

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION



FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORT OF THE JUNE 11, 2013 COMMISSION PLENARY SESSION DAYTONA BEACH, FLORIDA

PROCESS DESIGN, CONSENSUS-BUILDING AND FACILITATION BY



CONSENSUS CENTER

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



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

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

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
JUNE 11, 2013 MEETING SUMMARY REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>TABLE OF CONTENTS</i>	1
<i>TABLE OF ATTACHMENTS</i>	2
I. MEETING SUMMARY OVERVIEW	3
II. WELCOME AND ATTENDANCE	4
III. MEETING OBJECTIVES	5
IV. CHAIR’S DISCUSSION ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	6
V. COMMISSION FUNDED RESEARCH	7
VI. GLITCH MODIFICATION PROCESSES	8
VII. ACCESSIBILITY WAIVER APPLICATIONS	9
VIII. PRODUCT AND ENTITY APPROVALS	9
IX. ACCREDITOR AND COURSE APPROVALS	9
X. LEGAL ISSUES	10
XI. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	10
XII. COMMISSION’S 2013 - 2013 ANNUAL REPORT	12
XIII. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT	13
XIV. COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS AND ISSUES	13
XV. NEXT MEETING OVERVIEW AND ISSUES	14

<i>TABLE OF ATTACHMENTS</i>		<i>15 - 87</i>
1.	MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS	15
2.	KEY TO COMMON ACRONYMS	17
3.	COMMISSION HISTORY AND OVERVIEW	18
4.	COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA (JUNE 11, 2013)	20
5.	COMMISSION’S UPDATED WORKPLAN (2013 CODE UPDATE)	23
6.	ACCESSIBILITY WAIVER SUMMARY	25
7.	LEGAL REPORT	28
8.	TAC GLITCH AMENDMENT REVIEW PROCESS	30
9.	COMMISSION GLITCH AMENDMENT REVIEW PROCESS	33
10.	LEGISLATIVE ISSUES UPDATE	37
11.	PRODUCT AND ENTITY APPROVAL REPORT	43

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
JUNE 11, 2013 FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORT

OVERVIEW OF COMMISSION'S KEY ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 2013

WELCOME

Chairman Browdy welcomed the Commission, DBPR staff and the public to Daytona Beach and the June 11, 2013 plenary session of the Florida Building Commission. The Chair noted the primary focus of the June meeting, in addition to considering regular procedural issues including product and entity approvals, applications for accreditor and course approvals, petitions for declaratory statements, accessibility waivers, and recommendations from the Commission's various committees, was for the purpose of approving the 2013 Glitch Review Processes (TAC and FBC) and reviewing and approving the Commission's 2012 – 2013 Annual Report.

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

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

Chairman Browdy explained that some of the licensing boards located within the Department of Business and Professional Regulation, have adopted rules regarding continuing education credits for attending Florida Building Commission meetings and/or Technical Advisory Committee meetings. Participants whose board participates may sign-in on the laptop kiosk station located in the meeting room.

I. PLENARY SESSION SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW

At the June 11, 2013 meeting the Commission considered and decided on Chair's issues and recommendations, product and entity approvals, applications for accreditor and course approvals, petitions for declaratory statements, accessibility waivers, recommendations from the Commission's various committees. Specific actions include: adopting the 2013 TAC and Commission Glitch Amendment Review processes and a revised 2013 Code Development Workplan schedule, and providing direction regarding Commission funded research by expanding topics beyond hurricane research based on the TACs' recommendations. Finally, the Commission approved the Commission's 2012-2013 Annual Report, and adopted resolutions of commendation for retired Commissioners.

(Attachment 1—Meeting Evaluation Results)

II. COMMISSION ATTENDANCE

The following Commissioners attended the June 11, 2013 meeting:

Dick Browdy (Chair), Bob Boyer, Oscar Calleja, Nan Dean, Kevin Flanagan, Charles Frank, Dale Greiner, Jeff Gross, Jon Hamrick, Beth Meyer, Rafael Palacios, John Scherer, Brad Schiffer, Jim Schock, Jeff Stone, and Brian Swope.

(16 of 21 seated Commissioners attended).

Absent Commissioners:

Hamid Bahadori, Herminio Gonzalez, Ken Gregory, Drew Smith, and Tim Tolbert.

Vacant Commission Positions:

Insurance Industry Representative; Plumbing Contractor Representative; Residential Contractor Representative; and Structural Engineer Representative.

DBPR STAFF PRESENT

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

MEETING FACILITATION

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



CONSENSUS CENTER

PROJECT WEBPAGE

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

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

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

III. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL

The Commission voted unanimously, 16 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda for the June 11, 2013 meeting as posted/presented. Following are the key agenda items approved for consideration:

- To Consider Regular Procedural Issues: Agenda Approval and Approval of the April 9, 2013 Facilitator's Summary Report and Meeting Minutes, and April 22, 2013, April 29, 2013, May 13, 2013 Teleconference Minutes, and May 14, 2013 Teleconference Minutes and Facilitator's Summary Report.
- To Consider/Decide on Chair's Discussion Issues/Recommendations.
- To Consider Provide Direction for Commission Funded Research.
- To Consider/Approve TAC and FBC Glitch Amendment Review Processes.
- To Consider/Decide on Accessibility Waiver Applications.
- To Consider/Decide on Approvals and Revocations of Products and Product Approval Entities.
- To Consider Applications for Accreditor and Course Approval.
- To Consider/Decide on Legal Issues: Petitions for Declaratory Statements.
- To Consider/Decide on Technical Advisory Committees (TACs): Accessibility, Code Administration, Energy, Mechanical, and Roofing TAC Report/Recommendations.
- To Consider/Decide on Program Oversight Committees (POCs): Education and Product Approval POC Reports/Recommendations.
- To Consider/Decide on Ad Hoc/Workgroups: Building Code System Uniform Implementation Evaluation.
- To Consider and Approve Commission's 2012–2013 Annual Report.
- To Receive Public Comment.
- To Discuss Commissioner Comments and Issues.
- To Review Committee Assignments and Issues for the Next Meeting—August 22-23, 2013 in Boca Raton, Florida.

Amendments to the Posted Agenda:

There were no amendments to the posted/presented Agenda.

(Attachment 4—June 11, 2013 Commission Agenda)

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 9, 2013 FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORT AND MEETING MINUTES, AND APRIL 22, 2013, APRIL 29, 2013, MAY 13, 2013 TELECONFERENCE MINUTES, AND MAY 14, 2013 TELECONFERENCE MINUTES AND FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORT

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 - 0 in favor, to approve the April 9, 2013 Facilitator's Summary Report and Meeting Minutes, and April 22, 2013, April 29, 2013, May 13, 2013 Teleconference Minutes, and May 14, 2013 Teleconference Minutes and Facilitator's Summary Report as presented.

Amendments:

There were no amendments offered.

IV. CHAIR'S DISCUSSION ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Florida Building Commission Appointment Confirmations

The Chair reported that Nan Dean was confirmed by the Senate for a term ending in 2017.

TAC Appointments:

Chairman Browdy made the following TAC appointments for June 11, 2013:

James A. Ginas was appointed to serve on the Special Occupancy TAC, and moved from the Code Administration TAC, allowing him to represent manufactured buildings interests.

Commissioners With Expired Terms

The Chair noted that a number of Commissioners have expired terms, and appreciated members continuing to serve pending re-appointment or replacement. The Chair advised that if members desired to be reappointed, it is important that they submit a new application by completing the Gubernatorial Appointments Questionnaire on the Governor's Appointments Office webpage. The Chair stated that this should be done immediately if an application has not been submitted recently. The URL is: <http://www.flgov.com/appointments/>

Commission Alumnus Appreciation

The Chair expressed that on behalf of the Commission it was his honor to offer for the Commission's consideration a Resolution of Commendation for the following Commissioners in appreciation for their outstanding service to the State of Florida:

Ed Carson: Ed represented Manufactured Buildings and served from June 2000 until June 2012. Ed served on the Electrical TAC and chaired the Product Approval POC. On behalf of the Commission thank you Ed for your 12 years of service to the citizens of Florida.

Chris Schulte: Chris represented roofing, sheet metal and AC contractors served from May 2003 until June 2012. Chris chaired the Roofing TAC and served on the Product Approval POC. On behalf of the Commission thank you Chris for your 9 years of service to the citizens of Florida.

Kiko Franco: Kiko represented architects and served from August 2007 until November 2012. Kiko chaired the Education POC and served on the Code Administration TAC. On behalf of the Commission thank you Kiko for your 5 years of service to the citizens of Florida.

Scott Mollan: Scott represented mechanical contractors and served from July 2008 until November 2012. Scott served on the Mechanical TAC and the Education POC. On behalf of the Commission thank you Scott for your 4-1/2 years of service to the citizens of Florida.

Mark Turner: Mark represented electrical contractors and served from July 2008 until November 2012. Mark chaired the Electrical TAC. On behalf of the Commission thank you Mark for your 4-1/2 years of service to the citizens of Florida.

Nick Nicholson: Nick represented structural engineers and served from June 2009 until December 2012. Nick served on the Structural TAC and the Product Approval POC. On behalf of the Commission thank you Nick for your 3-1/2 years of service to the citizens of Florida.

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 - 0 in favor, to adopt the Resolutions of Comendation for Commissioners Carson, Schulte, Franco, Mollan, Turner and Nicholson.

(Attachment 10—Commissioner Comendations)

Legislative Issues Update

Jim Richmond reviewed the status of current legislative issues of interest to the Commission and answered member's questions. Jim noted that the main Building Code Bill (HB 269) was submitted to the Governor for signature on June 3, 2013 and signed into law June 14, 2013. HB 973 regarding revisions to the enforcement processes for low-voltage alarms was submitted to the Governor for signature on June 10, 2013. Jim noted if the Governor does not take action on a bill within 15 days of submittal the bill becomes law.

V. COMMISSION FUNDED RESEARCH

Chairman Browdy explained that the Commission has been funding hurricane resistance research since the formation of the Commission's Hurricane Research Advisory Committee in January of 2005, based on spending authority approved by the Florida Legislature. During FY 2012-2013 the Commission continues to fund important hurricane resistant research by helping to fund UF research projects.

Research projects include: evaluating the wind resistance of asphalt shingle roof systems and roof tile systems, and wind-driven rain penetration resistance of buildings. The objectives of this research are to evaluate the effects of aging on shingle roofs, to understand the performance of hip and ridge attachments in strong winds, and to provide guidelines for the design and installation of building products and system intended to prevent water ingress from wind-driven rain. In addition to the research, UF conducts an on-going task to survey and investigate buildings damaged by hurricanes when and if such events take place in the future. The final reports for these projects are due as early as June 15, 2013.

Commissioner Schock recently visited UF's research facility and took some pictures for the Commission's review in a slideshow he presented during the meeting. Following the slide show the Chair indicated he would like for the Commission to discuss whether they should continue to fund research in general and if so whether to fund only hurricane resistance research as in the past or consider expanding research into other Code areas such as building mechanical systems, plumbing/water distribution systems, and pool safety technology as examples. Currently, the roofing TAC is evaluating concerns regarding corrosion of ridge vent fasteners and will advise whether further technical research is warranted.

