FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

FACILITATOR’S SUMMARY REPORT OF THE

JUNE 8, 2010

COMMISSION PLENARY SESSION

ORLANDO, FLORIDA

FACILITATION, MEETING AND PROCESS DESIGN BY

CONSENSUS CENTER

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

jblair@fsu.edu
http://consensus.fsu.edu

This document is available in alternate formats upon request to Dept. of Community Affairs, Codes & Standards, 2555 Shumard Oak Blvd., Tallahassee, FL 32399, (850) 487-1824.
FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
SUPPLEMENT TO THE JUNE 8, 2010 MINUTES

OVERVIEW OF COMMISSION’S KEY DECISIONS

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 2010

Welcome
Chairman Rodriguez welcomed the Commission, staff and the public to Orlando and the June 2010 plenary session. The Chair indicated that the primary focus of June’s meeting was to consider recommendations from the Commission’s various committees, to decide on product approvals, declaratory statements and accessibility waivers, and to adopt the TAC’s and Commission’s 2010 Code amendment review procedures.

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, and should be offered before there is a formal motion on the floor.

Commission Attendance
Chairman Rodriguez conducted a roll-call and the following members were in attendance: Raul L. Rodriguez, AIA, Chair, Bob Boyer, Dick Browdy, Ed Carson, Herminio Gonzalez, Jim Goodloe, Ken Gregory, Dale Greiner, Tony Grippa, Jeff Gross, Scott Mollan, Nick Nicholson, John Scherer, Jim Schock, Chris Schulte, Drew Smith, Jeff Stone, and Randall Vann.

Absent:
Hamid Bahadori, Donald Dawkins, Kiko Franco, Jon Hamrick, Rafael Palacios, Tim Tolbert, and Mark Turner.

DCA Staff Present
Suzanne Davis, Rick Dixon, Jim Hammers, Bruce Ketcham, Ila Jones, Mo Madani, Jim Richmond, Ann Stanton, and Marlene Stern.

Meeting Facilitation
The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair from the FCRC Consensus Center at Florida State University. Information at: http://consensus.fsu.edu/
Project Webpage
Information on the project, including agenda packets, meeting reports, and related documents may be found in downloadable formats at the project webpage below:
http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/index.html

Agenda Review and Approval
The Commission voted unanimously, 17 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda for the April 7, 2010 meeting as amended. Following are the key agenda items approved for consideration:

• To Consider Regular Procedural Issues: Agenda Approval and Approval of the April 7, 2010 Minutes and Facilitator’s Summary Report.
• To Consider Approval of March 8, 15, and 29 and April 12, 19, and 26, 2010 Teleconference Meeting Summary Reports.
• To Consider/Decide on Chair’s Discussion Issues/Recommendations.
• To Recognize Senator Constantine’s Legislative Leadership on Building Codes.
• To Review and Update the Commission Workplan.
• Review and Approval of TAC’s Code Amendment Review Process (rule development workshop).
• To Consider TAC Meeting Schedule and Agenda for Each TAC.
• 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: Binding Interpretations, and Petitions for Declaratory Statements.
• To Consider and Discuss Legislative Issues.
• To Hear an Update on the Septic System Sizing Workgroup Project.
• To Consider/Decide on Code Administration, Special Occupancy, and Structural Technical Advisory Committees (TAC’s) Report/Recommendations.
• To Consider/Decide on Product Approval/Manufactured Buildings and Education Program Oversight Committee (POC’s) Reports/Recommendations.
• To Consider/Decide on Workgroup/Subcommittee Reports/Recommendations:
• To Discuss Commissioner Comments and Issues.
• To Receive Public Comment.
• To Review Committee Assignments and Issues for the Next Meeting—August 8 - 11, 2010 in Melbourne.

Amendments to the Agenda:
No Roofing TAC report since the TAC did not meet.

Review and Approval of the April 7, 2010 Minutes and Facilitator’s Summary Report
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 17 - 0 in favor, to approve the April 7, 2010 Minutes as presented, and the April 7, 2010 Facilitator’s Summary Report as presented.
Review and Approval of March 8, 15, and 29 and April 12, 19, and 26, 2010 Teleconference Meeting Summary Reports

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 17 - 0 in favor, to approve the March 8, 15, and 29 and April 12, 19, and 26, 2010 Facilitator’s Summary Reports as presented.

Chair's Discussion Issues and Recommendations

Appointments: Commission—TAC/POC(s)—Workgroup(s)
The Chair made the following appointments, welcoming new appointees and thanking members who rotated-off. The appointments for June 2010 are as follows:

Accessibility TAC
Larry Schneider was appointed to the Accessibility TAC.

Education POC
Scott Molan was appointed to the Education POC.

Roofing TAC
Mark Zehnal was appointed to replace Kenneth Everett on the Roofing TAC.

Special Occupancy TAC
Wayne P. Young was appointed to replace the retiring Skip Gregory on the Special Occupancy TAC.

Recognition of Senator Lee Constantine’s Legislative Leadership on Building Codes
Chairman Rodriguez expressed that on behalf of the Commission it was his honor and privilege to express the Commission’s sincere appreciation for Senator Lee Constantine’s leadership, vision and tireless support for the Commission and for Florida’s stakeholder driven consensus based building code system. The Chair noted that Senator Constantine completed his full terms in the Florida Senate and will be greatly missed. While a member of the House then Representative Constantine sponsored HB 4181 the unanimously adopted bill implementing the Governor’s Building Codes Study Commission’s recommendations by creating the Florida Building Commission and the Florida Building Code (Statewide Unified Building Code) and was signed into law as 98-287 LOF. From the beginning and throughout the Code’s thirteen year existence Senator Constantine has been a strong supporter, advocate and sponsor for the Commission’s legislative recommendations. His support for the Commission’s consensus-building process and commitment to working with stakeholders to design and implement an effective statewide building code and building code system has been invaluable and is greatly appreciated. The Chair presented Senator Constantine with a paper weight in the shape of a star as a token of the Commission’s appreciation, and invited him to address the Commission, once again thanking him for his outstanding service to the citizens of Florida.

Senator Constantine expressed his appreciation for the Commission and their service to the citizens of Florida by the development, implementation and maintenance of the best building code in the country. The Senator noted that the Building Code bill was one of the most significant pieces of legislation ever enacted and he was proud to be a part of the creation of Code. Senator Constantine explained that because of the Commission’s consensus-based process inclusive of key stakeholders
the Legislature has been comfortable giving the Commission many important assignments over the years.

**Review and Update of Commission Workplan**
Rick Dixon reviewed the updated Workplan with the Commission and answered member’s questions.

**Commission Actions:**
**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 17 - 0 in favor, to approve the updated Commission Workplan as presented.  
(Included as Attachment 2—Commission’s Updated Workplan)

**TAC’s Code Amendment Review Process (Rule Development Workshop)**
Jeff Blair reviewed the proposed rule development process for TAC review of proposed code amendments for the 2010 Code Update, as well as the standing motion to recommend approval of amendments to the Florida Building Code, and answered member’s questions. Following questions and answers, public comment, and Commission discussion, the Commission took the following action:

**Commission Actions:**
**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor to adopt the rule development process for TAC review of proposed Code amendments for the 2010 Code Update, and the standing motion to recommend approval of amendments to the Florida Building Code, as amended.

**Amendment:**
Clarify that proponents and opponents may have one additional opportunity to offer counterpoints but only if they address new issues/comments and do not repeat what they and/or others have already stated in previous comments.
(Included as Attachment 3—TAC Code Amendment Review Process)

**Commission Process for Review of TAC Recommendations on Proposed Code Amendments (Rule Adoption Hearing)**
Jeff Blair reviewed the proposed rule adoption hearing process for Commission review and decision regarding TAC recommendations on proposed amendments to the Florida Building Code for the 2010 Code Update, as well as the standing motion for approval of amendments to the Florida Building Code, and answered member’s questions. Following questions and answers, public comment, and Commission discussion, the Commission took the following action:

**Commission Actions:**
**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor to adopt rule adoption hearing process for Commission consideration of TAC recommendations on proposed amendments to the Florida Building Code for the 2010 Code Update, and the standing motion to approve amendments to the Florida Building Code as presented. In addition, authorization for staff to adjust the titles of the consent agendas as needed to correlate with the organization of the amendments was provided.
(Included as Attachment 3—Commission Code Amendment Review Process)
TAC Meeting Schedule
Rick Dixon reviewed the proposed schedule for TAC and Commission review of proposed code amendments for the 2010 Code Update process, and answered member’s questions. Following questions and answers, public comment, and Commission discussion, the Commission took the following action:

Commission Actions:
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor to adopt the TAC and Commission meeting schedule for the 2010 Code Update process as presented.

Following is the TAC and Commission review of proposed Code amendment schedule as adopted by the Commission:

| TAC’s Review of Code Modification Proposals in Rule Development Workshops |
|---|---|---|---|
| Committee | Date | City | Location |
| **Group I** | | | |
| Special Occupancy TAC | July 15, 2010 9:00 AM | Tallahassee | DCA Office |
| **Group II** | | | |
| Code Administration TAC | August 9, 2010 1:00 PM | Melbourne | Crowne Plaza Hotel |
| Electrical TAC | August 10, 2010 1:00 PM | Melbourne | Crowne Plaza Hotel |
| Fire TAC | August 10 – 11, 2010 1:00 PM/8:00 AM | Melbourne | Crowne Plaza Hotel |
| Mechanical TAC | August 11, 2010 8:00 AM | Melbourne | Crowne Plaza Hotel |
| Plumbing TAC | August 9, 2010 8:00 AM | Melbourne | Crowne Plaza Hotel |
| Roofing TAC | August 8 – 9, 2010 2:00 PM/8:00 AM | Melbourne | Crowne Plaza Hotel |
| **Group III** | | | |
| Structural TAC | August 23 – 24, 2010 9:00 AM/8:00 AM | Gainesville | UF Hilton Hotel |
| Energy TAC | August 25, 2010 8:00 AM | Gainesville | UF Hilton Hotel |

| TAC’s Review Comments on Their Recommendations Regarding Code Amendment Proposals |
|---|---|---|---|
| Committee | Date | City | Location |
| TACs TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD |

Commission Review of TAC Recommendations on Proposals and Public Comments on TAC Recommendations in a Rule Adoption Hearing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>December 7 – 8, 2010</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Crowne Plaza Hotel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consideration of Accessibility Waiver Applications
The Commission reviewed and decided on the Waiver applications submitted for their consideration. A complete summary of accessibility waiver applications is included as an attachment to this Report.
(Included as Attachment 4—Accessibility Waiver Summary Report)

Consideration of Applications for Product and Entity Approval
Commissioner Carson presented the committee’s recommendations for entities and Jeff Blair presented the committee’s recommendations for product approvals. The complete results of product and entity applications are included as an attachment to this Report.

Commission Actions:
Motion—The Commission voted 16 – 2 in favor to approve product numbers FL 13534 and FL 13535 with a thirty day delay for the approval. The parties shall be notified of the Commission’s action and informed of their administrative rights.
(Included as Attachment 6—Product and Entity Approval Report)

Consider Applications for Accreditor and Course Approval
Commissioner Browdy presented the POC's recommendations, and the Commission reviewed and decided on the accreditor and course applications submitted for their consideration as follows.

Commission Actions—Education POC:
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to approve advanced course #412.0
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to approve advanced course #425.0
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to approve advanced course #427.0
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to approve the following administratively approved updated advanced courses on a consent agenda: course #s 415.1, 77.3, and 224.1.
(See Commission Minutes for Committee Report)

Consideration of Legal Issues

Appeals/Product Approval Revocations/Binding Interpretations
None/None/None

Legal Report

Petitions For Declaratory Statements
Following are the actions taken by the Commission on petitions for declaratory statements.

