS 114 Appendix J section 5.1 and 5.2. TAS 114 contains language that indicates the roof assemblies are to be installed as tested	

							<p>and that the construction and application specification is to be reviewed to ensure a reliable installation. This information is needed in the product approval for an effective plans review and inspection process at any building department.</p> <p>The test specimen's deck construction needs to have been included in the uplift report and needs to be included in the roof product approval assembly. Else, indicate not for use in the HVHZ.</p>	
							<p>Mr. Gascon has provided Code references in TAS 114, wherein he asserts the language requires complete deck description information, i.e. thickness, strength, type, span (as applicable), and structural attachment requirements, must be</p>	

							<p>listed in the product approval.</p> <p>In review of these sections as well as limits imposed on the product evaluation, I respectfully disagree with this assertion on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. These product approvals are formed on the basis of evaluating an assemblage of products in a "Roofing System". The HVHZ specifically defines Roofing System as "A system of interacting roofing components, generally consisting of membrane or primary roof covering and insulation (not including the roof deck) designed to weatherproof, and sometimes to improve, the building's thermal resistance". The evaluation reports comply with this definition by providing roof deck information for the thickness, strength, type, and span. These</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>descriptions provide assurance that the performance of the installed roof system components will achieve the evaluated load resistance as demonstrated through testing conducted under TAS 114.</p> <p>2. Adding further detail to the deck attachment based on the deck construction used in the test would in effect create potential danger to public welfare. Neither the test methodology nor the practice of the test methodology is appropriately sophisticated to simulate the worst case loading conditions for the deck's structural attachment. Therefore in testing practice, the resistance of the deck's structural attachment is often varied, which if used directly in the approval, could lead to an unrealistic assessment of the performance of the deck's structural</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>attachment. For this reason, the evaluation specifically imposes a limit of use on the deck by requiring the deck to be designed by others in accordance with the Florida Building Code requirements. This further aligns with requirements of the HVHZ for cold-formed steel construction, which allows for the rational analysis of the deck attachment under 2222.4.2.</p> <p>In summary, the above rationale provides further clarification to the design intent of the product evaluation in question. It is my belief that the methodology for the specification of the roof components approved for use in the referenced Florida product approvals best serves the interest of public safety and complies with the Code.</p>	
				c	c	c	POC recommends	

							<u>Conditional Approval with conditions of: 1. Specify attachments as tested and type of deck otherwise indicate not for use in HVHZ.</u>	
16767	Wasau Window and Wall Systems	Panel Walls	Curtain Walls	a	c	c	Recommend Approval	New
							Gascon - Product .3 installation instructions (last sheet) glass type GL5 is not qualified by the testing for the limits of use specified; i.e. impact. Remove this glass type or limit approval not for use in the HVHZ.	
							Applicant requests conditional approval with the understanding that GL-5 will be marked as non-impact and not for use inside the HVHZ. We will have the application corrected as soon as we are permitted after the product approval meeting.	
				c	c	c	<u>POC recommends conditional approval with the condition of: 1. Remove GL-5 from</u>	

							subproduct .3 otherwise indicate not for use inside the HVVZ.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--