Following Commissioner Schock's presentation on UF research initiatives partially funded by the Commission, the Chair requested the Commission engage in a discussion on the funding of research (i.e., whether to fund research, whether to fund only hurricane resistance research, and/or whether to expand the funding of research into other Code related areas). The Chair explained that at this point he would primarily like the discussion to focus on whether the research portion funded by the Commission should be broader in scope than hurricane and associated wind related topics, and

noted that if the Commission feels as he does, that in fact the Commission should be more engaged in this process, he would ask each TAC and POC at the appropriate time in their schedules to discuss the matter and make recommendations to the Commission regarding this matter going forward. Following questions and answers, discussion and an opportunity for public comment the Commission took the following action:

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 - 0 in favor, to evaluate expanding research projects considered for Commission funding based on recommendations from the Commission’s TACs and POCs.

Following the vote of support, the Chair requested staff convene each of the TACs and POCs at an appropriate time in their schedules, and add a discussion of possible research topics to their next agendas. The Chair will convene a meeting of TAC chairs to discuss the TACs’ and POCs’ recommendations prior to submittal of a recommendation to the Commission.

VI. GLITCH MODIFICATION CONSIDERATION PROCESSES, 2013 FLORIDA BUILDING CODE TO BE ADOPTED BY REFERENCE IN RULE 61G20-1.001, F.A.C.

Jeff Blair reviewed the proposed TAC Glitch Review Process with members and answered questions. Following questions and answers, and an opportunity for public comment and Commission discussion, the Commission took the following action:

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 - 0 in favor, to adopt the TAC Glitch Review Process as posted/presented.

Jeff Blair reviewed the proposed Commission Glitch Review Process with members and answered questions. Following questions and answers, and an opportunity for public comment and Commission discussion, the Commission took the following action:

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 - 0 in favor, to adopt the Commission Glitch Review Process as posted/presented.

Mo Madani, DBPR Code Technical Manager, reviewed a proposed 2013 Code Update development process schedule with members and answered questions. Following questions and answers, and an opportunity for public comment and Commission discussion, the Commission took the following action:

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 - 0 in favor, to approve the revised Workplan schedule for the 2013 Code Update process as presented.

(Included as Attachment 5—Glitch Process Workplan Schedule)

(Included as Attachment 8—TAC Glitch Review Process)

(Included as Attachment 9—Commission Glitch Review Process)

VII. CONSIDERATION OF ACCESSIBILITY WAIVER APPLICATIONS

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

(Included as Attachment 6—Accessibility Waiver Summary Report)

VIII. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR PRODUCT AND ENTITY APPROVAL

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

(Included as Attachment 11—Product and Entity Approval Report)

IX. CONSIDER APPLICATIONS FOR ACCREDITOR AND COURSE APPROVAL

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

Commission Actions:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to approve advanced course #593.0.

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to approve advanced course #594.0.

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to approve advanced course #584.0.

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to approve advanced course #567.0.

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to approve advanced course #564.0.

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to approve advanced course #575.0.

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to approve advanced course #588.0.

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to approve advanced course #583.0.

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to approve advanced course #572.0.

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to approve advanced course #570.0.

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to approve the following administratively approved updated advanced courses on a consent agenda: #421.3.

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to defer action on self-affirmed advanced course #317.1.

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

X. CONSIDERATION OF LEGAL ISSUES

Legal Report

Petitions For Declaratory Statements

Following are the actions taken by the Commission on petitions for declaratory statements.

DS2013-028 by Encoders, Inc.

MOTION—The Commission voted 16 – 0 in favor, to approve the Energy TAC's recommendation on the petition.

DS2013-029 by Innovative Insulation, Inc.

MOTION—The Commission voted 16 – 0 in favor, to approve the Product Approval POC's recommendation on the petition.

DS2013-031 by Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals

MOTION—The Commission voted 11 – 5 in favor, to defer action on the petition and refer the petition for review by a joint meeting of the Fire and the Code Administration TACs.

DS2013-032 by Allen Gezelman

Petition was withdrawn by the petitioner.

DS2013-036 by Jack Glenn of the FHBA

MOTION—The Commission voted 16 – 0 in favor, to approve the Energy and Mechanical TACs' recommendations on the petition.

XI. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chairman Browdy requested TAC and POC chairs confine their reports to a brief summary of any key recommendations, emphasizing any issues requiring an action from the Commission. The Chair requested if the TAC/POC requires Commission action, to frame the needed action in the form of a proposed motion. This will ensure that the Commission understands exactly what the TAC/POC's are recommending, and the subsequent action requested of the Commission. The Chair explained that the complete reports/minutes will be linked to the committees' subsequent agendas for approval by the respective committees. Committee reports are available at the following URL (linked to Commission's June 11, 2013 Agenda):

http://www.floridabuilding.org/fbc/commission/FBC_0613/index.htm

Accessibility TAC

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

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to accept the TAC's report (May 6, 2013).

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

Building Code System Uniform Implementation Evaluation Workgroup

Jeff Blair, Facilitator, presented the Workgroup's report and any recommendations

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to accept the Workgroup's final report (April 8, 2013).

(See Project Webpage for Report: <http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/BCSUIEWG.html>)

Code Administration TAC

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

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to accept the TAC's report (May 31, 2013).

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

Education POC

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

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to accept the POC's reports (June 3, 2013).

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

Energy TAC

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

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to accept the TAC's report (June 4, 2013).

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

Mechanical TAC

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

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to accept the TAC's report (June 4, 2013).

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

Product Approval POC

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

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to accept the POC's report (May 30, 2013).

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

Roofing TAC

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

Commission Actions:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to accept the TAC's report (May 23, 2013).

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

XII. COMMISSION'S 2012-2013 ANNUAL REPORT

Chairman Browdy reminded Commissioners that from this year going forward the Commission's Annual Report will be submitted at the end of June to correspond with the fiscal year and to provide sufficient time for legislative issues to be vetted through the Department's review process. The Chair explained that at the April meeting the Commission approved the Summary of Issues and Recommendations for inclusion in the Commission 2012-2013 Annual Report. At the June meeting the Commission will consider approving the Draft Commission 2012-2013 Annual Report, and the plan as always, with the Commission's support and approval, is for the Chair to review and approve the final draft of the Annual Report, ensure completeness and accuracy, and approve the Report for submittal to the Legislature and Governor.

Jeff Blair reviewed the Report with Commissioners, and following questions and answers, and an opportunity for public comment and Commission discussion, the Commission took the following action:

Commission Action:

MOTION—The Commission voted unanimously, 16 – 0 in favor, to adopt the Commission's 2012 – 2013 Annual Report as posted/presented, including incorporating any Commission actions taken during the June meeting, and to charge the Chair with reviewing and approving the Final Report prior to submittal to the Legislature and Governor.

OTHER COMMISSION ACTION

There were no additional Commission actions.

XIII. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

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

Public Comments:

There was no additional public comment offered.

XIV. COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENT AND ISSUES

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

Commission Member Comments:

- Gross: reported that AIA, FES, and BOAF submitted a white paper on paperless permitting submittals. Jeff reported that although there is support for this initiative in concept, there is inconsistency in implementation across the various jurisdictions, with some jurisdictions working on implementation and others not. Jeff requested that this issue be discussed by the Commission at a future meeting.
- Browdy: noted he will ask staff to schedule the issue as an agenda item at an appropriate meeting after completion of the Glitch process.
- Stone: expressed the perspective that Florida is not well represented at the I-Codes process and the Commission should encourage building departments to allow staff to participate in the process.
- Boyer: the ICC is implementing a CDP Access system allowing members' to participate and vote on-line for code modifications. Bob requested that the Chair send another letter on behalf of the Commission encouraging building departments to allow their staff to participate in code development initiatives.

XV. NEXT COMMISSION MEETING OVERVIEW AND ISSUES

The August 22 - 23, 2013 Commission meeting in Boca Raton, Florida will initiate the new Thursday – Friday meeting format, and will focus on routine Commission procedural matters including Chair’s issues and recommendations, updates of the Workplan, product and entity approvals, applications for accreditor and course approvals, petitions for declaratory statements, accessibility waivers, and recommendations from the Commission’s various committees. In addition, the Commission will consider and decide on TACs’ recommendations regarding proposed Glitch amendments to the 2013 Code Update.

STAFF ASSIGNMENTS FROM JUNE 2013 MEETING

- Schedule TAC meetings to discuss topical research needs.
- Schedule Commission discussion regarding paperless permitting.
- Letter encouraging building departments to support staff participation in code development.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chair thanked Commission members and the public for their attendance and participation, and adjourned the meeting at 11:11 AM on Tuesday, June 11, 2013 following an unanimous vote of 16 – 0 in favor of adjournment.

ATTACHMENT 1
FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS

JUNE 11, 2013—DAYTONA BEACH, FLORIDA

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

Number of Respondents: x of x Commissioners present completed meeting evaluations.

1. OVERALL MEETING ASSESSMENT.

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

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

- 9.7 ___ Chairs Issues and Recommendations.
- 9.5 ___ Direction for Commission Funded Research Discussion.
- 9.4 ___ TAC and FBC Glitch Amendment Review Processes.
- 9.7 ___ Accessibility Waiver Applications.
- 9.6 ___ Approvals and Revocations of Products and Product Approval Entities.
- 9.7 ___ Applications for Accreditor and Course Approvals.
- 9.7 ___ Legal Issues Including Requests for Declaratory Statements.
- 9.7 ___ TAC and POC Reports and Recommendations.
- 9.6 ___ Workgroup, Ad Hoc, and/or Committee Reports and Recommendations.
- 9.7 ___ Commission's 2012-2013 Annual Report Review and Approval.

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

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

4. MEMBERS LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE MEETING.

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

5. HOW WELL THE NEXT STEPS WERE COMMUNICATED.

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

6. WHAT MEMBERS LIKED BEST ABOUT THE MEETING.

- Length.
- Short meetings.
- Agenda.

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

- Meeting was fine.
- Sound system and facility were problematic.
- Quieter group next door.
- The meeting in the room next to the Commission meeting was very loud, and I had difficulty hearing all the comments.

8. OTHER GENERAL COMMENTS.

- Good job Jeff and Rick.
- I agree with Jack Glenn's comment on the problems with the upcoming Structural TAC meeting.
- Can we meet in a more central location, like Orlando?

COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC AGENDA ITEMS

None were offered.

PUBLIC-MEETING EVALUATION AND COMMENT RESULTS

None were completed.