Second Hearings

DCA09-DEC-259 by Robert S. Fine Counsel for Malibu Lodging Investments, LLC
Motion—The Commission voted 15 – 0 in favor, to defer the petition with leave to withdraw.
DCA09-DEC-411 by Manny Sanchez of Fenestration Testing Laboratory, Inc.
**Motion**—The Commission voted 16 – 0 in favor, to approve the draft order on the petition.

DCA10-DEC-002 by Derrek Runion of GreenBuilt, Inc.
**Motion**—The Commission voted 16 – 0 in favor, to approve the draft order on the petition.

DCA10-DEC-034 by C.W. (Ben) Bentley
**Motion**—The Commission voted 18 – 0 in favor, to approve the draft order on the petition as amended.

First Hearings

DCA10DEC-038 by Ray Habic of Gillette Generators
**Motion**—The Commission voted 18 – 0 in favor, to dismiss the petition due to insufficient facts.

DCA10-DEC-059 by Paul T. Myers, Building Official of Putnam County
**Motion**—The Commission voted 18 – 0 in favor, to defer the petition to the August meeting in order for staff to consult with the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

DCA10-DEC-079 by Richard Mihalich, Chief Building Official of City of South Daytona
**Motion**—The Commission voted 18 – 0 in favor, to defer the petition at the applicant’s request.

DCA10-DEC-085 by Paul E. Radauskas, C.B.O. of Sarasota County
The petition was withdrawn by the petitioner.

DCA10-DEC-091 by George Merlin of George Merlin Associates Inc.
**Motion**—The Commission voted 18 – 0 in favor, to dismiss the petition due to a disputed interpretation of the Code with the local building official.

DCA10-DEC-107 by Paul T. Myers, Building Official of Putnam County
**Motion**—The Commission voted 18 – 0 in favor, to dismiss the petition as outside the statutory authority of the Florida Building Commission.

Legislative Issues Update and Discussion
Jim Richmond reported that HB 663 was signed into law implementing the Commission’s legislative recommendations from 2008 and 2009. Following is a summary of key issues of interest to the Commission:
- Amends section 553.512(1), Florida Statutes, relating to certain modifications and waivers, to require the Florida Building Commission to establish a fee for submitting a request for a waiver.
- Amends section 553.721, Florida Statutes, relating to surcharges, to modify the surcharge imposed from “one-half cent per square foot of under- roof floor space permitted” to “1.5 percent of all permit fees associated with enforcement of the Florida Building Code” with a minimum surcharge of $2.00 per permit.
• Amends section 553.73, Florida Statutes, relating to the Florida Building Code, to:
  o Allow counties and municipalities to adopt by ordinance an administrative or
technical amendment to the Florida Building Code relating to flood resistance in
order to implement the National Flood Insurance Program or incentives
  o Removes the requirement that any model code selected by the Florida Building
Commission as the foundation for the Florida version be made available to the
public at least 6 months before the Commission selects it.
  o Allows the Florida Building Commission to approve amendments needed to address
equivalency of standards and inconsistencies in federal or state law via the glitch
process.
• Specify that “the provisions of section R313 of the most current version of the International
Residential Code relating to mandated fire sprinklers may not be incorporated into the Florida
Building Code as adopted by the Florida Building Commission and may not be adopted as a local
amendment to the Florida Building Code. This subsection does not apply to a local government
that has a lawfully adopted ordinance relating to fire sprinklers which has been in effect since
January 1, 2010”.
• Amends section 553.74, Florida Statutes, relating to the Florida Building Commission to specify a
member of an FBC committee or workgroup does not have an impermissible conflict when
representing a client before the Florida Building Commission. Further specifies that such a
member may not participate in discussion or decision on any matter in which the member has a
direct financial interest.
• Amends section 553.76, Florida Statutes, relating to general powers of the Florida Building
Commission, to permit the Commission to adopt rules for its consensus-based decision-making,
including super majority voting requirements for code provisions.
• Amends section 553.775, Florida Statutes, relating to Florida Building Code interpretations, to
authorize charging a fee for declaratory statement requests (maximum $250) and non-binding
interpretations (maximum $125).
• Amends section 553.842, Florida Statutes, relating to product evaluation and approval, to allow for
direct payment of fees to a contract administrator and specify that such fees shall be used only to fund
the product evaluation and approval system. Authorizes the Florida Building Commission to make
editorial revisions to product approvals. For products subject to approval by standardized testing,
provides for time limits for staff review and addition to the list of products and provides additional
related direction for the Florida Building Commission. Requires that the Florida Building Commission
specifically approve the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials Evaluation
Service as an evaluation entity, and deletes such designation for the International Conference of
Building Officials Evaluation Services and the Building Officials and Code Administrators
International Evaluation Services, the Southern Building Code Congress International Evaluation
Services. Removes direction and authority for the Florida Building Commission to annually review
and recommend additions to the list of evaluation entities.

Commission Actions:
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to send a letter of
appreciation to Senator Bennett and Representative Aubuchon for their leadership in support of
Commission’s legislative recommendations and related building code issues.

(Included as Attachment 5 — Legal Report)
Septic System Sizing Workgroup Project Update

Jeff Blair reported that the Department of Health's (DOH) Technical Review and Advisory Panel (TRAP) last met on January 28th, 2010. The Department provided a new proposal replacing the "room" sizing methodology with a bedroom definition similar to the Septic System Sizing Workgroup’s Option # 1. The proposed revised rule language is as follows:

(11) Bedroom – Any room which has an area of 60 square feet or more; has a recess with a minimum inside depth of 22 inches; has doors on its entrances; has an emergency escape and rescue opening; and can be expected to provide sleeping accommodation. Portions of rooms with ceiling heights less than 7.5 feet are not included in the calculation of the area of the room.

In addition to the bedroom definition language, to address system sizing of large homes, the Department (DOH) proposed changes to Table I, Chapter 64E-6, F.A.C. (Estimated Sewage Flows for System Design), to flatten out the curve of gallons per day (GPD) for larger homes by reducing the gallons per day for each additional bedroom after 4 bedrooms or each additional 750 square feet of building area or fraction thereof, from 100 to 60 per dwelling unit (see Table I excerpt below). The panel motioned to adopt the lower flow rates for larger homes, provided comments and tabled the bedroom definition proposal.

To date, the lower flow rates for larger homes issue has been reviewed by the Variance Review and Advisory Committee (VRAC) and returned to the TRAP with comments. The issue will be re-heard at the next TRAP meeting scheduled for July 15, 2010. The lower flow rates for larger homes issue will be ready for rule making if approved by TRAP at their next meeting.

TRAP Meeting - July 15, 2010: In addition to the lower flow rates for larger homes, the bedroom definition issue will also be heard at the July 15, 2010 TRAP meeting. Below is the proposed definition the Department will be presenting. (11) Bedroom – Any room which has a recess with a minimum inside depth of 22 inches; has doors on its entrances; has an emergency escape and rescue opening; and can be expected to provide sleeping accommodation. A room designed primarily for sleeping or a room which is expected to routinely provide sleeping accommodations for occupants.

Following questions and answers, public comment, and Commission discussion, the Commission took the following action:

**Commission Actions:**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to send a letter to the Department of Health's (DOH) Technical Review and Advisory Panel (TRAP) expressing the Commission’s concern that the proposed rule language does not adequately address the concerns and recommendations developed by the Commission’s and Department of Health’s joint committee (Septic System Sizing Workgroup) and urging them to revise the rule consistent with the Workgroup’s recommendation.

**Committee Reports and Recommendations**

The Chair requested TAC/POC chairs to confine their reports to a brief summary of any key recommendations, emphasizing those 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
recommendating, and the subsequent action requested of the Commission. The Chair explained that the complete reports/minutes will be entered into the record and included as a part of the Commission’s report for review and approval at the next Commission meeting.

Florida Accessibility Code Workgroup Report and Recommendations
Jeff Blair reported on the Florida Accessibility Code Workgroup’s meeting and answered member’s questions.

Commission Actions:
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor to accept the report.
The Report may be viewed at the project webpage:
http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/accessibility-code.html

Code Administration TAC
Commissioner Gonzalez presented the Committee’s report and recommendations.

Commission Actions:
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to accept the report.
(See Commission Minutes for Committee Report)

Education POC
Commissioner Browdy presented the Committee’s report and recommendations.

Commission Actions:
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to accept the report.
(See Commission Minutes for Committee Report)

Florida Energy Code Workgroup Report and Recommendations
Jeff Blair reported on the Florida Energy Code Workgroup’s meeting and answered member’s questions. Jeff reported that the Workgroup has completed their tasks as follows:
The Florida Energy Code Workgroup developed an energy efficiency cost-effectiveness tests for residential code consensus recommendations {adopted by Commission}; energy efficiency cost-effectiveness tests for commercial code consensus recommendations {adopted by Commission}; a definition of “consumer” (applies to both residential and commercial”) {adopted by Commission}; energy conservation measures for replacement of air conditioning equipment recommendations [proposed code amendment(s) for 2010 Update]; a strategic plan for increased efficiency requirements required by law for future FBC editions {adopted by Commission}; specific building options to achieve energy efficiency improvements recommendations [proposed code amendment(s) for 2010 Update]; design criteria for energy efficient pools recommendations (Pool Efficiency Subcommittee) [proposed code amendment(s) for 2010 Update]; and, proposed requirements for green roofs recognition in the Florida Building Code (Green and Energy Efficient Roofs Subcommittee) [proposed code amendment(s) for 2010 Update].

Commission Actions:
Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor to accept the report.
The Report may be viewed at the project webpage:
Green and Energy Efficient Roofs Subcommittee
Jeff Blair reported on the Green and Energy Efficient Roofs Subcommittee meeting and answered member’s questions.

**Commission Actions:**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor to accept the report.

The Report may be viewed at the project webpage: [http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/Green-Roofs-Subcommittee.html](http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/Green-Roofs-Subcommittee.html)

Hurricane Research Advisory Committee
Commissioner Palacios presented the Committee’s report and recommendations.

**Commission Actions:**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor to accept the report.

The Report may be viewed at the project webpage: [http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/hrac.html](http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/hrac.html)

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor that current year funding be directed to supporting studies to characterize the wind effects on roofs and to leveraging funding for roof systems related research provided by federal and other organizations/agencies including FEMA/DHS, NOAA/Sea Grant and RCMP/DEM. In addition, to continue to fund on a contingency basis post-hurricane buildings investigation research.

Product Approval POC
Commissioner Carson presented the Committee’s report and recommendations.

**Commission Actions:**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor to accept the report.

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor to proceed with rule adoption for Rule 9B-72, Product Approval, to implement HB 663 product approval provisions by noticing and conducting a rule development workshop at the August 2010 Commission meeting.

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor to approve the Product Approval Administrator’s change in CPA auditing firm to MBAF.

*(See Commission Minutes for Committee Report)*

Special Occupancy TAC
Jeff Blair presented the Committee’s report and recommendations.

**Commission Actions:**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 - 0 in favor, to accept the report.

*(See Commission Minutes for Committee Report)*

Structural TAC
Commissioner Schock presented the Committee’s report and recommendations.

**Commission Actions:**

**Motion**—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 - 0 in favor, to accept the report.

*(See Commission Minutes for Committee Report)*
Commission Member Comment and Issues
Chairman Rodriguez invited Commission members to make any general comments to the Commission, or identify any issues or agenda items for the next Commission meeting.