ATTACHMENT 2
KEY TO COMMON ACRONYMS

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

ATTACHMENT 3

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION HISTORY AND OVERVIEW

HISTORY

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

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

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

OVERVIEW

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

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

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

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

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

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

ATTACHMENT 4
JUNE 11, 2013 MEETING AGENDA

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
JUNE 11, 2013
HILTON DAYTONA BEACH OCEANFRONT RESORT
100 NORTH ATLANTIC AVENUE, DAYTONA BEACH, FL 32118

OBJECTIVES

- To Approve Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda and Minutes)
- To Consider/Decide on Chair's Discussion Issues/Recommendations.
- To Consider/ Provide Direction for Commission Funded Research
- To Consider/Approve Processes for Review of Glitch Modifications for the 2013 Code
- 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 Technical Advisory Committees Reports/Recommendations.
- To Consider/Decide on POCs Reports/Recommendations: Education and Product Approval Program Oversight Committee (POCs).
- To Consider/Approve Commission's 2012-2013 Annual Report
- To Hear Public Comment
- To Identify Needed Next Steps, Assignments, and Agenda Items For Next Meeting

MEETING AGENDA—TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 2013

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

8:30	1.)	Welcome and Opening, Roll Call
	2.)	Review and Approval of Meeting Agenda
	3.)	Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. April 9 Meeting (Meeting Minutes and Facilitator's Summary Report) b. April 22 Telephone Conference c. April 29 Telephone Conference d. May 13 Telephone Conference e. May 14 Telephone Conference (Meeting Minutes and Facilitator's Summary Report)
	4.)	Chair's Discussion Issues:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Appointments b. Commissioners with expired terms c. Commission Alumnus Appreciation

	5.)	Commission Funded Research Photos of Commissioner Schock's visit to UF Research Facility
	6.)	Glitch Modification Consideration Processes, 2013 Florida Building Code to be adopted by reference in Rule 61G20-1.001, F.A.C.
		a. Technical Advisory Committee Review Processes b. Commission Review c. Update to the 2013 Code Development Plan
	7.)	Accessibility Waiver Applications:
		a. 5th Avenue Marina, 341 N. W. South River Drive, Miami b. Holiday Surf and Racquet Club, 510 Gulfshore Drive, Destin c. John King, 919 4th Street, Miami Beach d. 7-Eleven #1032305, 860 Ocean Drive, Miami Beach e. Corry Village Building, 286 Village Circle, Gainesville f. Nancy Dance Studio, Inc., 1521 Penman Road, Jacksonville Beach g. Off the Wall Trampoline Fun Center, 4959 Coconut Creek Parkway, Coconut Creek
	8.)	Applications for Product and Entity Approval
	9.)	Applications for Course and Accreditor Approval
	10.)	Petitions for Declaratory Statement:
		a. DS2013-028 by Encoders, Inc. b. DS2013-029 by Innovative Insulation, Inc. c. DS2013-031 by Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals d. DS 2013-032 by Allen Gezelman (withdrawn) e. DS2013-036 by Jack Glenn of the FHBA
	11.)	Committee Reports:
		a. Accessibility Technical Advisory Council b. Building Code System Uniform Implementation Evaluation Workgroup (Approve final written report) c. Code Administration Technical Advisory Committee d. Education Program Oversight Committee e. Energy Technical Advisory Committee f. Mechanical Technical Advisory Committee g. Product Approval Program Oversight Committee

		h. Roofing Technical Advisory Committee
	12.)	2012-2013 Annual Report
	13.)	Public Comment
	14.)	Commission Comment
	15.)	<i>Adjourn</i>

ATTACHMENT 5
COMMISSION'S UPDATED MEETING SCHEDULE AND WORKPLAN

(UPDATED JUNE 11, 2013)

COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE

2012	LOCATION	RATE
January 30 - 31	St. Pete Beach (Tradewinds: 1.727.367.6461)	\$139
April 2 - 3	Gainesville (UF Hilton: 1.352.371.3600)	\$119
June 11 - 12	Daytona Beach (Daytona Hilton Hotel: 1.386.947.8061)	\$ 99
August 6 - 7	Tampa (Embassy Suites, USF: 1.813.977.7066)	\$ 93
October 8 - 9	Daytona Beach (Daytona Hilton Hotel: 1.386.947.8061)	\$ 99
December 3 - 4	Gainesville (UF Hilton: 1.352.371.3600)	\$119

2013	LOCATION	RATE
February 4 – 5, 2013	St. Pete Beach (Tradewinds: 1.727.367.6461)	\$145
April 8 – 9, 2013	Saint Augustine (World Golf Village: 1.904.940.8000) 500 South Legacy Trail; St. Augustine, Florida 32092	\$149
June 10 – 11, 2013	Daytona Beach (Hilton Daytona Beach: 1.386.947.8061)	\$ 99
August 22 - 23, 2013	Boca Raton (Marriott Boca Raton at Boca Center)	
October 17 – 18, 2013	Kissimmee (Gaylord Palms)	
December 12–13, 2013	St. Pete Beach (Tradewinds Islands)	

2014	LOCATION	RATE
February 20 - 21, 2014	St. Augustine (World Golf Village)	
April 16 – 17, 2014	Kissimmee (Gaylord Palms)	
June 19 - 20, 2014	Daytona Beach (Hilton Daytona Beach)	
August		
October		
December		

2013 FBC CODE UPDATE DEVELOPMENT TASKS

12. 2013 UPDATE TO THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE—COMBINE PRIMARY UPDATE AND GLITCH REVISIONS IN A SINGLE RULE PROCEEDING	
TASK	SCHEDULE
<i>Primary Code Development Phase:</i>	
2011 NEC published and available to the public;	01/2011
2012 International Codes published and available to the public;	09/2011
Commission selects 2012 I Codes and 2011 NEC as foundation for 2013 FBC (<i>Note: The 6 month delay between I Codes available to public and Commission selection as base for the next Florida Building Code edition was removed from law in 2010</i>)	12/6/2011
Staff evaluates Florida amendments resulting from direction of the Legislature and Commission initiatives to propose for inclusion in the 2013 FBC	1/2012 – 6/2012
Period for public to propose modifications to the 2012 I Codes	7/1/2012 – 8/1/2012
TACs consider proposed modifications	10/9-11/2012
Commission considers TAC recommendations	2/4-5/2013
Draft 2013 (Florida Supplement plus I Codes) posted online	3/1/2013
<i>Glitch Correction Phase:</i>	
Period to propose glitch modifications to draft 2013 FBC	4/1/2013 – 5/1/2013
Post Tracking/Detail reports online	6/24/2013
TACs consider proposed glitch modifications and develop public comment via conference call/Webinars	6/12-17/2013
Commission considers proposed glitch mods and TAC comments (Rule Development Workshop)	8/22-23/2013
Draft 2013 FBC posted online	10/1/2013
Provide Supplements to ICC for integration into the 2012 I-Code	
Final Rule Hearing on 2013 FBC/Commission approves final version of Code	12/12-13/2013
Rule Submitted to Secretary of State and Supplement posted online – subject to addressing all JAPC’s concerns	TBD
Printed Code available - subject to negotiation with ICC	TBD
2013 FBC (5th edition) effective date (6 – months after publication)	TBD
Sub-Tasks	
a. Amend BCIS Forms and Commission Rule for Code Modification Proposals	
Authorize initiation of rule amendment	12/6/11
Rule development workshop	1/31/12
b. Review 2012 I Codes and 2012 NFPA 1 and NFPA 101 for Conflicts	
Joint Fire TAC/Fire Code Advisory Council review and recommendations	
Glitch proposals considered during “ <i>Glitch Correction Phase</i> ”	
553.73(7)(e) A rule updating the Florida Building Code in accordance with this subsection shall take effect <u>no sooner than 6 months</u> after publication of the updated code. Any amendment to the Florida Building Code which is adopted upon a finding by the commission that the amendment is necessary to protect the public from immediate threat of harm takes effect immediately.	

ATTACHMENT 6
ACCESSIBILITY WAIVER SUMMARY

WAIVERS FROM ACCESSIBILITY CODE REQUIREMENTS—JUNE 11, 2013

The Council met via webinar on June 3, 2013 at 2:00 p.m.

The Council reviewed and made recommendations for disposition of waivers for the following projects. There was not a quorum of the Council so the individual members provided recommendations.

The Commission took the following actions regarding waivers.

A. 5th Avenue Marina, 341 N. W. South River Drive, Miami

Issue: Vertical accessibility to the loft area of a marina warehouse undergoing an alteration.

Analysis: The applicant is requesting a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to a new, 1,600 square foot loft in an existing 5,000 square foot warehouse that has historically been used for marine industrial purposes. The owner plans to divide the building into two commercial studios and construct the new loft. There is an existing lift to convey patrons to the first floor level and quotes from \$88,867 to \$122,000 for elevators were provided. The overall construction cost of the project is estimated to be \$202,252; however, the building official stated that the building underwent a \$1,250,000 alteration during the previous three years, increasing the applicable cost for determining disproportionate cost to be \$1,454,252.

Recommendation: *1 – Deny, 2 – Defer for more information and to allow Applicant to participate*

COMMISSION ACTION: **Defer**

B. Holiday Surf and Racquet Club, 510 Gulfshore Drive, Destin

Issue: Design criteria for dune walkover.

Analysis: The applicant is requesting a waiver from providing a ramped dune walkover system in lieu of a stepped dune walkover costing \$40,534. According to the applicant, a ramped system would increase the cost of construction an additional \$79,600. The structure is being constructed as a result of a beach renourishment project adjacent to the property which is a resort condominium licensed under Chapter 509, F. S. It is also subject to regulation by the Department of Environmental Regulation (DEP), since the system will be installed seaward of the Coastal Construction Control Line. DEP will not permit a ramped system to be constructed because the size of the structure would create more impervious materials, subject to storm conditions, on the beach. The applicant plans to provide a beach wheelchair to maneuver on the sand after leaving the structure. The local building official does not consider the stepped system accessible, and referred the applicant to the Commission for a waiver. There are no Florida-specific requirements in the Accessibility Code that can be waived.

Recommendation: 3 – *Deny*
COMMISSION ACTION: Deny

C. John King, 919 4th Street, Miami Beach

Issue: Vertical accessibility to all levels in a historic building.

Analysis: The applicant is requesting a waiver from providing a vertical lift at the main entrance to the building and installing a ramp at the side entrance. Installing the lift would change the façade of the historic structure, which is not permitted. The request also entails a request from providing 2 platform lifts in the interior to create a accessible path of travel throughout the structure. The building is undergoing a \$159,049 interior alteration and an estimate of \$14,700 was submitted for the cost of two lifts with an additional \$2,400 cost of installation. Toilet facilities on an accessible route are also planned for the project.

Recommendation: 3 – *Grant for historic nature*
COMMISSION ACTION: Grant

D. 7-Eleven #1032305, 860 Ocean Drive, Miami Beach

Issue: Vertical accessibility to the basement area of a hotel building.

Analysis: The applicant is requesting a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to the basement area containing a convenience store in a four story hotel. The building is recognized by the National Register of Historic places, and the applicant only relates to the 1,961 square foot tenant space previously occupied by a convenience store and will house a 7-Eleven store when the alteration is complete. The project will cost \$256,826 to make the proposed changes. The building's façade cannot be altered because it would damage the historic significance of the structure and the existing building's structural design and load bearing structural frame member locations prohibit modifications due to technical infeasibility. Cost estimates of \$7,820 for a ramp and \$22,770 were submitted.

Recommendation: : 3 – *Grant for historic nature and technical infeasibility*
COMMISSION ACTION: Grant

E. Corry Village Building, 286 Village Circle, Gainesville

Issue: Vertical accessibility to the second floor of 10 student apartment buildings.

Analysis: The applicant is requesting a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to the second floor of a 16 unit apartment building that is undergoing a \$1,950,000 alteration as a component of an overall alteration of 10 buildings. There are 8 one bedroom and 8 two bedroom units divided equally between the two floors. When the project is completed, each building will have a fully accessible unit on the accessible first floor. There are no common areas provided on the second floor. Estimates of \$137,233 and \$122,517 were submitted as the cost to provide vertical accessibility to all levels.

Recommendation: 3 – *Grant for unreasonable and economic hardship*

COMMISSION ACTION: Grant

F. Nancy Dance Studio, Inc., 1521 Penman Road, Jacksonville Beach

Issue: Vertical accessibility to a mezzanine in a dance studio.

Analysis: The applicant is requesting waiver from providing vertical accessibility to a 2,700 square foot mezzanine in a dance studio undergoing a \$219,000 alteration. The current use is retail/storage on the first level, with additional storage on the mezzanine. The applicant proposes to modify the building to provide two large studios on the first floor, with common area and storage and a dance studio and additional common area and storage on the mezzanine. According to the applicant, all services and facilities available are provided on the accessible first floor with duplications on the mezzanine. Estimates of \$86,400 and \$83,000 were submitted to substantiate costs of installing a lift to the area

Recommendation: 3 – *Grant for unreasonable and economic hardship*

COMMISSION ACTION: Grant

G. Off the Wall Trampoline Fun Center, 4959 Coconut Creek Parkway, Coconut Creek

Issue: Vertical accessibility to the trampoline and lazer tag areas of a family entertainment facility.

Analysis: The applicant is requesting a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to the elevated trampoline area in an entertainment facility undergoing a \$27,192 alteration. According to the equipment manufacturer, the trampolines are not designed for the use of persons with disabilities. According to the applicant, patrons may observe people in the jump area from the accessible, ground level seating area. The lazer tag section of the project is existing and is not undergoing an alteration. The applicant further contends that allowing people having less than full physical control would constitute a hardship, resulting in potential liability.

Recommendation: 3 – *Defer for more information and allow Applicant to participate*

COMMISSION ACTION: Defer

ATTACHMENT 7
LEGAL REPORT

DECLARATORY STATEMENTS

PETITIONS FOR DECLARATORY STATEMENTS—JUNE 11, 2013

a.) DS2013-028 by Encoders, Inc.

Question: To the question, “Does the code require that all lighting in sleeping units be switchable by master switch at the entry door or not (bathrooms being excluded)?”

Answer: NO, Section 505.2.1.3, 3, of the Florida Building Code, Energy Conservation, and its base documents intended to require only the permanently installed luminaires and switched receptacles to be controlled by a master switch. Other lighting such as lamps used in general lighting or task lighting are not required to be controlled by a master switch if they are not hard wired or plugged into a switched receptacle.

COMMISSION ACTION: The Commission voted unanimously, 16-0 in favor, to adopt the Energy TACs’ recommendation on the petition.

b.) DS2013-029 by Innovative Insulation, Inc.

Question: Do radiant barrier and reflective insulations products fall under the scope of the Florida Rule 61G20-3 and therefore require approval from the Florida Building Commission to be sold for construction in your state?

Answer: No, based on the rules 61G20-3.001(2) Scope and 61G20-3.002 Definitions, “Radiant Barrier and Reflective Insulation” is not a structural product thus does not fall within the scope of the State Product Approval rule. However, the product in question is subject to approval by the local authority having jurisdiction.

COMMISSION ACTION: The Commission voted unanimously, 16-0 in favor, to adopt the Product Approval POCs’ recommendation on the petition.

c.) DS2013-031 by Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals

Question1a: By adding these elements (sinks, electrical outlets, etc.) does that mean that the status of the exemption used to construct the Chickee without a building permit is null and void?

Answer: YES, adding the elements (sinks, electrical outlets, etc.) to the “Chickee” in question would mean that the “Chickee” as a structure is no longer in compliance with the literal requirements of section 102.2(h) of the 2010 FBC, Building and therefore would be no longer exempted from compliance of the FBC.

Question 1b: If the answer to question “a” is yes, does that mean that the Chickee structure must get a building permit and comply with the current building codes?

The answer is YES, the “chickee” in question would be required to demonstrate compliance with the current FBC as applicable.

Question 2: Does the fact of whether the utility services; electric; plumbing; propane or natural gas appliances are attached or not attached to any part of the structure/Chickee change the interpretation of Question 1?

Answer: NO, the definition of the term “chickee” does not differentiate or provide for allowance to whether the utility services, (electric, plumbing, propane or natural gas appliances) are attached or not attached to any part of the structure/chickee.

COMMISSION ACTION: The Commission voted, 11-5 in favor, to defer action on the petition and refer the petition for review by a Fire TAC the Code Administration TAC joint meeting.

The petitioner agreed to waive the 90-day review requirement.

d.) DS2013-032 by Allen Gezelman

Petition was withdrawn by the petitioner.

e.) DS2013-036 by Jack Glenn of the FHBA

Question: “If the installation of gaskets as required in the FBC-EC has the effect of invalidating the listing of the factory-built fireplaces should the requirement of FFBC-M for tight fitting doors be the correct action during inspection?”

Answer: YES, factory-built fireplaces listed and labeled in accordance with UL 127 shall be configured in accordance with their listing and need not meet the more general requirement for gasketed doors for new fireplaces in Section 402.4.3 of the Florida Building Code, Energy Conservation so as to not void their approval and/or cause an unsafe condition.

COMMISSION ACTION: The Commission voted unanimously, 16-0 in favor, to adopt the Energy and Mechanical TACs’ recommendation on the petition.

ATTACHMENT 8
TAC GLITCH REVIEW PROCESS
(ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY JUNE 11, 2013)

TAC CONSIDERATION PROCESS FOR REVIEWING PROPOSED GLITCH AMENDMENTS TO THE 2013 FLORIDA BUILDING CODE

GLITCH AMENDMENT CRITERIA—SECTION 553.73(8) F.S.

In order for a proposed code amendment to be accepted as a Glitch amendment, it must fall within one of the following criteria:

- (a.) Conflicts within the updated code;
- (b.) Conflicts between the updated code and the Florida Fire Prevention Code adopted pursuant to chapter 633;
- (c.) Unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the model code;
- (d.) Equivalency of standards;
- (e.) Changes to or inconsistencies with federal or state law; or
- (f.) Adoption of an updated edition of the National Electrical Code if the Commission finds that delay of implementing the updated edition causes undue hardship to stakeholders or otherwise threatens the public health, safety, and welfare.
- In addition, the TAC (Commission) may not approve an amendment that diminishes criteria related to wind resistance or prevention of water intrusion.

The Proponent of a proposed Glitch amendment was required to check which of the Glitch criteria (a. – f. above) their proposed amendment complied with when they submitted the amendment, and the specific glitch criteria is noted on the relevant tracking chart.

OVERVIEW OF TAC DECISION SEQUENCE

The TAC will first determine whether the amendment meets the Glitch criteria:

Glitch Motion: proposed amendment meets the Glitch criteria as indicated by the Proponent (either for approval or for a negative roll call).

No Vote On Glitch Criteria: If the vote is less than 75% in favor, then the recommendation to the Commission is the amendment does not meet Glitch criteria and the TAC recommends **No Affirmative Recommendation** (NAR).

Yes Vote On Glitch Criteria: If the vote meets the 75% in favor threshold for approval then it is deemed to meet the required Glitch criteria. The TAC will subsequently vote on the proposed code text to correct the Glitch.

Motion: to approve proposed Glitch amendment code text, either: **As Submitted** (AS) if there are no TAC revisions; or if an amendment to the code text is made by the TAC: **As Amended** (AM). If less than 75% are in favor of the proposed code text to correct the glitch, then the recommendation is **No Affirmative Recommendation** (NAR).

The TAC should avoid substantive amendments to proposed Glitch amendment code text and focus on editorial corrections only. If an amendment requires substantive revisions for TAC support, the TAC should recommend No Affirmative Recommendation (NAR).

TAC GLITCH AMENDMENT REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION PROCESS

LOGISTICS

- Facilitator (or TAC chair if there is not a 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.
- Comments will be limited to a maximum of three-minutes (3) per person.
- 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 (other than to state agreement).

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Facilitator will introduce each proposed Glitch amendment in turn by technical Code area.
- Public comment opportunity provided.
- Proponents speak first followed by opponents. Commenters should comment on whether the amendment meets Glitch criteria and on the proposed Glitch fix code text. The proponent (submitter) of the amendment will be offered one brief counterpoint opportunity to address only new points not addressed during their initial comment opportunity.

TAC CONSIDERATION

- Clarifying questions by TAC members only.
- Staff, proponent, or specified commenter will respond to TAC Members' questions through approval of the TAC chair.
- TAC will first vote whether amendment complies with Glitch criteria.
- Once a motion is on the floor, discussion is limited to TAC members except as allowed by the Chair/Facilitator.
- If the TAC votes that the amendment meets Glitch criteria, they will subsequently vote on the proposed code text to correct the Glitch. This will provide the Commission with a recommendation to approve the proposed Glitch amendment: **As Submitted (AS)**, **As Amended (AM)**, or **No Affirmative Recommendation (NAR)**.
- If the TAC votes that the amendment does not meet Glitch criteria, the recommendation to the Commission will be: proposed amendment does not meet Glitch criteria, TAC recommends No Affirmative Recommendation (NAR).
- Motions to deny are not allowed by Commission Rules. Negative roll calls are used to recommend denial of an amendment.
- All proposed Glitch amendments will be voted on individually.
- Motions require a 75% favorable vote for approval; those with less than a 75% favorable vote are deemed to be: **No Affirmative Recommendation (denied)**.

ORGANIZATION OF TAC RECOMMENDATIONS AND REQUEST FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION OF TAC RECOMMENDATIONS

ORGANIZATION OF TAC RECOMMENDATIONS ON GLITCH AMENDMENTS

For each technical code area (Accessibility, Code Administration, Electrical, Energy, Fire, Mechanical, Plumbing, Roofing, Special Occupancy, Structural, and Swimming Pool), TAC recommendations on proposed Glitch amendments will be organized on three consent agendas per TAC, as follows:

Consent Agenda 1: TAC recommends amendments meet Glitch criteria, and TAC recommends approval of Glitch amendments **As Submitted** (AS).

Consent Agenda 2: TAC recommends amendments meet Glitch criteria, and TAC recommends approval of Glitch amendments **As Modified** (AM) by the TAC.

Consent Agenda 3: TAC recommends amendments do not meet Glitch criteria, and TAC recommends **No Affirmative Recommendation** (NAR).

If any amendments are deemed to meet the Glitch criteria and there is no affirmative recommendation on the code text proposed to correct the glitch, they will be considered individually by the Commission.

PULLING AMENDMENTS FROM THE CONSENT AGENDAS OF TAC RECOMMENDATIONS

Once the TAC recommendations on proposed Glitch amendments are posted to the BCIS the public will have three weeks to submit their requests for amendments to be pulled off of the consent agendas through the BCIS. DBPR staff will work with the respective TAC chairs to develop recommendations regarding which amendments to initially pull from the consent agendas of TAC recommendations. All Commission members retain the right to pull any amendment they wish to consider individually during the Commission's consideration of Glitch amendment conducted at the August 22-23, 2013 Commission meeting. Pulling amendments off of the consent agendas in advance will allow staff to organize the tracking charts as accurately as possible and expedite the Commission's Glitch review process during the August meeting.