Commission Member Comments:
Carson: asked whether eligible Commission members could still get CEU for CILB license renewals. Dixon: it is still allowed and staff will check with CILB and DCA and get back to those who qualify. Browdy: the Governor vetoed funding that is used to support Commission Education administration, BOAF, and construction education mitigation program. Commissioner Browdy indicated that the POC will have to prioritize critical services, and if anyone has any ideas to please contact the POC. Dixon: requested that Commissioners review and provide any needed updates to their contact information.

General Public Comment
Chairman Rodriguez invited members of the public to address the Commission on any issues under the Commission’s purview.

Public Comments:
None were offered.

Adjourn
The Commission voted unanimously, 18 – 0 in favor, to adjourn the meeting at 11:36 AM.
ATTACHMENT 1
MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS

June 8, 2010—Gainesville, Florida

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

1. Please assess the overall meeting.
   - 9.73 The background information was very useful.
   - 9.73 The agenda packet was very useful.
   - 9.73 The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.
   - 9.60 Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.

2. Do you agree that each of the following meeting objectives was achieved?
   - 9.60 Accessibility Waiver Applications.
   - 9.40 Approvals and Revocations of Products and Product Approval Entities.
   - 9.73 Applications for Accréditor and Course Approval.
   - 9.73 Legal Issues and Requests for Declaratory Statements.
   - 9.73 Legislative Issues Update and Discussion.
   - 9.67 Chairs Issues and Recommendations.
   - 9.67 Commission’s Workplan and Meeting Schedule Review and Update.
   - 9.67 Adoption of TAC’s Code Amendment Review Process (rule development workshop).
   - 9.67 Adoption of TAC Meeting Schedule and Agenda for Each TAC.
   - 9.67 TAC and POC Reports and Recommendations.
   - 9.67 Workgroup and Committee Reports and Recommendations.

3. Please tell us how well the Facilitator helped the participants engage in the meeting.
   - 9.73 The members followed the direction of the Facilitator.
   - 9.80 The Facilitator made sure the concerns of all members were heard.
   - 9.67 The Facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
   - 9.80 Participant input was documented accurately in Meeting Notes and Facilitator’s Report.

4. Please tell us your level of satisfaction with the meeting?
   - 9.67 Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
   - 9.67 I was very satisfied with the services provided by the Facilitator.
   - 9.67 I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

5. Please tell us how well the next steps were communicated?
   - 9.67 I know what the next steps following this meeting will be.
   - 9.67 I know who is responsible for the next steps.
6. What did you like best about the meeting?
   • Agenda was appropriate and facilitated.
   • To the point!
   • Stayed on time and schedule. Sound system has been improved.
   • Brevity.

7. How could the meeting have been improved?
   • Need to check the equipment before we start the meeting.
   • Audio continues to be an issue. This is about the third meeting in a row where it is difficult to hear all parties involved.
   • Better sound technical.
   • Sound system should be tweaked.
   • Have coffee available for attendees.
   • Coffee should be available.

8. Do you have any other comments?
   • Appreciate the hard work by DCA staff.
   • The meeting was well run by both the Chair and the facilitator.
   • We need coffee, lets figure out how to get it.
   • Sound system needs work.
   • Jim Richmond or Jeff (probably Jim) should remind the Commission members not to lose focus on our mission. We get too many people that think with their hearts instead of their head. We have a charge and a legal responsibility to make decisions. We are all constrained by law to go only so far (in terms of applying law) every time Jim says you (the Commission) have no business to make a particular decision based on our legal constraints I respect that advice from (our) counsel. Others need to be reminded to focus on our charge and stop trying to save the world. We are not charged with saving the world. We are charged with making good decisions based on codes, standards, existing laws and advice of (our) counsel.
   • I know the budget is tight but we cannot afford coffee?

Comments on Specific Agenda Items:
None were provided.

PUBLIC-MEETING EVALUATION AND COMMENT RESULTS
None were completed.
ATTACHMENT 2

COMMISSION’S UPDATED WORKPLAN AND MEETING SCHEDULE

(Adopted Unanimously June 8, 2010)

MEETING DATES

2009
February 2, 3 & 4
April 6, 7 & 8
June 8, 9 & 10
August 10, 11 & 12
October 12, 13 & 14
December 7, 8 & 9

Meeting Location
Crowne Plaza, Melbourne, (321-777-4100)
Hilton Hotel, Gainesville, (352-371-3600)
Embassy Suites, Tampa, (813-977-7066)
Crowne Plaza, Melbourne, (321-777-4100)
Embassy Suites, Tampa, (813-977-7066)
Rosen Centre, Orlando, (800-204-7234)

2010

Deadline
February 1, 2 & 3
April 5, 6 & 7
June 7, 8 & 9
August 9, 10 & 11
October 11, 12 & 13
December 6, 7 & 8

Meeting Location
Embassy Suites, Tampa, (813-977-7066) Reservation
January 1, 2010
Hilton Hotel, Gainesville, (352-371-3600) March 4, 2010
Rosen Centre, Orlando, (321-777-4100) May 6, 2010
Crowne Plaza, Melbourne, (321-777-4100) July 16, 2010
Hilton Hotel, Gainesville, (352-371-3600) September 9, 2010
Crowne Plaza, Melbourne, (321-777-4100) November 12, 2010

Teleconference Meetings

March 8
March 15
March 29
April 12
April 19
April 26

10:00 AM
10:00 AM
10:00 AM
10:00 AM
10:00 AM
10:00 AM

Number: 888-808-6959
Call Code: 1967168

Meeting Location

2011
Jan 31 & Feb 1 & 2
April 4, 5 & 6
June 6, 7 & 8
August 8, 9 & 10
October 10, 11 & 12
December 5, 6 & 7
ANNUAL ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

1. **Report to 2010 Legislature**

   **Schedule:**
   - Commission identifies and receives draft recommendations 12/12/09
   - Commission report to 2009 Legislature 2/10

   **Status:** Pending
   - % Complete
   - 100%

   **Origination:** Commission. Annual task authorized by statute

2. **Workplan Prioritization**

   **Schedule:**
   - Survey sent to Commissioners 11/09
   - Review results at meeting 1/10

   **Status:** Pending
   - % Complete
   - 100%

   **Origination:** Commission. Annual task.

3. **2010 Commission Effectiveness Assessment Survey**

   **Schedule:**
   - Discussion of survey instrument at Commission meeting 12/09
   - Review results at meeting 2/10

   **Status:** Pending
   - % Complete
   - 100%

   **Origination:** Commission. Annual task.
### 2010 FBC UPDATE DEVELOPMENT TASKS

#### 5. 2010 Update to the Florida Building Code

**Workplan Priority 2**

#### Schedule:

- **Printed 2009 International Codes published and available to the public:** 4/2/09
  - **2009 I Codes must be available to public for 6 months prior to selection** 10/13/09
  - Commission selects 2009 I Codes as foundation for 2010 FBC *(Oct Cmsn meeting)*
  - Staff evaluates changes of 2006 to 2009 I Codes for overlap with Florida amendments 4/09-11/09
  - TACs review existing Florida amendments that overlap with 2006 to 2009 I code changes and develop recommendations for retaining the Florida amendment or the new I code requirement. *(see subtask below)*

- All existing Florida amendments compiled in 2009 I Codes format posted to website including TAC recommendations for “overlapping” amendments 2/1/10
  - **Note:** Proposed amendments to existing “Florida specific” code requirements must be made to the section numbers provided in this document. Staff will not correlate proposals for proponents.

#### Local amendments posted to the website: 2/1/10

- FFPC to FBC correlations/overlaps identified and recommendations developed 1/20/10 *(see subtask below)*

- Submittal of new proposed amendments for the 2010 FBC **opens** 3/1/09
  - New proposed amendments for the 2010 FBC **due and process closes** 4/2/10

- **Proposed amendments reviewed by staff and posted to the Commission website** 4/15/10
  - **45 day comment period ends** *(By law- 45 day min before TAC review)* 5/31/10

#### TACs Review Proposals at Rule Development Workshop

- **TACs review proposed Florida amendments and adopt recommendations** 7/15/10
  - at Rule Development Workshop 8/9-12/10
  - *(Spel Occap 7/15; Structural & Energy 8/23-25; all others at August 2010 Commission meeting)* 8/23-24/10
  - **TAC recommendations posted to the website** 9/3/10

- **45 day comment period ends** *(By law- 45 day min before Commission review)* 10/18/10

#### Commission Reviews TAC Recommendations at Rule Adoption Hearing

- **TACs review comments on their recommendations and prepare public comment for the Rule Hearing** 11/15/10

- **Commission considers TAC recommendations on proposed amendments at the Rule Adoption Hearing** *(December 2010 Commission meeting)* 12/7-8/10

#### 2010 Florida Building Code Rule Finalized

- **File the Rule adopting the 2010 FBC and post the Supplement on the website** 2/1/11
  - **2010 Florida Building Code Rule is final but with implementation date of 12/31/11** 3/1/11
  - *(By law- Code must be available for 6 months before implementation)*

#### Glitch Fix Cycle Prior to Code Taking Effect

- **Code amended to resolve glitches** *(see Glitch schedule below)* 4/11-6/11

### Code Books Available

- Code printed with integrated Florida modifications and glitch fixes 10/1/11

### Code implemented

- **Note:** By law this is the latest date the Florida Fire Code can be implemented. The goal is to implement the FFPC and FBC concurrently.
Subtasks:

**Review Florida specific amendments that overlap with 2006 to 2009 I Codes changes 12/09**

(Note: Law requires review of Florida specific amendments when I codes changes address the Florida amendment issue. The Commission must decide whether to retain the Florida amendment or to adopt the I code requirement. All other Florida specific amendments roll forward into the FBC update unless modified or removed by an approved amendment proposal. Staff will identify overlaps for the TACs’ and Commission’s consideration and decision.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint Fire TAC/Fire Code Advisory Council review of I Codes/NFPA 1/NFPA 101</th>
<th>20/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>changes for overlaps/conflicts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor reviews Building and Fire codes and reports</td>
<td>1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Fire TAC/FCAC meeting to develop recommended fixes</td>
<td>1/20/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended correlation fixes posted to the web</td>
<td>2/1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire TAC reviews proposed building code amendments for fixes</td>
<td>8/9-10/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Law requires the Commission and State Fire Marshal to maintain the FBC and FFPC for consistency to avoid conflicting requirements. A contractor will identify new overlaps resulting from changes in the new editions of the I codes and NFPA codes for consideration by the joint Fire TAC and Fire Code Advisory Council and decision on FBC amendments by the Commission)

(Note: Subtasks identify proposed code modifications that are integrated into the code development process.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>Status: Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Origination:** Requirement of law that the Commission updates the Code triennially.
6. Glitch Amendments to the 2010 Florida Building Code

Workplan Priority 4

**Schedule:**

- 2010 FBC Supplement published online: 2/1/11
- Glitch amendment submittal DEADLINE: 3/1/11
  
  *(Note: The Code publisher will identify correlation glitches and unintended consequences of Florida specific amendments in the final 2010 FBC Supplement for correction by glitch amendment. See subtask for adoption of the 2011 NEC via the glitch proceeding)*
- Rule development workshop *(April Commission meeting)*: 4/5/11
- Rule adoption hearing *(June Commission meeting)*: 6/7/11
- Glitch Rule adopted (filed): 7/1/11
- Code printed with first cycle glitch fixes and available to the public: 10/1/11

**2010 FBC effective**: 12/31/11
  
  *(Note: By law this is the latest date the Florida Fire Prevention Code can be implemented. The goal is to implement the FFPC and FBC concurrently.)*

**Subtasks:**

a. Review 2011 NEC *(Note: not subject to glitch proposal submittal deadline)*: 1/11-2/11
- Proposal to adopt 2011 NEC submittal deadline: 3/1/11
- Recommend whether to adopt as glitch *(August Commission meeting)*: 4/5/11
- Adoption per schedule above

**Status:** Pending

% Complete

| % |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

0%

**Origination:** Requirement of law that the Commission updates the Code triennially.
Primary Task -

7. Study Energy Conservation Measures Code Compliance Methods and Develop a Plan for Increased Efficiency Requirements for Future FBC's (HB 697 and HB 7135)

Origination: The 2008 Legislature directed the Commission to enact specific increase in building energy efficiency requirements in HB 697 (Building Code) and HB 7135 (Energy). This task initiates the study and development of a schedule of increasing requirements, the first of which are to be enacted in the 2010 FBC whose development begins in 2009.