Amendments the TAC chairs recommend pulling for individual consideration based on public comment submitted through the BCIS will be on separate tracking charts for each code area and will be considered individually. Commissioners may pull any amendments they wish from the consent agendas of TAC recommendations during the Commission's consideration of Glitch amendments at the August 22-23, 2013 Commission meeting.

ATTACHMENT 9
COMMISSION GLITCH REVIEW PROCESS
(ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY JUNE 11, 2013)

COMMISSION 2013 GLITCH AMENDMENT REVIEW PROCESS—AUGUST 2013

ORGANIZATION OF TAC RECOMMENDATIONS ON GLITCH AMENDMENTS

For each technical code area (Accessibility, Code Administration, Electrical, Energy, Fire, Mechanical, Plumbing, Roofing, Special Occupancy, Structural, and Swimming Pool), TAC recommendations on proposed Glitch amendments will be organized on three consent agendas per TAC, as follows:

Consent Agenda 1: TAC recommends amendments meet Glitch criteria, and TAC recommends approval of Glitch amendments **As Submitted** (AS).

Consent Agenda 2: TAC recommends amendments meet Glitch criteria, and TAC recommends approval of Glitch amendments **As Modified** (AM) by the TAC.

Consent Agenda 3: TAC recommends amendments do not meet Glitch criteria, and TAC recommends **No Affirmative Recommendation** (NAR); or TAC recommends amendments meet Glitch criteria, and TAC recommends **No Affirmative Recommendation** (NAR) on the code text fix.

Amendments TAC chairs recommended pulling for individual consideration based on public comment submitted through the BCIS will be on separate tracking charts for each code area and will be considered individually. Commissioners may pull any amendments they wish from the consent agendas of TAC recommendations during the Commission's consideration of Glitch amendments at the August 22-23, 2013 Commission meeting.

PULLING AMENDMENTS FROM THE CONSENT AGENDAS OF TAC RECOMMENDATIONS

Once the TAC recommendations on proposed Glitch amendments are posted to the BCIS the public will have three weeks to submit their requests for amendments to be pulled off of the consent agendas through the BCIS. DBPR staff will work with the respective TAC chairs to develop recommendations regarding which amendments to initially pull from the consent agendas of TAC recommendations. All Commission members retain the right to pull any amendment they wish to consider individually during the Commission's consideration of Glitch amendment conducted at the August 22-23, 2013 Commission meeting. Pulling amendments off of the consent agendas in advance will allow staff to organize the tracking charts as accurately as possible and expedite the Commission's Glitch review process during the August meeting.

COMMISSION GLITCH AMENDMENT REVIEW PROCESS

In order for a proposed code change to be accepted as a Glitch change, it must meet each of the following criteria:

- (1) The proposed code change falls within the scope of the glitch criteria (listed below a-f).
- (2) The proposed code change has a Florida specific need.
- (3) The impact on small businesses has been considered.

GLITCH CRITERIA—SECTION 553.73(8) F.S.

In order for a proposed code change to be accepted as a Glitch change, it must fall within one of the following criteria:

- (a.) Conflicts within the updated code;
 - (b.) Conflicts between the updated code and the Florida Fire Prevention Code adopted pursuant to chapter 633;
 - (c.) Unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the model code;
 - (d.) Equivalency of standards;
 - (e.) Changes to or inconsistencies with federal or state law; or
 - (f.) Adoption of an updated edition of the National Electrical Code if the Commission finds that delay of implementing the updated edition causes undue hardship to stakeholders or otherwise threatens the public health, safety, and welfare.
- In addition, the Commission may not amend to diminish criteria related to wind resistance or prevention of water intrusion.

GLITCH AMENDMENTS WILL BE ORGANIZED ON THREE CONSENT AGENDAS PER TECHNICAL CODE AREA {Accessibility, Code Administration, Electrical, Energy, Fire, Mechanical, Plumbing, Roofing, Special Occupancy, Structural, and Swimming Pool}:

CONSENT AGENDA 1—QUALIFIES AS A GLITCH AMENDMENT AND APPROVE AS SUBMITTED

Commission will vote that the amendments on the consent agendas **are** Glitch Amendments, and to approve the amendments **As Submitted**.

- Public Comment on the TAC recommendations by technical code area.
- Commission will decide whether to pull any specific proposed Glitch Amendments for individual consideration by technical code area.
- Commission will vote to approve Consent Agenda of TAC recommendations as presented or as amended if any additional amendments are pulled for individual consideration by technical code area.
- Vote is in favor of TAC recommendations regarding the proposed glitch amendments (the package of proposed amendments meets the Glitch criteria and should be approved as submitted).
- Commission will individually discuss and vote on all amendments pulled for individual consideration (meets glitch criteria and code text to correct the glitch).

CONSENT AGENDA 2—QUALIFIES AS A GLITCH AMENDMENT AND APPROVE AS MODIFIED BY THE TAC

Commission will vote that the amendments on the consent agendas **are** Glitch Amendments, and to approve the amendments **As Modified** by the TACs.

- Public Comment on the TAC recommendations by technical code area.
- Commission will decide whether to pull any specific proposed Glitch Amendments for individual consideration by technical code area.
- Commission will vote to approve Consent Agenda of TAC recommendations as presented or as amended if any additional amendments are pulled for individual consideration by technical code area.
- Vote is in favor of TAC recommendations regarding the proposed glitch amendments (the package of proposed amendments meets the Glitch criteria and should be approved as modified by the TAC).
- Commission will individually discuss and vote on all amendments pulled for individual consideration (meets glitch criteria and code text to correct the glitch).

CONSENT AGENDA 3—DOES NOT QUALIFY AS A GLITCH AMENDMENT AND NO AFFIRMATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Commission will vote that the amendments on the consent agendas **are not** Glitch Amendments, and to not approve the amendment.

- Public Comment on the TAC recommendations by technical code area.
- Commission will decide whether to pull any specific proposed Glitch Amendments for individual consideration by technical code area.
- Commission will vote to approve Consent Agenda of TAC recommendations as presented or as amended if any additional amendments are pulled for individual consideration by technical code area.
- Vote is in favor of TAC recommendations regarding the proposed glitch amendments (the package of proposed amendments does not meet the Glitch criteria and should be not be approved (denied)).
- Commission will individually discuss and vote on all amendments pulled for individual consideration (meets glitch criteria and code text to correct the glitch).

GLITCH AMENDMENT REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION PROCESS

- Facilitator will serve as the moderator.
- One person speaks at a time.
- Limit your comment and be concise.
- Do not read lengthy prepared statements; Summarize and submit complete comment text for the record.
- Offer new points or state agreement with previous speakers; Please do not repeat what has been stated.
- The Commission wants to hear all view points, but not repeats of the same views.
- Comments will be limited to a maximum of three-minutes (3) per person.
- Facilitator will assist with process and groundrules.
- Facilitator will introduce **Consent Agenda 1** for those amendments recommended by TACs as: **“Qualifies as Glitch Amendment and Approve As Submitted”** by technical code area.
- Public will be provided an opportunity for comment.
- Commissioners will decide which, if any, amendments to pull for individual consideration.
- Commission will vote to approve Consent Agenda of TAC recommendations as presented or as amended if any additional amendments are pulled for individual consideration by technical code area.
- Facilitator will introduce **Consent Agenda 2** for those amendments recommended by TACs as: **“Qualifies as Glitch Amendment and Approve As Modified”** by technical code area.
- Public will be provided an opportunity for comment.
- Commissioners will decide which, if any, amendments to pull for individual consideration.
- Commission will vote to approve Consent Agenda of TAC recommendations as presented or as amended if any additional amendments are pulled for individual consideration by technical code area.
- Facilitator will introduce **Consent Agenda 3** for those amendments recommended by TACs as: **“Does Not Qualify as Glitch Amendment and No Affirmative Recommendation”** by technical code area.
- Public will be provided an opportunity for comment.
- Commissioners will decide which, if any, amendments to pull for individual consideration.
- Commission will vote to approve Consent Agenda of TAC recommendations as presented or as amended if any additional amendments are pulled for individual consideration by technical code area.

AMENDMENTS PULLED FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSIDERATION

- Commission will consider individually any amendments pulled from the Consent Agendas.
- Facilitator will introduce each amendment.
- Proponents of proposed amendment will speak first.
- Opponents of proposed amendment will follow proponents.
- The proponent (submitter) of the amendment will be offered one brief counterpoint opportunity to address only new points not addressed during their initial comment opportunity.
- Groundrules for commenting apply (see above).
- Clarifying questions by Commission members only.
- Once a motion is on the floor, discussion is limited to Commission members except as allowed by the Chair.
- Motions require a 75% favorable vote for approval; those with less than a 75% favorable vote, are deemed to be: **No Affirmative Recommendation** (denied).

ATTACHMENT 10
COMMISSIONERS RESOLUTIONS OF COMMENDATION

Resolution of Commendation

WHEREAS, the Florida Building Commission was constituted by the Florida Legislature with members appointed by the Governor to develop and maintain the Florida Building Code System; and

WHEREAS, Angel (Niko) Franco was appointed to the Florida Building Commission by Florida Governor Charlie Crist on August 30, 2009 and served continuously until November 23, 2012; and

WHEREAS, Angel (Niko) Franco was appointed to the Code Administration Technical Advisory Committee by Chairman Raul Rodriguez, AIA, on April 7, 2010 and served continuously until November 23, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Florida Building Commission recognizes the critical role Angel (Niko) Franco has played in the development of the Florida Building Code utilizing a stakeholder participatory consensus-building process; and

WHEREAS, Angel (Niko) Franco has always represented the Commission's commitment to fairness, and consensus-building on public policy in a highly visible and professional manner; and

WHEREAS, Angel (Niko) Franco has always demonstrated his personal commitment to integrity, and treated all who interacted with the Commission's processes with respect; now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Florida Building Commission at its public meeting held in Daytona Beach, Florida voted unanimously to express their appreciation and respect for the outstanding leadership, dedication, public service, integrity and commitment to the citizens of Florida demonstrated by Angel (Niko) Franco of the Florida Building Commission.



KEN LAWSON, SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS
AND PROFESSIONAL REGULATION

RICHARD BROWDY, CHAIRMAN,
FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

Resolution of Commendation

WHEREAS, the Florida Building Commission was constituted by the Florida Legislature with members appointed by the Governor to develop and maintain the Florida Building Code System; and

WHEREAS, Mark Turner was appointed to the Florida Building Commission by Florida Governor Charlie Crist on July 1, 2008 and served continuously until June 30, 2012; and

WHEREAS, Mark Turner was appointed as Chair of the Electrical Technical Advisory Committee by Chairman Paul Rodriguez, USA, on October 4, 2011 and served continuously until June 30, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Florida Building Commission recognizes the critical role Mark Turner has played in the development of the Florida Building Code utilizing a stakeholder participatory consensus-building process; and

WHEREAS, Mark Turner has always represented the Commission's commitment to fairness, and consensus-building on public policy in a highly visible and professional manner; and

WHEREAS, Mark Turner has always demonstrated his personal commitment to integrity, and treated all who interacted with the Commission's processes with respect; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Florida Building Commission at its public meeting held in Daytona Beach, Florida voted unanimously to express their appreciation and respect for the outstanding leadership, dedication, public service, integrity and commitment to the citizens of Florida demonstrated by Mark Turner of the Florida Building Commission.



KEN LAWSON, SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS
AND PROFESSIONAL REGULATION

RICHARD S. BROWDY, CHAIRMAN
FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

Resolution of Commendation

WHEREAS the Florida Building Commission was constituted by the Florida Legislature with members appointed by the Governor to develop and maintain the Florida Building Code System; and

WHEREAS Nicholas Nicholson was appointed to the Florida Building Commission by Florida Governor Charles Crist on July 1, 2008 and served continuously until November 3, 2012; and

WHEREAS Nicholas Nicholson was appointed to the Structural Technical Advisory Committee by Chairman Paul Rodriguez, AIA, on August 11, 2009 and served continuously until November 3, 2012; and

WHEREAS Nicholas Nicholson was appointed to the Product Approval Oversight Committee by Chairman Paul Rodriguez, AIA, on April 7, 2010 and served continuously until November 3, 2012; and

WHEREAS the Florida Building Commission recognizes the critical role Nicholas Nicholson has played in the development of the Florida Building Code utilizing a stakeholder participatory consensus-building process; and

WHEREAS Nicholas Nicholson has always represented the Commission's commitment to fairness, and consensus-building on public policy in a highly visible and professional manner; and

WHEREAS Nicholas Nicholson has always demonstrated his personal commitment to integrity, and treated all who interacted with the Commission's processes with respect; and

THEFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Florida Building Commission at its public meeting held in Daytona Beach, Florida voted unanimously to express their appreciation and respect for the outstanding leadership, dedication, public service, integrity and commitment to the citizens of Florida demonstrated by Nicholas Nicholson of the Florida Building Commission.



KEN LAWSON, SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS
AND PROFESSIONAL REGULATION

RICHARD S. BROWNE, CHAIRMAN
FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

Resolution of Commendation

WHEREAS, the Florida Building Commission was constituted by the Florida Legislature with members appointed by the Governor to develop and maintain the Florida Building Code System; and

WHEREAS, Scott Mollen was appointed to the Florida Building Commission by Florida Governor Charlie Crist on July 4, 2008 and served continuously until November 27, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Scott Mollen was appointed to the Mechanical Technical Advisory Committee by Chairman Paul Rodriguez, CMAA, on October 14, 2008 and served continuously until November 27, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the Florida Building Commission recognizes the critical role Scott Mollen has played in the development of the Florida Building Code utilizing a stakeholder participatory consensus-building process; and

WHEREAS, Scott Mollen has always represented the Commission's commitment to fairness, and consensus-building on public policy in a highly visible and professional manner; and

WHEREAS, Scott Mollen has always demonstrated his personal commitment to integrity and treated all who interacted with the Commission's processes with respect; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Florida Building Commission at its public meeting held in Daytona Beach, Florida voted unanimously to express their appreciation and respect for the outstanding leadership, dedication, public service, integrity and commitment to the citizens of Florida demonstrated by Scott Mollen of the Florida Building Commission.



KEN LAWSON, SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS
AND PROFESSIONAL REGULATION

RICHARD S. BROWDY, CHAIRMAN
FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

Resolution of Commendation

WHEREAS, the Florida Building Commission was constituted by the Florida Legislature with members appointed by the Governor to develop and maintain the Florida Building Code System; and

WHEREAS, Christopher Schulte was appointed to the Florida Building Commission by Florida Governor Jeb Bush on May 6, 2008 and served continuously until June 30, 2012; and

WHEREAS, Christopher Schulte was appointed as Chair of the Roofing Technical Advisory Committee by Chairman Raul Rodriguez, AIA, on May 3, 2006 and served continuously until June 30, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Florida Building Commission recognizes the critical role Christopher Schulte has played in the development of the Florida Building Code utilizing a stakeholder participatory consensus-building process; and

WHEREAS, Christopher Schulte has always represented the Commission's commitment to fairness, and consensus-building on public policy in a highly visible and professional manner; and

WHEREAS, Christopher Schulte has always demonstrated his personal commitment to integrity, and treated all who interacted with the Commission's processes with respect; now

IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED, that the Florida Building Commission at its public meeting held in Daytona Beach, Florida voted unanimously to express their appreciation and respect for the outstanding leadership, dedication, public service, integrity and commitment to the citizens of Florida demonstrated by Christopher Schulte of the Florida Building Commission.



KEN LAWSON, SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS
AND PROFESSIONAL REGULATION

RICHARD S. BROWDY, CHAIRMAN
FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

Resolution of Commendation

WHEREAS, the Florida Building Commission was constituted by the Florida Legislature with members appointed by the Governor to develop and maintain the Florida Building Code System; and

WHEREAS, Joseph (Ed) Carson was appointed to the Florida Building Commission by Florida Governor Jeb Bush on June 22, 2000 and served continuously until June 30, 2012; and

WHEREAS, Joseph (Ed) Carson was appointed as Chair of the Florida Product Approval Oversight Committee by Chairman Paul Rodriguez, CA, on July 2, 2002 and served continuously until June 30, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Florida Building Commission has developed the Florida Product Approval System through a participatory consensus-building process under the leadership and guidance of the Florida Product Approval Program Oversight Committee Chair, Joseph (Ed) Carson; and

WHEREAS, the Florida Building Commission recognizes the critical role Joseph (Ed) Carson has played in the development of the Florida Product Approval System utilizing a stakeholder participatory consensus-building process; and

WHEREAS, Joseph (Ed) Carson has always represented the Commission's commitment to fairness, and consensus-building on public policy in a highly visible and professional manner; and

WHEREAS, Joseph (Ed) Carson has always demonstrated his personal commitment to integrity, and treated all who interacted with the Commission's processes with respect; now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Florida Building Commission at its public meeting held in Daytona Beach, Florida voted unanimously to express their appreciation and respect for the outstanding leadership, dedication, public service, integrity and commitment to the citizens of Florida demonstrated by Joseph (Ed) Carson of the Florida Building Commission.



KEN LAWSON, SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS
AND PROFESSIONAL REGULATION

RICHARD S. BROWDY, CHAIRMAN
FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

ATTACHMENT 11

PRODUCT AND ENTITY APPROVAL REPORT

ID	Manufacturer	Category	Subcategory	TBA	POC	FBC	Comments	
Evaluation by Engineer/ Architect Method - FBC Voted Approval								
984-R9	Firestone Building Products Company, LLC.	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
1960-R4	TAMKO Building Products, Inc.	Roofing	Cements-Adhesives-Coatings	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
2144-R5	Sealoflex, Inc.	Roofing	Liquid Applied Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
2324-R5	The Garland Company, Inc.	Roofing	Built up Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
2330-R4	The Garland Company, Inc.	Roofing	Cements-Adhesives-Coatings	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
2534-R6	IB Roof Systems	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
3671-R4	The Garland Company, Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
3723-R4	The Garland Company, Inc.	Structural Components	Roof Deck	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
3915-R9	Soprema, Inc.	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
4133-R4	CENTRIA	Structural	Roof Deck	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

							Approval	
4930-R5	Seaman Corporation	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
5259-R18	POLYGLASS USA	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
5305-R3	U.S. Ply, Inc.	Roofing	Built up Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
5851-R4	YKK AP America	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
5968-R7	Hunter Panels	Roofing	Roofing Insulation	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
6332-R4	3M Company	Roofing	Roof Tile Adhesives	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
6943-R4	GenFlex Roofing Systems, LLC	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
7409-R1	InSpire Roofing Products	Roofing	Roofing Tiles	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
8134-R9	Alside Window Company	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
8637-R5	StormWatch	Shutters	Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
8831-R5	Overhead Door Corporation	Exterior Doors	Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9625-R7	Gentek Building Products	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9627-R7	Revere Building Products	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9779-R6	Soprema, Inc.	Roofing	Cements-Adhesives-	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

			Coatings					
10128-R5	Firestone Building Products Company, LLC.	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
10284-R6	Firestone Building Products Company, LLC.	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
10342-R1	Siplast / Icopal	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10991-R8	Alside Window Company	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11137-R8	Gentek Building Products	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11139-R8	Revere Building Products	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11141-R9	Associated Materials Inc.	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11720-R7	Associated Materials Inc.	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11727-R5	Englert Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12114-R2	Drexel Metals, Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
12144-R3	The Garland Company, Inc.	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
12145-R2	RKW Finland LTD	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12278-R5	Solar Innovations, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12279-R4	Solar Innovations, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

			Assemblies					
12510-R3	PrimeSource Building Products, Inc.	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
13385-R1	CENTRIA	Panel Walls	Siding	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
13407-R2	Solar Innovations, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
13555-R3	Ingersoll-Rand	Exterior Doors	Exterior Door Components	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
13629-R2	Firestone Building Products Company, LLC.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
13655-R1	Storage Structures, Inc.	Structural Components	Roof Deck	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
13671-R2	Commercial Innovations, INC.	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
13727-R2	AFCO Industries, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Exterior Door Components	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
13768-R2	Agri-Metal Supply Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
13780-R2	Amarr Garage Doors	Exterior Doors	Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
13806-R3	Soprema, Inc.	Roofing	Liquid Applied Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
13838-R2	Agri-Metal Supply Inc.	Structural Components	Roof Deck	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
13856-R2	Windoor Incorporated	Windows	Dual Action	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
13889-R2	Tell Manufacturing, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

14083-R4	Carlisle SynTec Incorporated	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
14207-R4	Versico Incorporated	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
14285-R2	Andersen Corporation	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
14294-R1	All Metal Roofing and Siding, Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
14317-R4	Boral Roofing / MonierLifetile	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
14399-R2	Solar Innovations, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
14426-R3	SR Products	Roofing	Built up Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
14907-R2	Fleetwood Windows and Doors	Windows	Awning	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
14918-R2	Silverline Building Products Corp.	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
14937-R2	Silverline Building Products Corp.	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
14964-R1	Silverline Building Products Corp.	Windows	Awning	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15038-R1	Therma-Tru Corporation	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15210-R3	Plastpro Inc. / Nanya Plastics Corp.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
15260-R1	ODL/Western Reflections	Exterior Doors	Exterior Door Components	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15710-R1	YKK AP America	Windows	Mullions	a	a	a	Recommend	Revision

							Approval	
15729-R1	YKK AP America	Windows	Mullions	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15734-R1	ALUCOM, LLC	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15816-R2	Wincore Window Company, LLC	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15817-R1	Wincore Window Company, LLC	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15818-R1	Wincore Window Company, LLC	Windows	Awning	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15819-R1	Wincore Window Company, LLC	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15847-R1	Ply Gem Siding Group	Panel Walls	Soffits	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15861-R1	JELD-WEN	Windows	Mullions	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
15892-R1	Firestone Building Products Company, LLC.	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16039-R2	Duro-Last Roofing Inc.	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16092-R1	Wincore Window Company, LLC	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16105	Tradewood Windows and Doors Inc.	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16107-R2	Clopay Building Products Company	Exterior Doors	Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16150	Alucoil North America LLC	Panel Walls	Siding	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16216-R1	Wincore Window Company, LLC	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