Sub-Tasks –

7a. Develop Rule for Energy Code Cost Effectiveness Test (HB 687 and HB 7135)

**Schedule for Sub-Task 27:**

*Appoint Work Group* 12/9/08


Rule Development Workshop 4/09

Rule Adoption Hearing 6/09

Notice of Change published 7/3/09

Rule Effective 9/1/09

**Status:** Complete

% Complete 100%

Origination: The Commission was directed by the 2008 Florida Legislature in HB 697 and HB 7135 to develop a cost effectiveness test criteria by rule to be applied to justification for increased residential building energy efficiency requirements.

7b. Study Energy Conservation Measures for Replacement of Air Conditioning Equipment


Approved by the Commission October 15, 2008.

**Schedule:**

Work Group/TAC considers options and develops consensus plan 3/27/09 4/30/09

Recommendation adopted 5/28/09
Proposals for 2010 FBC submitted for adoption 3/10
(See 2010 FBC development schedule)

% Complete

100%

7d. Develop Recommendations for 20% Increased Energy Efficiency Requirement for 2010 FBC (HB 697 and HB 7135)

This task integrates the outputs of Task 35 and the Sub-tasks to develop a draft of Energy Code chapters for the 2010 FBC.

Schedule:
Workgroup appointed 12/9/08
Commission approves output of Task 27 and adopts requisite Rule 6/9/09
Workgroup adopts strategic plan for Commission approval 10/12/09
Contractor and Workgroup develop draft 2010 Energy chapters 9/09 - 1/10
Proposals for 2010 FBC submitted for adoption 3/09

Status: Pending

% Complete

100%

7e. Identify Specific Building Options to Achieve the Energy Efficiency Improvements (list identified in HB 697 and HB 7135)

Schedule: In Progress

Origination: Energy act of 2008 (HB 7135) directs the Commission to include, as a minimum, certain technologies for achieving enhanced building efficiency targets established by the Act in the Florida Energy Code. The Building Code act of 2008 (HB 697) directs the Commission to facilitate and promote the use of certain renewable energy technologies.

Status: Pending

% Complete

100%
### 7g. Develop Criteria for Energy Efficient Pool and Spa Systems

**Subtask 29**

**Schedule:**
- Pool Sub-workgroup appointed: 4/8/09
- Workgroup meetings:
  - 6/8/09
  - 8/12/09
  - 2/1/10

Proposals for 2010 FBC submitted for adoption: 3/10  
(See 2010 FBC development schedule)

**% Complete**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

### 7h. Evaluate Requirements for Green Roofs Recognition in Florida Building Code

**Subtask 45**

**Schedule:**
- Cool Roofs Workgroup appointed: 4/8/09
- Workgroup meeting: 2/2/10
- Proposals for 2010 FBC submitted for adoption: 3/10  
  (See 2010 FBC development schedule)

**% Complete**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

### 15. Evaluate Hurricane Wind Pressure and Wind Driven Rain Criteria for Soffit Systems and Establish Labeling Requirements  
**Workplan Priority 13**

**Schedule:**
- Appoint workgroup: 3/19/08
- Include task in UF components and cladding contract: 3/08
- Workgroup meetings:
  - 11/6/08
  - 2/4/09
  - 4/8/09
  - 7/09-9/09
- Recommendations ready to propose for 2010 FBC: 2/10
- Report to Structural TAC and Commission: 2/10/10
- Proposals for 2010 FBC submitted for adoption: 3/10

**% Complete**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|


## 16. Evaluate Adoption of Flood Standards in the Florida Building Code
### Workplan Priority 9

**Schedule:**
- Workgroup appointed: 12/08
- DEM contract with FSU/CRC: 1/09
- Workgroup meetings:
  - 3/25/09
  - 4/29/09
  - 5/29/09
- Review companion local ordinance and local variance authority issue: 1/13/10
- Recommendations to Structural TAC & Commission: 8/11/09
- Additional recommendations to Structural TAC & Commission: 2/2/10
- Proposals for 2010 FBC submitted for adoption: 3/10
  (See 2010 FBC development schedule)

**% Complete**: 100%

## 17. Evaluate Adoption of Flood Standards in the Florida Building Code
### Workplan Priority 9

**Schedule:**
- Workgroup appointed: 12/08
- DEM contract with FSU/CRC: 1/09
- Workgroup meetings:
  - 3/25/09
  - 4/29/09
  - 5/29/09
- Review companion local ordinance and local variance authority issue: 1/13/10
- Recommendations to Structural TAC & Commission: 8/11/09
- Additional recommendations to Structural TAC & Commission: 2/2/10
- Proposals for 2010 FBC submitted for adoption: 3/10
  (See 2010 FBC development schedule)

**% Complete**: 100%
7. Develop Integration of Florida Accessibility Law into the 20?? Standards for Accessible Design (SAD) Being Adopted by the US Department of Justice

**Workplan Priority 4**

**Schedule:**
- Appoint work group: 12/12/08
- Staff Developed Starting Draft: 1/09
- Workgroup Meetings: 2/2/09, 4/6/09, 6/9/09, 8/10/09, 10/12/09, 12/7/09, 2/1/10
- Staff Identify Changes to Law to Maintain Consistency with SAD: 4/5/10
- Recommendation to Commission: 2010
- Public Hearings: 2010
- Commission adopts recommendation to Governor and Legislature: 2010
- Report to Legislature: 2011

**Status:** Pending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Evaluation of Standards to Address Corrosive Gypsum Board Outgassing

**Workplan Priority 12**

**Schedule:**
- DOH led Committee appointed: 2/09
- Meetings: 4/09-9/09

**Note:** DOH project discontinued no directive to the Commission for action. Defer to the 2010 FBC development.

Recommendation to Commission
- DOH rule amendment and 2010 FBC submitted by (DOH preliminary determination is no health hazard so no rule will be pursued for now.)
- Bill in the Legislature would require to develop sulfur and strontium content limits for gypsum board in consultation with DOH

**Status:** Pending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 3
TAC CODE AMENDMENT REVIEW PROCESS

TAC CODE AMENDMENT REVIEW PROCESS
AUGUST 2010 RULE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP—2010 CODE UPDATE PROCESS
(Adopted Unanimously June 8, 2010)

AMENDMENT REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION PROCESS

- Facilitator (or TAC chair if there is not a facilitator present) will serve as moderator and assist with adopted process and groundrules.
- One person speaks at a time.
- Limit your comment and be concise.
- Chair/Facilitator may limit comments to a maximum of three-minutes (3) per person, depending on the number of individuals wishing to speak. *(This provision should only need to be used if there are a large number of speakers relative to the total number of amendments and total time for review allocated for the specific TAC.)*
- Do not read lengthy prepared statements; Summarize and submit complete text of comment for the record.
- Offer new points and/or state agreement with previous speakers; Please do not repeat what has been stated.
- Chair/Facilitator may terminate a comment if it is repeating previous comments, and not simply stating agreement or offering new points.
- The TAC wants to hear all viewpoints to ensure all perspectives are considered, and not repeats of the same views.

- Facilitator (or TAC chair) will introduce each amendment.
- Proponents of proposed amendment will speak first.
- Opponents of proposed amendment will follow proponents.
- Proponents/opponents will be allowed one (1) brief counterpoint opportunity to address any new point(s) raised by previous speakers(s), but only if they address new points specific to the comment(s) raised by the speaker(s) and if they provide new points. No repeating of previous comments/points.

- **Withdrawal of Proposal:** A code amendment proposal may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time prior to the TAC consideration of that proposal.

- Standing motion to approve will be in effect.
- TAC will vote in favor of the Standing Motion to Approve (found on page 3) prior to considering proposed amendments.
- Findings Considered: rationale, Florida specific need, does not diminish requirements related to wind resistance or prevention of water intrusion, and fiscal impact data reviewed.
- Clarifying questions by TAC members only.
- Staff, proponent, or specified commenter will respond to TAC Member’s questions.
- Once a motion (second to the standing motion) is on the floor, discussion is limited to TAC members except as allowed by the Chair/Facilitator.
TAC members should avoid spending time revising a code amendment proposal, and instead TAC members should focus on providing a proponent with constructive comments for possible revision of their amendment during the 2nd 45-day review/comment period. This approach will ensure that consideration of amendments are completed within the time frame allocated for the meeting.

Any TAC revisions (amendments) to proposed amendments: require additional public comment, and TAC analysis of findings, rationale, and fiscal impact.

Amendments: Amendments to proposals may be suggested by any person participating in the rule development workshop. The person proposing the amendment is deemed to be the proponent of the amendment. All amendments must be written, unless determined by the Chair to be either editorial or minor in nature. The amendment proponent shall provide 20 copies to staff for distribution to the TAC.

A proposed amendment shall not be considered by the TAC if it:
- Is not legible;
- Changes the scope of the original proposal; or,
- Is not readily understood so that a proper assessment of its impact on the original proposal of the Code can be determined.

TAC members should provide specific and clear reason(s) for not supporting/approving a Code amendment proposal. It is the responsibility of the moderator to make sure that staff has ample time to record such reasoning and the vote count.

The standing motion to approve will be in effect, a second is required in order to vote for the amendment—Only motions to approve may be considered.

Motions to deny are not allowed by Commission Rules.

All amendments must be voted on individually.

Motions require a 75% favorable vote for approval; those with less than a 75% favorable recommendation, are recommended for denial.
STANDING MOTION TO APPROVE AMENDMENTS TO THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE

TAC chair will read the following motion, ask for a motion and second to approve, and the TAC will then vote in favor.

Move to recommend approval of the proposed amendments by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) based on the following findings:

A. The amendment has a reasonable and substantial connection to the health, safety, and welfare of the general public; and,

B. The amendment does not degrade the effectiveness of the Code and either strengthens or improves the Code or provides for innovation or new technology by allowing equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction; and,

C. The Amendment does not discriminate against products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities; and,

D. The Amendment has the following fiscal impact:

   1. The fiscal impact of enforcement imposed upon local government is as indicated by the amendment proponent.
   2. The fiscal impact of compliance imposed upon property and building owners is as indicated by the amendment proponent.
   3. The fiscal impact of compliance imposed upon industry is as indicated by the amendment proponent.
   4. The fiscal impact of compliance to small business is as indicated by TAC review (no impact or impact as identified by the proponent).

E. The proponent has provided an analysis of the amendment’s fiscal impact.

F. The Amendment’s benefits noted with regard to fiscal impact and efficacy outweigh the costs imposed.

G. The Amendment addresses a Florida-specific need.

H. The Amendment does not diminish requirements related to wind resistance or prevention of water intrusion contained in the Code or its referenced standards and criteria.

TAC AMENDMENTS

TAC amendments to proposed amendments: require additional public comment, and TAC analysis of findings, rationale, and fiscal impact.
TAC’s recommendations are on two agendas per TAC (by topical Code areas):
- Approval of consent agenda for APPROVAL as recommended by the TAC’s incorporating the findings (A – G). Standing motion to approve amendments As Submitted (AS) and As Modified (AM).
- Approval of consent agenda AGAINST APPROVAL as recommended by the TAC’s. (Requires a motion to approve; no second should be offered; motion dies for lack of a second.) Commissioners should pull off any amendment(s) that would prevent them from NOT offering a second. Standing motion to approve amendments with No Affirmative Recommendation (NAR, Without Second, and Withdrawn).

Commission will move to adopt four (4) standing motions to approve:
1. TAC’s recommendations as submitted and as modified (AS and AM).
2. TAC’s recommendations against approval (NAR, Without Second, and Withdrawn).
3. Amendments pulled off consent agenda(s) by a Commissioner for individual consideration.
4. Staff’s recommendations regarding correlation issues and integration of Florida Specific amendments for the 2010 Code Update.

TAC chairs will pull off any amendments that the TAC’s voted in favor of supporting a submitted comment that would change the TAC’s original recommendation on the amendment (comments considered during the TAC’s second review process).
Public comment on TAC’s recommendations will be during the rule adoption hearing.

Close public comment.
Commission consideration of TAC’s recommendations on proposed Code amendments.

Any Commissioner may pull any amendment for individual consideration based on public comment(s) (submitted in writing or verbally). Standing motion to approve is in effect. Second to discuss and vote for each amendment considered individually. If no second, motion dies for lack of second (amendment is deemed not approved).
Commissioners decide whether to pull any amendment(s) based on comment(s).

Commission consideration of amendments pulled for individual consideration.
Approval of the four (1 - 4) consent agendas as amended by the Commission (minus any amendments pulled for individual consideration). Standing motion to approve is in effect. Second offered and then a vote. No second should be offered for consent agenda(s) recommending against approval (NAR, Without Second, and Withdrawn).
STANDING MOTION TO APPROVE TAC’S RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Motion to approve the consent agenda(s) of the amendments for approval (AS and AM) as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee’s (TAC’s), and amended by the FBC, based on the following findings:

A. The amendment has a reasonable and substantial connection to the health, safety, and welfare of the general public; and,

B. The amendment does not degrade the effectiveness of the Code and either strengthens or improves the Code or provides for innovation or new technology by allowing equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction; and,

C. The Amendment does not discriminate against products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities; and,

D. The Amendment has the following fiscal impact:

1. The fiscal impact of enforcement imposed upon local government is as indicated by TAC review.
2. The fiscal impact of compliance imposed upon property and building owners is as indicated by TAC review.
3. The fiscal impact of compliance imposed upon industry is as indicated by TAC review.
4. The fiscal impact of compliance imposed upon small business is as indicated by TAC review (no impact or as specified by the TAC).

E. The Amendment’s benefits noted with regard to fiscal impact and efficacy outweigh the costs imposed.

F. The Amendment addresses a Florida-specific need.

G. The Amendment does not diminish requirements related to wind resistance or prevention of water intrusion contained in the Code or its referenced standards and criteria.

2. Motion to approve the consent agenda(s) AGAINST APPROVAL (NAR, Without Second, and Withdawn) as recommended by the TAC’s, and amended by the FBC, based on the above findings (A – G).

3. Motion to approve each amendment pulled off of the consent agendas of TAC recommendations for individual consideration, based on the above findings (A – G).

4. Motion to approve consent agenda of Staff’s recommendations regarding correlation issues and integration of Florida Specific amendments for the 2010 Code Update.
FBC CODE AMENDMENT REVIEW PROCESS—2010 CODE UPDATE

AMENDMENT REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION PROCESS

Facilitator will serve as the moderator, and assist with adopted process and groundrules.
One person speaks at a time.
Limit your comment and be concise.
Chair may limit comments to a maximum of three-minutes (3) per person, depending on the number of individuals wishing to speak.
Do not read lengthy prepared statements; Summarize and submit complete text of comment for the record.
Offer new points and/or state agreement with previous speakers; Please do not repeat what has been stated.
Chair/Facilitator may terminate a comment if it is repeating previous comments, and not simply stating agreement or offering new points.
The FBC wants to hear all view points to ensure all perspectives are considered, and not repeats of the same views.

Facilitator will introduce consent agenda(s) of amendments by Code area.
Public will speak to any amendments they wish the Commission to consider individually.

Standing motion to approve will be in effect.
Commissioner(s) will decide which, if any, amendments to pull for individual consideration.
Clarifying questions by FBC members only.
FBC will vote in favor of the Standing Motion(s) to Approve (found on previous page) as/if amended prior to considering proposed amendments.
Once a motion (second to the standing motion) is on the floor, discussion is limited to FBC members except as allowed by the Chair.

Amendments Pulled for Individual Consideration
Standing motion(s) to approve will be in effect, a second is required in order to vote for the amendment(s)—By Commission rule only motions to approve may be considered.
All amendments not approved on a consent agenda must be voted on individually.
Any consent agenda or individual amendment that does not receive a second is deemed denied due to failure to receive a second.
Motions require a 75% favorable vote for approval; those with less than a 75% favorable recommendation, are deemed denied.
ATTACHMENT 5
ACCESSIBILITY WAIVER SUMMARY

Waivers from Accessibility Code Requirements—June 8, 2010

1. Pine Creek Sporting Club

The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to the upper levels of a tree house structure with two elevated observation levels. The structure is located in a private, member only club which includes a lodge, various types of shooting sports, helipad, recreational field, toy barn, nature trails, horse stables, dog kennels, aviary and volleyball and bocce courts. The cost to construct the tree house is $36,000. The applicant is not claiming disproportionate cost; however, the club maintains the law was never intended to include an auxiliary feature of this limited nature in a rustic environment.

Action: Withdrawn by applicant.

2. Superstein Building

The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to all three floors of a building containing an apartment and 11 hotel units. There are three separate entrances to the building and the owner plans to provide accessibility to the first floor via ramp at the northeast entrance. The first floor contains a lobby, the accessible guest room and a guest room for the hearing impaired. According to the applicant, making the other floors accessible would destroy the historic character of the building since three exterior elevators would need to be provided in addition to the existing stairwells serving the second and third floors. The building is located in the historic Art Deco district.

Action: Waiver granted.

3. University of South Florida Basketball Training Facility

The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to three rows of tiered seating in the film room of a basketball training facility. Accessible seating is provided in the first row. The project is a new, $8,500,000 athletic facility that is in the design phase.

Action: Waiver granted.
4. Hollywood Golf

The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to 9 holes of a new 36 hole miniature golf course costing $1,000,000. The course will include the playing area and a village with a Golf Clubhouse, toilet rooms and storage which are fully accessible. The course is designed to permit persons with mobility impairments to play nine holes of golf with alternate pin/hole placements to provide the experience of playing a total of 18 holes in both courses in the project. Signage and score card information will also be provided for instructions on the accessible route and pin placement. According to the applicant, the cost of acquiring additional land would not be feasible to create landscape features, unique hole layouts and water features.

Action: Waiver granted.

5. Hernando Elementary K

The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to all rows of seats in a collapsible bleacher system in a gymnasium. The project is new, $28,510,000, 166,695 square foot K-8 school consisting of a three story classroom wing and three one story wings which also include a cafeteria, and administration/media center. Seven wheelchair seating locations are provided on the first level of the bleachers.

Action: Waiver granted.

6. Orange County Orlando Magic Recreation Center, Mildred Dixon Site

The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to all rows of seats in a retractable bleacher system located in a new, $5,000,000 facility. The project will contain 24,400 square feet and consists of a one story combination gymnasium, activity room, weight room, cardio room and game room building. The plans indicate that the 213 seat bleacher system will provide 6 wheelchair seating locations with companion seats at the lower level bleachers.

Action: Waiver granted.

7. Whispering Pines Center

The applicant requested a waiver for modifications to the requirements for 18” maneuvering clearance at a doorway and to reduce the size of a toilet room grab bar from 42” to 36”. The project is an existing facility and during the course of construction a structural column was found that prohibits being able to provide the required clearance and grab bar. To do so would require extensive demolition and reconfiguration of the space, including reducing classroom size. The scope of the project is renovation of 11 existing toilet rooms at a cost of $341,333. Note: This request is not for a waiver from a Florida specific standard, but from requirements of the federal guidelines.

Action: Dismiss. Commission cannot waive federal requirement but building official may make determination that compliance is “technically infeasible”.
8. Winter Park Community Center

The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to all rows of seats in a new retractable bleacher system. The building contains a gymnasium, meeting room, fitness room, teen classroom and senior center. The gymnasium contains a retractable bleacher system with accessible seating located in the first two rows. The project will cost $9,000,000 and no estimates of additional cost to provide full accessibility were submitted.

Action: Waiver Granted.

9. Alpha Delta Pi Sorority

The applicant requested a waiver from vertical accessibility to the second floor of a 14,239 square foot building that was constructed in 1970. The scope of the $120,000 involves a renovation to the second floor bathroom to make it accessible. An estimate of $33,000 was provided for the installation of a passenger elevator to the second floor.

Action: Waiver granted.

10. Kipp School

The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to all rows of seats in a former greyhound racing facility that is being converted to a charter school. The existing cast concrete bleacher system was formerly used as the viewing area for the dog track and is being converted to an interior auditorium. Eight wheelchair seating locations are provided at the top of the auditorium; however, three seats are on the ends of the rows. The project is being developed in stages and the waiver request pertains to Phase II, costing $3,000,000 and includes the auditorium renovation.

Action: Approved with condition.

11. Kids Inc. Daycare Facility

The facility is a church with the sanctuary located above a lower level with classrooms in two adjacent buildings connected by breezeways and open air stairs. The church arranged for a non-profit agency, unaffiliated with the church, to operate the daycare center for low income children up to three years of age. The center will be located on the lowest levels of the two education buildings and the lowest level of the sanctuary building, for a total of 8,805 square feet. Each of the levels is accessible at grade, but not vertically accessible internally. The project will cost $180,425 and $23,903 will be spent on improvements to provide accessibility, including accessible door hardware and providing a new high/low drinking fountain. A platform lift would cost an additional $27,500, raising accessibility costs to 32.7% of the budget.

Action: Approved with conditions.
12. Florida State University – Johnston Building

The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to all rows of seats in an expansion of a building originally constructed in 1932 as a dining hall. Once completed, the building will provide new classroom, lecture hall and studio space. Three new accessible entrances will provide access to a central five story atrium that will contain two elevators serving all floors in the building. The classroom in question contains six stepped platforms with 95 fixed seats and four additional wheelchair seating locations located at the top and bottom levels. The project will cost $33,354,342; however, cost is not the basis for the waiver request; and the applicant provided a breakdown indicating $2,574,400 of the project budget has been allocated to improve accessibility.

**Action:** Approved with conditions.

13. Soho Beach House

The applicant requested a modification to a final order previously issued by the Commission. The project is a historic hotel that is being renovated and the addition of a new tower on the property. The original final order granted a waiver from vertical accessibility to the second floor of the hotel. This area was intended for use as a guest room; however, the applicant would prefer using it for two offices. The application has been submitted because the proposed use of the area has been changed.

**Action:** Prior waiver modification approved.

14. Greenview Hotel

The applicant requested a waiver from providing an elevator with interior dimensions in compliance with the current code. The elevator has a door that provides a 33” clear opening and has interior dimensions of 33” x 150”. It is adjacent to existing stairs and corridors and cannot be enlarged without encroaching on the means of egress. The first guest room is elevated and due to structural constraints, cannot be served by the elevator. The width of steps from the lobby entrance level does not permit installation of the inclined lift. The lobby is one riser above the main entrance level and cannot be ramped because of historic preservation requirements. The applicant proposed to maintain a portable ramp to access into this area. Some of the rooftop additions proposed guest rooms are intended to have a sunning area accessed by spiral stairs. This area cannot be served by an elevator because the penthouse would violate zoning regulations.