			Assemblies					
16225-R1	Raynor Garage Doors	Exterior Doors	Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16241	Tradewood Windows and Doors Inc.	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16245	Butler Manufacturing Company	Structural Components	Roof Deck	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16259	Window Technology, Inc.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16265	Comfort Line Inc.	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16266	UNION CORRUGATING COMPANY	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16269	InSpire Roofing Products	Roofing	Roofing Tiles	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16272	Loadmaster Systems, Inc.	Structural Components	Roof Deck	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16281	Tradewood Windows and Doors Inc.	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16290	Derbigum Americas, Inc.	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16291	The Folding Sliding Door Company	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16294	Nu-Vue Industries Inc.	Structural Components	Wood Connectors	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16296	Dixie Building Supply Co., Inc.	Structural Components	Roof Deck	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New

16297	Dixie Building Supply Co., Inc.	Structural Components	Structural Wall	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16298	Dixie Building Supply Co., Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16299	KAYCAN LTD	Panel Walls	Siding	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16305	Atlas Roofing Corporation	Roofing	Asphalt Shingles	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16307	Dixie Building Supply Company, Inc	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16310	The Nassal Company	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16311	GAF	Roofing	Roofing Insulation	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16312	YKK AP America	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16313	YKK AP America	Windows	Projected	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16314	YKK AP America	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16315	YKK AP America	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16316	Johns Manville	Roofing	Cements-Adhesives-Coatings	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16317	Florida Metal Roofing Products, Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16318	U.S. Ply, Inc.	Roofing	Cements-Adhesives-Coatings	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16321	C.T.WINDOWS	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend	New

	INC						Approval	
16325	Window Technology, Inc.	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16326	BORANO INC	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16327	Green Span Profiles	Structural Components	Structural Wall	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16329	C.T.WINDOWS INC	Windows	Projected	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16331	BORANO INC	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16334	Geolam, Inc.	Panel Walls	Siding	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16342	Drexel Metals, Inc.	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16344	Windoor Incorporated	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16347	BITEC, INC.	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16352	Tell Manufacturing, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Exterior Door Components	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16354	La Cantina Doors, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16357	The Dow Chemical Company	Roofing	Roofing Insulation	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
Evaluation by Test Report - FBC Voted Approval								
3664-R6	TAMKO Building	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend	Editorial

	Products, Inc.						Approval	Change
10960-R1	Merchant & Evans, Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12087-R1	Mitsubishi Plastics Composites America	Panel Walls	Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12328-R3	TAMKO Building Products, Inc.	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
13525-R1	Merchant & Evans, Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16176	EFCO Corporation	Panel Walls	Curtain Walls	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16348	Tubelite Inc.	Panel Walls	Storefronts	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
Evaluation by Evaluation Entity - FBC Voted Approval								
814-R3	amvic inc.	Structural Components	Insulation Form Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
1322-R6	Siplast / Icopal	Roofing	Roofing Insulation	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
13466-R3	Greenheck Fan Corporation	Roofing	Roofing Accessories that are an Integral Part of the Roofing System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
13816-R1	Coating and Foam Solutions, LLC	Roofing	Liquid Applied Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
16244	Siplast / Icopal	Roofing	Waterproofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16282	Siplast / Icopal	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New

			System					
16284	Siplast / Icopal	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16285	Siplast / Icopal	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16286	Siplast / Icopal	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16287	Siplast / Icopal	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16288	Siplast / Icopal	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
16289	Siplast / Icopal	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
Entities - FBC Voted Approval								
CER9626	UL LLC	Product Certification Agency		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
QUA1990	RADCO, INC.	Product Quality Assurance		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
QUA9625	UL LLC	Product Quality Assurance		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
TST1867	FM Approvals - Testing Lab	Product Testing Laboratory		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

TST2613	Element Wausau	Product Testing Laboratory		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
TST4317	Testing Evaluation Laboratories, Inc.	Product Testing Laboratory		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
TST9610	Element Des Moines	Product Testing Laboratory		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
TST9628	UL LLC	Product Testing Laboratory		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
TST10037	Benchmark Holdings, L.L.C. (test lab)	Product Testing Laboratory		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
VAL1786	National Accreditation & Management Institute,	Product Validation Entity		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
VAL3120	APA - The Engineered Wood Association	Product Validation Entity		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
VAL3920	Quality Auditing Institute Ltd.	Product Validation Entity		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
VAL9627	UL LLC	Product Validation Entity		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
Entities - FBC Voted Conditional Approval								
TST3619	Applied Research Laboratories of South Florida, LLC	Product Testing Laboratory		a	c	c	<u>Recommend Conditional Approval with conditions of: 1.</u>	Revision

							Provide correct fee payment. 2. Revise personnel list on application.	
Discussion Items								
16323	Nana Wall Systems, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies				<p>We do not accept letters from one application for another. We also observe that there are two different shapes of gaskets and therefore need to clarify with the letter for which, or both does it apply.</p> <p>Also we have concerns on the comparative analysis performed. Because this two issues are clarifying and not outright deficiencies, we will place the item on the agenda as a discussion item.</p>	New
	Public Comment by Jaime Gascon						Evaluation indicates maximum tested door height of 100 inches. TAS	

							201 and TAS203 section 5.1 requires full size specimen. Therefore, limit height to 100 inches. Also, if the interlocks did not conform to the requirements of 1/180 deflection (FBC 1615.3(5)) when tested to TAS202, then limit width of qualified units to 4 panels maximum as tested. (Reference DCA05.DEC-219.) Else, indicate not for use in the HVHZ.	
	Response by Regina L. Hoover and Allen N. Reeves, P.E.						Item 1) It is our contention that all of the test specimen were full size, because we believe full size is not the same as maximum size. All parts of the test specimen were full size. We understand that the test specimen were	

							approximately 100 inches high and we are applying for a maximum of 120 inches high. All testing laboratories who have tested full range of glazed panel sizes to TAS201 & 203 are aware that the smaller the size specimen do not perform as well as the larger ones. The reason for this is during impact the glazing can deflect more, thereby absorbing more energy, than the smaller ones. The required energy based on the weight and speed of the 2 x 4 is identical for all specimen.	
	Response by Regina L. Hoover and Allen N. Reeves, P.E.(Cont.)						Item 2) Limiting the number of panels in the approval to the four panels maximum as tested	

							will not change deflections at all. Each panel transmits load through either a locking rod or a roller mechanism to the supporting frame. If, an eight panel wide unit is substituted for a four panel wide unit there will be twice as many roller mechanisms and locking rods. Each locking rod and roller mechanism will carry the same load, and thus produce the same deflection on all panels. This is why the system is called repetitive in the evaluation report.	
	Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator			c	c	c	The response by evaluator on tested sizes does not comply with requirements of TAS 201 and TAS 202 and therefore not acceptable.	

							<p>The issue of deflection of interlock needs to be addressed.</p> <p><u>Recommend Conditional Approval with conditions of:</u></p> <p><u>1. Limit sizes and to maximum size tested and remove from evaluation charts with comparative analysis showing larger sizes than tested.</u></p> <p><u>2. Provide to Administrator tests reports to verify deflection compliance of interlocks.</u></p> <p><u>3. Provide document verifying the gaskets used and their testing for compliance with code requirements.</u></p>	
16332	Drexel Metals, Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	c	c	c	On product 16332.2 the coating on metal complying with ASTM A792 is not clearly	New

							indicated. <u>Recommend Conditional Approval with condition of: On evaluation report clarify the coating applied and its testing on metal conforming to ASTM A792.</u>	
Public Comments								
2948-R7	Johns Manville	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a			Recommend Approval	Revision
	Public Comment Robert Nieminen, P.E.						Johns Manville has alerted me to a mistake made by their testing laboratory (PRI) in the reporting of one of the wind uplift tests submitted to our office to facilitate revision to our Evaluation Report. The error in the laboratory report has been promulgated to an error in System No. S-47 in the ER	

						<p>Appendix, which should state “DynaFast 180 HW” for the base sheet rather than “DynaFast 250 HW”. Johns Manville submitted yesterday to our office the revised, corrected laboratory report from PRI that supports this correction. We formally request Conditional Approval of the subject file with the following condition: 1. Correct the base sheet reference in System S-47 to reflect “DynaFast 180 HW” in place of “DynaFast 250 HW”. 2. Update the “References” section of the Evaluation Report to include the corrected, revised report from PRI.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	Recommendation by Administrator						<u>Recommend Conditional Approval with the conditions of: 1. Correct the base sheet reference in System S-47 to reflect “DynaFast 180 HW” in place of “DynaFast 250 HW”. 2. Update the “References” section of the Evaluation Report to include the corrected, revised report from PRI.</u>	
				c	c	c		
15218-R2	Tag & Stick, LLC.	Roofing	Underlayments	a			Recommend Approval	Revision
	Public Comment by Jaime Gascon						Suggestion to separate the HVHZ product and place in .2, and upload reference to NOA 12-1003.04. Then indicate .1 as non-HVHZ only. This will minimize potential confusion at time of permit.	
	Response by Robert Nieminen, P.E.						The original submittal was made inclusive of HVHZ	

						<p>as Tag & Stick, LLC was still working with Miami-Dade to facilitate an NOA, even though the data existed for HVHZ compliance. Now that the NOA has been issued, there is no need for the Evaluation Report or the associated Product Approval file include HVHZ, other than to make reference to the current NOA. In response to this public comment, we request Conditional Approval under the following conditions: 1. Un-check the HVHZ check-box. 2. Include a note in the "Other Limits" section referring to use of the NOA in HVHZ jurisdictions. 3,</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							Update the Evaluation Report to include exclusion of use in HVHZ, and referring to use of the NOA in HVHZ jurisdictions.	
	Recommendation by Administrator			c	c	c	<u>Recommend Conditional Approval with conditions of:</u> 1. <u>Un-check the HVHZ check-box.</u> 2. <u>Include a note in the “Other Limits” section referring to use of the NOA in HVHZ jurisdictions.</u> 3. <u>Update the Evaluation Report to include exclusion of use in HVHZ, and referring to use of the NOA in HVHZ jurisdictions.</u>	
15514-R1	Majestic Entries, LLC	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a			Recommend Approval	Revision
	Public Comment						Section A/3 on	

	by Jaime Gascon						drawing for inswing needs to describe the panel infill material and its attachment as tested. Confirm panel was impacted as required in FBC 1626.2.5.1.	
	Response by Hermes F Norero						The steel panels is constructed of the same 12 ga. steel thickness as the door rails and is tack welded 4" – 6" O.C. The doors were impacted in accordance with Miami-Dade County's impact location requirements for double swinging glazed doors as posted on Miami-Dade's website. The panels themselves, however, were not impacted. If these impact locations do not satisfy the applicable requirements of	

							Section 1626, we'd like to request conditional approval such that FL15514.2 is revised to indicate "not for use in HVHZ".	
	Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator.						The steel panels are not properly detailed on Section A/3. Sect. 1626.2.5.1 was corrected to indicate Sect. 1626.2.5.2. <u>Recommend Conditional Approval with conditions of:</u> 1. <u>Revise Section A/3 to properly describe the steel panel and its connection to the door frame as tested.</u> 2. <u>Confirm that panel was impacted as required on Sect. 1626.2.5.2 or indicate not for use within HVHZ.</u>	