**Action:** Waiver granted.
Second Hearings—June 8, 2010

Commission Action: Deferred

**DCA09-DEC-259 by Robert S. Fine Counsel for Malibu Lodging Investments, LLC.**

**Question 1:** Does the installation of lightweight material (such as vinyl mesh) murals on the exterior of existing buildings, where the material does not encroach the public right-of-way, require a building permit as might otherwise be required by under Section 105.1 of the FBC (2004 and 2007 editions)?

**Answer:** Yes. According to Section 403 of the Florida Building Code, Existing Building and Section 3107 of the Florida Building Code, Building the level of work described falls within the scope of the Florida Building Code “regulated by the Code” and for that a building permit would be required.

**Question 2:** If the answer to question (1) above is in the affirmative, then, on an existing building which had a mural as described in question (1) above installed prior to the original effective date of the Florida Building Code (i.e. the 2001 edition), would the lowering and then re-hanging the mural material to the existing fasteners periodically for maintenance purposes (or, for example, during hurricane warning through the passing of the storm periods) constitute a repair or an alteration under FBC Existing Building Volume (2007 edition) (FBC-EB)?

**Answer:** The level of work in question is specific to an existing installation which falls outside the scope of the Declaratory Statement process. The Declaratory Statement process is limited in scope to future projects.

**Question 3:** Regarding the scenarios set forth in questions (1) and (2) above, would the vinyl murals described in questions (2) and (3) above be considered “structural elements” for the purpose of FBC–EB?

**Answer:** Yes. The product in question will impose additional dead load (gravity load due to the weight of all materials) which has to be supported by the existing building and transferred to the structural members of the existing building

Commission Action: Approved

**DCA09-DEC-411 by Manny Sanchez of Fenestration Testing Laboratory, Inc.**

**Question #1:** We need clarification from the committee of the intent of this section. Our interpretation is that window manufacturer is to test three samples in size, configuration and glazing?

**Answer:** Yes. According to Section 1714.6 a minimum of three specimens/samples must be tested for the product in question.
Question #2: As the testing laboratory agency for the State are we correct in making such determination as to what was tested is ample or not and is in compliance.

Answer: Yes. According to Rule 9B-72.010, it is the responsibility of the approved test lab to test a product in accordance with the applicable testing standards referenced in the Code including any specific modification by the Code to such standard.

Commission Action: Approved

DCA10-DEC-002 by Derrek Runion of GreenBuilt, Inc.

Question #1: When we design and engineer a system for a custom home or commercial building for a client, and the system is designed consistent with FBC Section 2210. The purpose and use of our system in this capacity would constitute an exception to the Florida Product Approval rule and requirements, as stated in 9B-72-030 exceptions to the rule. Is this correct? If not, please explain why?

(Note: code reference was changed to FBC)

Answer: To the extent that the Petitioner’s pre-engineered system is constructed specific to plan or design “custom /one of a kind” and designed in accordance with specification standards referenced in the FBC, the system itself falls outside the scope of the optional state approval established by Rule 9B-72. However, local approval of the Petitioner’s system may be achieved through building plans review and inspection providing the system is manufactured under quality assurance procedures as specified in the Code.

Question #2: When we design and engineer a system for the roof of a custom home or commercial building for a client and the system is designed consistent with FBC Section 2210. The purpose and use of our system in this capacity would constitute an exception to the Florida Product Approval rules and requirements, as stated in 9B-72-030 exceptions to the rule. Is this correct? If not, please explain why?

Answer: See answer to Question #1.

Question #3: If we design a wall section that is not sold as part of a pre-engineered custom whole building, but rather intended for use in a custom design or addition, and it is manufactured, designed and installed consistent with FBC Section 2210, then the purpose and use of our system in this capacity would constitute an exception to the Florida Product Approval rules and requirements, as stated in 9B-72-030 exceptions to the rule. Is this correct? If not, please explain why?

Answer: See answer to Question #1.

Question #4: If we design a roof section that is not sold as a part of a pre-engineered custom whole building, but rather intended for use in a custom design or addition, and it is manufactured, designed and installed consistent with FBC Section 2210, the purpose and use of our system in this capacity would constitute an exception to the Rule 9B-72 Florida Product Approval rules and requirements as stated in 9B-72-030 exceptions to the rule. Is this correct? If not please explain why?

Answer: See answer to Question #1.
**Commission Action:** Approved

**DCA10-DEC-034 by C.W. (Ben) Bentley**

**Question:** To the question “Is it the intent of 2007 Florida Building Code [Residential] to allow installation of a PRV [pressure relief] valve in the “solar loop” portion of an active direct solar water heating system?”

**Answer:** YES, as long as the installation is in accordance with the system’s listing/certification and the manufacturer's installation instructions and there is a temperature and pressure valve provided at the storage tank to protect the system.

---

**First Hearings—June 8, 2010**

**Commission Action:** Dismissed

**DCA10DEC-038 by Ray Habic of Gillette Generators**

**Commission Action:** Deferred for input by Department of Agriculture

**DCA10-DEC-059 by Paul T. Myers, Building Official of Putnam County**

**Question:** Is it the intent of Florida Statute 553.73 and the 2007 Florida Building Code Section 102.2, which specifically exempts nonresidential farm building on farms from the provisions of the Florida Building Code, to also exempt the construction of a new building or addition, or the alteration or change use of an existing building, on a farm, under the following conditions:

1. Making and bottling of wine (alcohol content 14% or less) from farm grown grapes.
2. The processing of fish meat or caviar from farm raised fish.
3. Expansion of a nursery or farm to include an office to receive the public for purchase of off-site services (i.e., landscaping, fencing, or yard care).
4. The construction of an equestrian arena, stables or barns for non-farm related activities (i.e., private hunt clubs, show events, public use or boarding).
5. Construction of an office for farm use (bookkeeping, hiring, etc.).

**Commission Action:** Deferred

**DCA10-DEC-079 by Richard Mihalich, Chief Building Official of City of South Daytona**

**Question #.1.** Under the stated existing conditions of the roofing systems in the town-home complex, can a new modified bitumen roofing system, as defined in Section 1507.11 of the FBC be installed over the existing roof coverings without the addition of the required minimum slope of $\frac{1}{4}''$ in 12” for roofing covering systems requiring that minimum slope?
Question #2. Under the stated conditions of the roofing systems in the town-home complex, if the standing water evaporates within 48 hours, does this meet the definition of Positive Roof Drainage?

Question #3. Do the conditions of the townhome, as stated above, constitute Positive Roof Drainage as defined in Section 1502, Definition, FBC, thereby allowing the roof to be recovered as opposed to being replaced and the required minimum one-fourth unit in twelve slope installed?

Action: Withdrawn by Applicant

DCA-DEC-085 by Paul E. Radauskus, C.B.O. Building Official of Sarasota County

Commission Action: Dismissed


Commission Action: Dismissed

DCA10-DEC-107 by Pual T. Myers, Building Official of Putnam County.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>TBA</th>
<th>POC</th>
<th>FBC</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>251-R14</td>
<td>PGT Industries</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-R5</td>
<td>MonierLifetile</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Roofing Tiles</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>682-R4</td>
<td>TAMKO Building Products, Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699-R3</td>
<td>OMG, Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Roofing Fasteners</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>996-R4</td>
<td>Kinro, Inc</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1086-R6</td>
<td>Andersen Corporation</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1091-R7</td>
<td>Andersen Corporation</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1097-R5</td>
<td>Andersen Corporation</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1435-R6</td>
<td>PGT Industries</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555-R4</td>
<td>EFCO Corporation</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585-R1</td>
<td>NUDURA Corporation</td>
<td>Structural Components</td>
<td>Insulation Form Systems</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-R7</td>
<td>PGT Industries</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Company Name</td>
<td>Product Type</td>
<td>Product Description</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-R3</td>
<td>TAMKO Building Products, Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Asphalt Shingles</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3315-R1</td>
<td>Harmon, Inc.</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Curtain Walls</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3506-R3</td>
<td>Hanson Roof Tile</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Roofing Tiles</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4052-R2</td>
<td>Cherokee Metals Company</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4087-R4</td>
<td>TAMKO Building Products, Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4571-R4</td>
<td>Lincoln Wood Products, Inc. / Timeline Vinyl Products, Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4891-R4</td>
<td>Nucor Building Systems</td>
<td>Structural Components</td>
<td>Roof Deck</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5012-R5</td>
<td>PGT Industries</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5027-R4</td>
<td>LL Building Products, Inc sub of GAFMC</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Roofing Accessories that are an Integral Part of the Roofing System</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5179-R4</td>
<td>Simonton Windows</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5419-R5</td>
<td>Simonton Windows</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6649-R2</td>
<td>Lawson Industries</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6819-R2</td>
<td>Craft-Bilt Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7006-R2</td>
<td>IKO Industries</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ID   | Company Name                              | Category     | Product Type | Approval Status  
|------|-------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------  
| 7150-R3 | Marvin Windows and Doors                  | Windows      | Fixed        | Recommend Approval  
| 7154-R2 | TAMKO Building Products, Inc.             | Roofing      | Asphalt Shingles | Recommend Approval  
| 7156-R3 | Andersen Corporation                      | Windows      | Fixed        | Recommend Approval  
| 8337-R2 | Lawson Industries                         | Windows      | Horizontal Slider | Recommend Approval  
| 8802-R1 | Evergreen Slate Company                   | Roofing      | Roofing Slate | Recommend Approval  
| 8944-R2 | Florida Extruders International, Inc.     | Windows      | Single Hung  | Recommend Approval  
| 9064-R3 | CGI - Construction Glass Industries       | Windows      | Single Hung  | Recommend Approval  
| 9236-R2 | Florida Extruders International, Inc.     | Windows      | Horizontal Slider | Recommend Approval  
| 9242-R2 | Florida Extruders International, Inc.     | Windows      | Fixed        | Recommend Approval  
| 9249-R2 | Florida Extruders International, Inc.     | Windows      | Fixed        | Recommend Approval  
| 9262-R2 | Florida Extruders International, Inc.     | Windows      | Single Hung  | Recommend Approval  
| 9265-R2 | Florida Extruders International, Inc.     | Windows      | Single Hung  | Recommend Approval  
| 9340-R2 | PGT Industries                            | Windows      | Horizontal Slider | Recommend Approval  
| 9449-R2 | United States                             | Panel Walls  | Storefronts   | Recommend Approval  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10287-R3</td>
<td>Aluminum Corp.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10336-R1</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10477-R1</td>
<td>James Hardie Building Products, Inc.</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10692-R4</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10764-R1</td>
<td>Bigbee Steel Buildings</td>
<td>Structural Components</td>
<td>Roof Deck</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10936-R1</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10940-R2</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10943-R3</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10948-R1</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10966-R2</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10987-R1</td>
<td>CGI - Construction Glass Industries</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10988-R2</td>
<td>CGI - Construction Glass Industries</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11012-R1</td>
<td>Pella Corporation</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11116-R2</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11117-R2</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11119-R2</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11120-R2</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11147-R2</td>
<td>Pella Corporation</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11149-R2</td>
<td>Pella Corporation</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11252-R2</td>
<td>Hurd Windows and Doors, Inc.</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11409-R1</td>
<td>Regency Plus Incorporated</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11411-R1</td>
<td>Regency Plus Incorporated</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11412-R1</td>
<td>Regency Plus</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Product Type</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11413-R1</td>
<td>Regency Plus Incorporated</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11553-R1</td>
<td>MI Windows and Doors</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11585-R3</td>
<td>Hurd Windows and Doors, Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11594-R2</td>
<td>Hurd Windows and Doors, Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11599-R1</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11723-R2</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Awning</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11726-R4</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11812-R1</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11825-R4</td>
<td>MI Windows and Doors</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11827-R4</td>
<td>MI Windows and Doors</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11856-R1</td>
<td>BITEC, INC.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Underlayments</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11869-R2</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11938-R1</td>
<td>M W Manufacturers Inc.</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12207-R1</td>
<td>Hurd Windows and Doors, Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12404-R1</td>
<td>CGI - Construction Glass Industries</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12426-R1</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12437-R1</td>
<td>MI Windows and Doors</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12586-R2</td>
<td>MI Windows and Doors</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12622-R1</td>
<td>Nan Ya Plastics</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td>Swinging</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12624-R1</td>
<td>Nan Ya Plastics Corporation USA</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12683-R1</td>
<td>EcoStar LLC</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Underlayments</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12916</td>
<td>Marvin Windows and Doors</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12940</td>
<td>Pocahontas Aluminum Company, Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13054-R1</td>
<td>Lemminkainen Katto OY</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Underlayments</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13064-R1</td>
<td>Vinyl Corp</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Roofing Accessories that are an Integral Part of the Roofing System</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13074-R1</td>
<td>Andersen Corporation</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13090</td>
<td>Nan Ya Plastics Corporation USA</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13092</td>
<td>All Seasons Commercial Div.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13094</td>
<td>All Seasons Commercial Div.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13125</td>
<td>Lemminkainen Katto OY</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Underlayments</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13134</td>
<td>Atlantic Vinyl Windows and Doors, inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13329-R1</td>
<td>Resier Patio Doors</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13404</td>
<td>Parrett Manufacturing, Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13411-R1</td>
<td>Energy Saving Window &amp; Doors, Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13441</td>
<td>Hayfield Window and Door Company</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13457</td>
<td>Hurd Windows and Doors, Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13458</td>
<td>Hurd Windows and Doors, Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13460</td>
<td>Hurd Windows and Doors, Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13465</td>
<td>Southern Metals Products, LLC</td>
<td>Shutters</td>
<td>Accordion</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13541-R1</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13548</td>
<td>Andersen Corporation</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13554-R1</td>
<td>Andersen Corporation</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13601</td>
<td>Hurd Windows and Doors, Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Awning</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13602</td>
<td>Hurd Windows and Doors, Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13605</td>
<td>Wausau Window and Wall Systems</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13608</td>
<td>Wausau Window and Wall Systems</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13609</td>
<td>Pella Corporation</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td>Swinging</td>
<td>a a a Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13616</td>
<td>BASF Construction Chemicals, LLC</td>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13617</td>
<td>BASF Construction Chemicals, LLC</td>
<td>Panels</td>
<td>Exterior Insulation Finish System</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13618</td>
<td>BASF Construction Chemicals, LLC</td>
<td>Panels</td>
<td>Exterior Insulation Finish System</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13623</td>
<td>Nucor Building Systems</td>
<td>Structural Components</td>
<td>Roof Deck</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13624</td>
<td>CAL-ROYAL PRODUCTS INC.</td>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13630</td>
<td>Marvin Windows and Doors</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Awning</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13632</td>
<td>Marvin Windows and Doors</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13635</td>
<td>CENTRIA</td>
<td>Panels</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13636</td>
<td>Consolidated Systems Inc.</td>
<td>Structural Components</td>
<td>Roof Deck</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13639</td>
<td>Hurd Windows and Doors, Inc.</td>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13642</td>
<td>Windsor Windows and Doors</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Awning</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13643</td>
<td>Windsor Windows and Doors</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13645</td>
<td>Arch Aluminum and Glass</td>
<td>Panels</td>
<td>Storefronts</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13647</td>
<td>McElroy Metal, Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Products</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Approval Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13686</td>
<td>American Weatherstar</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Cements-Adhesives-Coatings</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13693</td>
<td>Weather Shield Mfg., Inc.</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13694</td>
<td>Peachtree Doors and Windows</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13698</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13699</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13700</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13704</td>
<td>CENTRIA</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13705</td>
<td>HMF Express LLC</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13716</td>
<td>Andersen Corporation</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Awning</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13717</td>
<td>Andersen Corporation</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13718</td>
<td>Andersen Corporation</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13719</td>
<td>Andersen Corporation</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13720</td>
<td>Andersen Corporation</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13724</td>
<td>Andersen Corporation</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13733</td>
<td>Rigid Building Systems</td>
<td>Structural Components</td>
<td>Roof Deck</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13734</td>
<td>Andersen Corporation</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13735</td>
<td>Thermal</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Code</td>
<td>Company Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13737</td>
<td>Windows Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Republic Powdered Metals, Inc.</td>
<td>Cements-Adhesives-Coatings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13741</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13745</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13746</td>
<td>Republic Powdered Metals, Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Liquid Applied Roof Systems</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13760</td>
<td>Eurotech Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation by Engineer/Architect Method - FBC Voted Approval**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Code</th>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>984-R4</td>
<td>Firestone Building Products Company, LLC.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Modified Bitumen Roof System</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766-R3</td>
<td>Dunbarton Corporation</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2533-R4</td>
<td>CertainTeed Corporation-Roofing</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Modified Bitumen Roof System</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2948-R5</td>
<td>Johns Manville</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Modified Bitumen Roof System</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4103-R4</td>
<td>TAMKO Building Products, Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Roofing Accessories that are an Integral Part of the Roofing</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td>Approval Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4264-R3</td>
<td>USG</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Roofing Insulation</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4483-R2</td>
<td>Petersen Aluminum Corporation</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Soffits</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6136-R5</td>
<td>Silverline Building Products Corp.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8134-R5</td>
<td>Alside Window Company</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Double Hung</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9190-R1</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9456-R2</td>
<td>Moss Supply Company</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9457-R2</td>
<td>Moss Supply Company</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9757-R3</td>
<td>JHRG LLC</td>
<td>Shutters</td>
<td>Storm Panels</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9834-R4</td>
<td>Alside Window Company</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9886-R4</td>
<td>Gentek Building Products</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9890-R4</td>
<td>Revere Building Products</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9909-R4</td>
<td>Associated Materials Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10753-R2</td>
<td>Town and Country Industries,</td>
<td>Shutters</td>
<td>Accordion</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10792</td>
<td>JRFour Ltd. DBA Technical Glass Products</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Products Introduced a Result of New Technology</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11243-R2</td>
<td>Bemo USA</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11565-R1</td>
<td>JHRG LLC</td>
<td>Shutters</td>
<td>Storm Panels</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11753-R1</td>
<td>Mid-America</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td>Sectional</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11911-R2</td>
<td>Pella Corporation</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12019-R2</td>
<td>American Construction Metals</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Soffits</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12076-R1</td>
<td>Metal Sales Manufacturing Corporation</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12088-R1</td>
<td>Overhead Door Corporation</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12320-R2</td>
<td>Alside Window Company</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12321-R2</td>
<td>Gentek Building Products</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12322-R2</td>
<td>Revere Building Products</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12389</td>
<td>Guernsey Architectural Solutions</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12906</td>
<td>Transamerican Strukturoc, Inc.</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12929</td>
<td>Barrette Outdoor Living</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12930</td>
<td>Barrette Outdoor Living</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Products Introduced as a Result of</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Technology Description</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12931</td>
<td>Barrette Outdoor Living</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12987</td>
<td>LiteSteel Technologies</td>
<td>Structural Components</td>
<td>Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13014-R1</td>
<td>TKO Dock Doors, Inc.</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13101</td>
<td>The Foundry</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13161-R1</td>
<td>C.H.I. Overhead Doors</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13162-R1</td>
<td>C.H.I. Overhead Doors</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13164-R1</td>
<td>C.H.I. Overhead Doors</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13166</td>
<td>C.H.I. Overhead Doors</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13167</td>
<td>C.H.I. Overhead Doors</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13255-R1</td>
<td>YKK AP America</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Curtain Walls</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13256-R1</td>
<td>YKK AP America</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Curtain Walls</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13262</td>
<td>Chem-Pruf Door Co., Ltd.</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13416</td>
<td>Energy Saving Window &amp; Doors, Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Mullions</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13433-R1</td>
<td>YKK AP America</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Curtain Walls</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13448</td>
<td>Style Crest Inc.</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13479</td>
<td>Style Crest Inc.</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13485-R1</td>
<td>Modern Metal Systems Incorporated</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13504</td>
<td>Major Industries</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13546</td>
<td>Stanek Vinyl Windows</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13556</td>
<td>American Construction Metals (ACM)</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13572</td>
<td>Tapco,Inc</td>
<td>Shutters</td>
<td>Storm Panels</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13592</td>
<td>EFCO Corporation</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13597</td>
<td>API (American Products Inc.)</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Storefronts</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13613</td>
<td>Discount Direct Metal Roofing</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13629</td>
<td>Firestone Building Products Company, LLC.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13653</td>
<td>All Metal Roofing and Siding, Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13655</td>
<td>Storage Structures, Inc.</td>
<td>Structural Components</td>
<td>Roof Deck</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Company Name</td>
<td>Product Line</td>
<td>Accessories</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13658</td>
<td>Windsor Republic Doors, Inc. Little Rock, AR</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13659</td>
<td>Engage Machinery, Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13660</td>
<td>Marianna Metal Roofing, Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13664</td>
<td>Morton Buildings, Inc</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13665</td>
<td>Morton Buildings, Inc</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Soffits</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13666</td>
<td>Soprema, Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Single Ply Roof Systems</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13671</td>
<td>Commercial Innovations, INC</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Underlayments</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13672</td>
<td>MBCI, L.P.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13674</td>
<td>ACI Building Systems</td>
<td>Structural Components</td>
<td>Roof Deck</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13684</td>
<td>Firestone Building Products Company, LLC.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Roofing Accessories that are an Integral Part of the Roofing System</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13685</td>
<td>Associated Materials Inc.</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13687</td>
<td>Door Innovations, inc.</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13691</td>
<td>Mai Doors by Distinctive Doors</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Company Name</td>
<td>Product Type</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13701</td>
<td>Pella Entry Systems- Wylie Operations</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13702</td>
<td>Therma-Tru Corporation</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13706</td>
<td>BITEC, INC.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Modified Bitumen Roof System</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13707</td>
<td>API (American Products Inc.)</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13712</td>
<td>Roxul, Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Roofing Insulation</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13713</td>
<td>Metal Sales Manufacturing Corporation</td>
<td>Structural Components</td>
<td>Roof Deck</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13722</td>
<td>Accelerated Building Technologies</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13728</td>
<td>ACI Building Systems</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Soffits</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13732</td>
<td>Fabral</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13738</td>
<td>Century Metal Roofing Supply, Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13742</td>
<td>Mayfair Window and Door</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13743</td>
<td>Mayfair Window and Door</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13750</td>
<td>Chicago Clamp Company</td>
<td>Structural Components</td>
<td>Pre-engineered AC Stands</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13751</td>
<td>Advance Hurricane</td>
<td>Shutters</td>
<td>Fabric Storm Panel</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Product Type</td>
<td>Feature/Type</td>
<td>Approval Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13753</td>
<td>CROCI NORTH AMERICA</td>
<td>Shutters</td>
<td>Roll-up</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13754</td>
<td>East Coast Metal systems</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13757</td>
<td>Town and Country Industries,</td>
<td>Shutters</td>
<td>Accordion</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13758</td>
<td>Windoor Incorporated</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13765</td>
<td>EFCO Corporation</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Casement</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13767</td>
<td>EFCO Corporation</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13768</td>
<td>Agri-Metal Supply Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Metal Roofing</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10969-R1</td>
<td>Creaton AG</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Roofing Tiles</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2075-R4</td>
<td>Florida Metal Products Inc.</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Roofing Accessories that are an Integral Part of the Roofing System</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2495-R2</td>
<td>Exterior Portfolio by</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranes (firms)</td>
<td>Buildings (categories)</td>
<td>Materials/Products (subcategories)</td>
<td>FBC Voted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6297-R3 Arch Aluminum and Glass Co., Inc.</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Storefronts</td>
<td>a a a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6350-R2 Arch Aluminum and Glass Co., Inc.</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a a a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12978-R1 Windoor Incorporated</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td>a a a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13165 Sunshine Windows Manufacturing Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Horizontal Slider</td>
<td>a a a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13192-R1 James Hardie Building Products, Inc.</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Siding</td>
<td>a a a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13478 Thybar Corporation</td>
<td>Structural Components</td>
<td>Pre-engineered AC Stands</td>
<td>a a a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13492 Cellular Concrete LLC</td>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Roofing Insulation</td>
<td>a a a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13606 Sunshine Windows Manufacturing Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>a a a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13625 Sunshine Windows Manufacturing Inc.</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single Hung</td>
<td>a a a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13628 Simpson Strong-Tie Co.</td>
<td>Structural Components</td>
<td>Anchors</td>
<td>a a a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13692 Exterior Portfolio by Crane</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Soffits</td>
<td>a a a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Entities - FBC Voted**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CER 1773</td>
<td>National Accreditation &amp; Management Institute</td>
<td>Product Certification Agency</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TST 1558</td>
<td>Architectural Testing, Inc.</td>
<td>Product Testing Laboratory</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TST 1589</td>
<td>National Certified Testing Laboratories, Inc.</td>
<td>Product Testing Laboratory</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TST 1657</td>
<td>Fenestration Testing Lab</td>
<td>Product Testing Laboratory</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TST 1795</td>
<td>Architectural Testing Inc. - Minnesota</td>
<td>Product Testing Laboratory</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TST 4120</td>
<td>Architectural Testing Inc. - Wisconsin</td>
<td>Product Testing Laboratory</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TST 4311</td>
<td>Architectural Testing Inc. - Florida</td>
<td>Product Testing Laboratory</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TST 4317</td>
<td>Testing Evaluation Laboratories, Inc.</td>
<td>Product Testing Laboratory</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TST 4744</td>
<td>National Certified Testing Laboratories, Inc - York</td>
<td>Product Testing Laboratory</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TST 7110</td>
<td>Architectural Testing Inc. - Springdale, PA</td>
<td>Product Testing Laboratory</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUA 7628</td>
<td>Quality Auditing-Institute Ltd.</td>
<td>Product Quality Assurance</td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Discussion Items | Superior Window Corp. | Structural Components | Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology | Public Comment by Jaime Gascon - Receptors are typical to and have an impact on the unit's air, water, and structural performance also if impact resistant. The HVHZ has treated alternative mounting conditions, requiring that each fenestration system be tested with it.