16247	Window Craftsmen Inc.	Windows	Mullions	a			Recommend Approval	New
	Public Comment by Jaime Gascon						Installation instructions showing section of mullion do not match the tested mullion shown on test report (sheet 15 of 17). Tests are not for TAS201 or TAS203. General notes (at the end) indicate 'mullion clips are not required', yet they were used in the testing; see testing sheet 16 of 17 where they were used. Also, HVHZ requires 1/180 for deflection per FBC 1615.3.1(5). Therefore, indicate not for use in the HVHZ	
	Response by Mark A. de Stefano, PE						Concerning the deflection comment of L/180 in HVHZ as quoted in Section 1615.3.1(5) the mullion as	

							<p>calculated will meet this requirement. In the same code section, 1615.1.1 which states “Any system, method of design or method of construction shall admit of a rational analysis in accordance with well-established principles of mechanics and sound engineering practices.” The system while tested with a similar mullion was calculated in the same method applied to both mullions as can be seen by the calculations. Both have been calculated in accordance with well-established engineering practices and principals that have been verified by two independent</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							engineers.	
	Response by Mark A. de Stefano, PE (Cont.)						Further, during our findings it was determined the clips served little use in the system and in our experience these clips are not installed correctly in the field. We found the mullions would perform more consistently if in-stalled at the factory rather than in the field. In addition, we found the connection of the windows to the mullions was adequate and the connection of the frame to the substrate adequate to meet the full loading requirements for these loading requirements. This has also been documented in our calculations. In our professional	

							opinion, we find this mullion consistent with the testing of the approved mullion and based on our comparative analysis will meet the design parameters of the Florida Building Code. We see no rational argument that this should not also be approved.	
	Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator.			c	d	c	The tested and analyzed deflections are within the required 1/180 as shown on test report and analysis. The anchors for the mullion are not indicated on the installation drawings. Because this is an impact product anchors should be as tested or better. The product was not tested to TAS 201, 202 or 203 as required for	

							HVHZ. The evaluation report shall note any equivalency of the testing performed to the required. <u>Recommend Conditional Approval with conditions of: 1. Indicate product as non-impact. 2. Indicate product as not for use within HVHZ.</u>	
16293	Hurricane Storm Panel MFG. Inc.	Shutters	Storm Panels	a			<u>Recommend Approval</u>	New
	Public Comment by Jaime Gascon						Panel schedule note #4 on sheet 6 of 6 in installation drawings does not conform with FBC 2413.2, TAS201 section 10.6, nor TAS203 section 11.6. Provide table for glass separation based on test report measured deflections, or indicate not for use in the HVHZ.	
	Response by						Background:	

	Robert J. Amoruso, P.E.						FL16293 is a name change application for KD Manufacturing under FL2773. That application was/is non-HVHZ and only included testing results for ASTM E1996-02, WZ 1, 2 and 3. The FL2773 approval did not include separation tables as ASTM E1996-02 only requires separation of porous protective coverings. Additionally, no inclusion of separation requirements is consistent with guidance in Declaratory Statements DEC08-DEC-002 and DEC09-DEC-254.	
	Response by Robert J. Amoruso, P.E. (Cont.)						Current: FL16293 includes revisions to the product approval	

							<p>documents used for FL2773 extending the usage to the HVHZ and Wind Zone 4. The testing for the product included TAS 201, 202 and 203 as well as ASTM E1996-02 Wind Zone 4 with two impacts per storm panel.</p> <p>Response: The comment is correct in that a glass to storm panel separation table is required for HVHZ. Such a table and revision to Note 4 on sheet 6 of 6 (and similar note on Sheet 1) was prepared by this engineer but inadvertently not included on the revised drawing. That table will be added consistent with the requirements of 2010 FBC Section 2413.2 and</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							references TAS 201 and 203 sections above.	
	Response by Robert J. Amoruso, P.E. (Cont.)						Response: The comment is correct in that a glass to storm panel separation table is required for HVHZ. Such a table and revision to Note 4 on sheet 6 of 6 (and similar note on Sheet 1) was prepared by this engineer but inadvertently not included on the revised drawing. That table will be added consistent with the requirements of 2010 FBC Section 2413.2 and references TAS 201 and 203 sections above.	
	Public Comment by Thomas Johnston						1. ASTM Wind Zone 4 requires separation to glass. Per note 7, this engineer states that no separation from	

							glass is necessary which would include WZ4. 2. Per the HVHZ requirements, this product must be offset from the glazing by the greatest deflection from static loading or impact, whichever is greater. I can't find any separation to glass chart anywhere. 3. Of the greatest concern, it does not appear that this engineer did any calculations on prying action and or safety factors relating to the fastener charts. Every mounting condition uses either 12 or 12.5" of spacing no matter what the span or load. Perhaps that is a matter for the FBPE.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	Response by Robert J. Amoruso, P.E.						See response above Public Comment by Jamie Gascon. ASTM E1996-02 does not require separation of non-porous shutter protective coverings. The requirement exists for porous protective coverings only. ASTM E1996-05 revised separation requirements for porous shutter systems (Section 8.3) to Essential Facilities for all Wind Zones and all impact protective systems (intrinsically including non-porous systems) in Wind Zone 4. Review of ASTM E1996-09 clarifies Porous and Non-Porous separation requirements as: (a) Section 8.3.1 Porous systems	
--	-------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							shall include separation criteria for all wind zones and (b) Section 8.3.2 non-porous systems for essential facilities in all wind zones. However, non-porous systems do not require separation for non-essential facilities per Section 8.3.2 of ASTM E1996-09. That appears to be a clarification/change from previous versions of ASTM E1996.	
	Response by Robert J. Amoruso, P.E. (Cont.)						Clarification can be added to the HVHZ table/note that was inadvertently omitted in the drawing (response above to Jamie Gascon Public Comment) to clarify these requirements in a manner consistent	

							with ASTM E1996-02 upon which the approval is based and the current/latest ASTM E1996-09 in the 2010 FBC.	
	Response by Robert J. Amoruso, P.E. (Cont.)						In my estimation this includes the following for consistency with this product's testing: 1) Table of separation requirements consistent with the HVHZ and Section 2413.2 of the 2010 FBC. 2) Table of separation requirements consistent with the requirements of ASTM E1996 for essential facilities with regards to this product's testing as Wind Zone 4, Missile Level D (Table 3 of ASTM E1996). 3) Note indicating that non-essential facilities do not	

							require separation per ASTM E1996, however a table will be included for guidance where enhanced separation by the user can be employed.	
	Response by Robert J. Amoruso, P.E. (Cont.)						The original calculation for FL2773 (see response above to Jamie Gascon Public Comment) prepared in 2009 included consideration for prying action. Based upon my review of that calculation, a prying factor of 1.9 was used for panel mount withdrawal loading where tension load was multiplied by a minimum of 1.9. Currently I employ the methodology promulgated in PCI Industry Handbook, 6th	

							<p>Edition, section 6.6.5 for unstiffened connection angles. This methodology differs from that previously used. Based on this method, a prying factor of 2.2 is calculated. To alleviate any concern over this issue, the calculation was revised to utilize this method. As such, the lower withdrawal allowable associated with two of the CMU anchors (Sammys and Powers Caulk-In) will be reduced to a spacing of 8" O.C.</p>	
	<p>Response by Robert J. Amoruso, P.E. (Cont.)</p>						<p>The other wood, concrete and masonry anchors shown remain acceptable for prying action at 12" O.C. as shown.</p>	

							<p>The 12.5" O.C. is for the attachment of the panel to the build-out F-Tracks using 18-8 1/4"-20 track bolts of sufficient strength for applied tension loading including prying. That spacing remains consistent among the various spans is because the span table is based on testing the large, small and intermediate spans lengths and interpolating spans between those test results. Thus loading is interpolated as well and consistency in anchor spacing can be expected. Each span shown in the span tables has been engineered for anchor loading.</p>	
	<p>Response by Robert J. Amoruso, P.E.</p>						<p>The application drawing HSPM0001 will be</p>	

	(Cont.)						<p>revised as follows to address comments above.</p> <p>Sheet 1 – revise general note 7 in accordance with the responses above to include differentiation of Wind Zone 1, 2, 3 and 4 as well as HVHZ requirements regarding separation.</p> <p>Sheet 6 – revise note 4 in accordance with the responses above to include differentiation of Wind Zone 1, 2, 3 and 4 as well as HVHZ requirements regarding separation.</p> <p>Sheet 6 revise anchor schedule to limit spacing for Sammys and Powers Caulk-In when used in CMU applications to 8” max. O.C. spacing.</p>	
--	---------	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

							Remove All-Points Wood Bushing (no longer used). All other anchors will have 12" O.C. spacing indicated. · Sheets 2, 3 and 4 to indicate "See Anchor Schedule on Sheet 6 for Requirements" to replace nomenclature "Anchor, See Schedule. 12" OC".	
	Recommendation by Administrator			c	c	c	<u>Recommend Conitional Approval with conditions of: 1. Provide table with proper glass sepration for Wind Zones 1, 2 and 3; Wind Zone 4; and HVHZ. 2. Provide proper anchor spacing considering proper prying action safety.</u>	
16343	Advance Hurricane	Shutters	Products Introduced as	α			<u>Recommend Approval</u>	New

	Technology Inc.		a Result of New Technology					
	Public Comment by Thomas Johnston							<p>This product states that it is Non-Porous and only needs separation to glass in WZ4 per ASTM. Looking at the specifications on the top of page one at the center, for zipper and rope fabrics, the top zipper fabric indicates and openness or porosity of 5% which is acceptable per ASTM. However that Rope fabric below does not state the openness , but refers to a shading factor of 88% which I assume is the closed percentage which is above the ASTM acceptable level of 10% open or 90% closed. The Zipper shows an airflow of</p>

							175CFM and the rope shows 300CFM. I would ask that you verify the openness of the rope mesh or require separation to glazing as per the ASTM standard.	
	Response by Trevor Johnson, P.E.						All the information available on the fabrics was provided in the product approval. The zipper screen fabric information included the open area of 5% and air flow of 175 CFM. The rope screen fabric information available does not provide the open area but does provide the air flow of 300 CFM. Based on equations for a gas flowing through an orifice plate, the flow rate is directly proportional to the open area. Using a comparative	

							analysis the flow rate of twice the 5% zipper screen would be 350 CFM. Based on this, the rope screen would then have an effective open area of less than 10% with the flow rate of 300 CFM. However, we understand that the rope screen fabric would be close to the ASTM 10% open area limit. To be precautionary, we would like to request a conditional approval to allow us to revise the product application. The revision would include additional separation to glazing requirements for the rope screen.	
	Recommendation by Administrator			c	c	c	<u>Recommend Conditional Approval with</u>	

							<u>condition of:</u> <u>Provide on</u> <u>installation</u> <u>instructions</u> <u>additional</u> <u>separation for the</u> <u>rope screen for use</u> <u>within Wind Zones</u> <u>1, 2 and 3.</u>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--