Response by Hermes F. Norero - We agree that the receptor water, structural, impact and cycle with each of the window types. This is why we had a test proposal approved by Miami Dade window assembly that contained all three types of windows to receptor system (including also the two type of mullion types.

We have a signed proposal and test reports that support Mr. Gascon's request. We believe that all HVHZ requirements have been met for this product submittal.

Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator.

Applicant has indicated that a triple window assembly was tested and indicated a +/ - 65 PSF design pressure. The application indicates in addition a single unit at +/ - 70 PSF. The receptor is another substrate to be used for window support. Approved assemblies need to be tested with this substrate. Application shall be limited to tested assemblies. Recommend Conditional Approval with condition of: Limit application to tested assemblies.

Armor Screen Corp. | Shutters | Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology | c w | Withdrawn

Roll-a-way by QMI | Shutters | Roll-up | c c c | Application shows configurations that have deflections in excess allowable for HVHZ in violation of Sect. 1613.1.9. Recommend Approval with condition of: Not to be used within HVHZ.

Applications with Public Comments

Certification Method
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>995-R3</td>
<td>Kinro, Inc</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>995-R3</td>
<td>Public Comment by Jaime Gascon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The certification needs to specify the actual glass type and lar indicate not for use in the HVHZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>995-R3</td>
<td>Response by Rick Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To answer Jaime's concerns we would like a conditional to al glass clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>995-R3</td>
<td>Recommendation by Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Recommend Conditional Approval with condition of: Provi tested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3951-R3</td>
<td>Quality Engineered Products</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3951-R3</td>
<td>Public Comment by Jaime Gascon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please consider a conditional approval for this application in presently uploaded NOA with the completely signed version stamps in sheets 10, 11, 12 and 13. The fully signed version Miami-Dade County's website <a href="http://www.miamidade.gov/buildingcode/library/productcontrol/noa/09061703.pdf">http://www.miamidade.gov/buildingcode/library/productcontrol/noa/09061703.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3951-R3</td>
<td>Recommendation by Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Recommend Conditional Approval with condition of: provic corrected NOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10937-R1</td>
<td>JELD-WEN</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10937-R1</td>
<td>Public Comment by Jaime Gascon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For products .3 and .4 the note on evaluation reports allowin glass thicknesses is not allowed in the HVHZ per FBC 2411. is PVC and there is no indication of compliance with Chapte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10937-R1</td>
<td>Response by Kristina S. Daugherty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We will remove the note allowing glazing other than tested a the approved PVC NOA #06-1220.01 to PER934B and PEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10937-R1</td>
<td>Recommendation by Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Recommend Conditional Approval with conditions of: Rem indicating configurations other than tested. Indicate the testi in accordance with Chapter 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13177</td>
<td>CHAMPION METAL INC</td>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13177</td>
<td>CHAMPION METAL INC</td>
<td>Panel Walls</td>
<td>Storefronts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend Approval - Deferred at the February 2010 meet condition of : Remove conditions not tested or certified (imp tested). Provide testing/certification of ASI 335 for all subst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FBC JUNE 8, 2010 SUMMARY REPORT
I would like to bring to your attention and the TBA staffs attention to changes that have occurred with application FL 13177 for state wide approval.

(1) This system has been placed in the wrong category. The fixed storefront an this application is for swinging doors.

(2) In the first application to the state for this system, FL1: February 2010 by Heritage Glass Inc. The system use formed steel with 6063-T5 aluminum. In the new application FL 13177 by Champion M change the steel design and aluminum temper. (I have no pr TAS 203-94 has no effect on it.)

My primary issue is that the engineer has changed the aluminum 6063-T6. This system was not tested as it is being represented with a T-6 temper have a greater risk of failure at the fastener tests are performed as per the Florida Building Code.

If this interchanging between steal and aluminum temper is allowed, it will minimize the usefulness of cyclic testing of the aluminum framing. This will open the door to even more creative ways for a company to work their way are instead of designing solutions to a problem.

1) FL13177 was submitted as a Panel wall – storefront system
2) The unit tested was 6063-T6, Our initial engineer made a few mistakes and as a result we hired Farooq engineering who corrected the use of T6 temper and these parts met and will meet the T6 requirements. See attached die drawings, these are the specifications that the unit was built with and all future products will utilize. These drawings are confidential and should not be forwarded.

The applicant had two applications at the February meeting. There was an application for the storefront assembly and a second application for the doors. Applicant used the application number of the previous door application for the present storefront. The changes on the application number were not reflected on the agenda list. This error, not by the applicant, is hereby corrected. On the issue of the grade of aluminum, the new evaluator indicated the grade as tested and the applicant provided to us the die drawings indication the grade of steel. Commentator is refering to an evaluation report by another evaluator. Therefore this application should be recommended for approval.

| 13177 | Public Comment by Daniel R. Leon | I would like to bring to your attention and the TBA staffs att have occurred with application FL 13177 for state wide appr (1) This system has been placed in the wrong category. The a fixed Storefront an this application is for swinging doors. (2) In the first application to the state for this system, FL1: February 2010 by Heritage Glass Inc. The system use formed aluminum. In the new application FL 13177 by Champion M change the steel design and aluminum temper. (I have no pr TAS 203-94 has no effect on it.) My primary issue is that the engineer has changed the aluminum 6063-T6. This system was not tested as it is being represented with a T-6 temper have a greater risk of failure at the fastener tests are performed as per the Florida Building Code. If this interchanging between steal and aluminum temper is a the usefulness of cyclic testing of the aluminum framing. Thi even more creative ways for a company to work their way are instead of designing solutions to a problem. |
| 13177 | Response by Bob Lytle | 1) FL13177 was submitted as a Panel wall – storefront system 2) The unit tested was 6063-T6, Our initial engineer made a few mistakes and as a result we hired Farooq engineering who corrected the use of T6 temper and these parts met and will meet the requirements. See attached die drawings, these are the specifications that the unit was built with and all future products will utilize. These drawings are confidential and should not be forwarded. |
| 13177 | Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator | The applicant had two applications at the February meeting. for the storefront assembly and a second application for the doors application number of the previous door application for the storefront changes on the application number where not reflected on the applicant, is hereby corrected. On the issue of the grade of aluminum, the new evaluator indicated the grade as tested and the applicant drawings indication the grade of steel. Commentator is refering to an evaluation report by another evaluator. Therefore this application should be approved. |
| 13711 | JELD-WEN Exterior Doors | Swinging Exterior Door | * | Recommend Approval |
| 13711 | Public Comment by Jaime Gascon | | Assemblies | Note on evaluation allowing for other than tested glass thickness in the HVHZ per FBC 2411.3.2.6(3). |
| 13711 | Response by Kristina S. Daugherty | | | Will remove the note allowing glazing other than tested from PER 938. |
| 13711 | Recommendation by Administrator | c | c | Recommend Conditional Approval with condition of: Remove indicating configurations other than tested. |

### Evaluation by Engineer/Architect Method

| 12140 | Chem-Pruf Door Co., Ltd. | Exterior Doors | Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies | a | a | Recommend Approval |

**12140 Public Comment by Jaime Gascon**

- The TAS versions (year) listed on the BCIS are not the versions adopted in the 2007 FBC.

- The HVHZ testing and installation protocols are listed on Chapter 35 grouped under FBC-TPHVHZ-07. This would indicate a 2007 adoption. The testing standards on application do indicate a -94 suffix, but this is a glitch that should be corrected. These standards have been revised several times after 1994 to include environmental recording requirements to substantial performance of type and velocity of missile. Therefore maintaining the -94 would not be a real description of the test performed because it would not indicate the scope of the standard at the time of test. The use of adoption year 2007 complies with year as indicated on Chapter 35.

**13252 YKK AP America**

- Panel Walls
- Curtain Walls

- Recommend Approval

**13252 Public Comment by Jaime Gascon**

- On all evaluations uploaded, there is a footnote at the bottom except to the listed "pass" results of TAS203 that needs clarification if the testing is to serve as qualifying the product for use in the HVHZ.

**13252 Response by Melih Susoy**

- Section 8.6 of the test report referenced in the evaluation report lists the passing and failing glass types as tested. Only glass types passing all test requirements should be used.
| 13252 | Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator | | | During the review period of the application we raised the same question as on public comment. We received the same answer and recommend approval. |
| 13380 | BP - Glass Garage Doors & Entry Systems | Exterior Doors | Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies | Recommend Approval |
| 13380 | Public Comment by Jaime Gascon | | | Glazing details on sheet 3 of 4 of drawings show part #3 as a gasket. Provide compliance with FBC 2411.3.4 or detail as a sealant part as called out in the bill of materials. |
| 13380 | Response by Hermes F. Norero | | | We will edit the information on the bill of materials to reflect gasket. We will also include the compliance of the gasket per request by Mr. Gascon. |
| 13380 | Recommendation by Administrator | | c c | Recommend Conditional Approval with condition of: Provide glazing detail as tested and include gasket in compliance with Sect. 2411.3.4 |