

**STRUCTURAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
CONCURRENT WITH  
PRODUCT APPROVAL PROGRAM OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
TELECONFERENCE MEETING FROM TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA  
WEB URL [HTTPS://GLOBAL.GOTOMEETING.COM/JOIN/545051013](https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/545051013)**

**AUDIO: DIAL-IN NUMBER 1 877-309-2070  
CONFERENCE CODE/MEETING ID: 545-051-013  
Wednesday, August 3, 2016  
10:00 AM until completion**

**MINUTES**

**STRUCTURAL TAC PRESENT:**

Jim Schock, Chairman  
Steve Strawn  
Joe Hetzel  
Do Y. Kim  
Warner Chang

David Compton  
Craig Parrino  
Daniel Lavrich  
Jamie Gascon  
Cris Fardelmann

**STRUCTURAL TAC NOT PRESENT:**

CW Macomber

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Mo Madani  
April Hammonds  
Nick Duval

Joe Bigelow  
Jim Hammers  
Marlita Peters

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Ted Berman, Ted Berman and Associates, LLC  
Tom Johnston Town and Country Industries  
Joe Belcher, International Hurricane Association  
John Rosende, Deco-Flash

Dick Wilhelm  
Lucas Turner, Deco-Flash  
Sal Delfino

**Welcome:**

**Time: 10:02 am**

Ms. Peters welcomed everyone to the concurrent teleconference call of the Structural TAC and Product Approval POC. She provided information for the callers on how to mute systems to avoid background noise.

**Roll Call:**

Ms. Peters performed roll call for the Structural TAC. A quorum was determined with 10 members present.

**Agenda Approval:**

Mr. Lavrich entered a motion to approve the agenda for today's meeting as posted. Mr. Compton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 10 to 0.

**DS 2016-048 by Theodore Berman, P.E. of Ted Berman and Associates LLC :**

The petitioner Mr. Ted Berman was present on the call explained his purpose in filing the declaratory statement and advised that he is available for questions should there be any.

Mr. Madani provided the background on the declaratory statement that was submitted by Ted Berman, P.E. of Ted Berman and Associates, LLC.

Mr. Madani explained the purpose of the statement including the question from the petitioner. He then provided the Structural TAC and Product Approval POC with the questions of concern and options for recommendation to the Commission.

**Option #1/Petitioner:** Petitioner respectfully believes that the answer is yes. Section 1609.1.2 Protection of Opening is clear in requiring the impact testes on numerals 1 and 2, but the Exemption is added and the Plysnap hurricane protection system when tested and analyzed for loads, subject to a cycle test, and non-porous in accordance with ASTM E1996 and limit its use in accordance with the aforesaid limit a through k complies with the exemption requirements of Section 1609.1.2. Therefore the product has complied with all the requirements of the Florida Building Code, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition (2014) and a Florida product approval may be granted.

**DS 2016-048 (cont.):**

**Option #2/Staff:** The product in question is a proposed alternative to the Wood Structural Panels (prescriptive specification method for protection of opening) as specified in Section 1609.1.2, Exception, of the 5<sup>th</sup> Edition (2014) Florida Building Code “FBC”, Building. As per Section 104.11 of the Florida Building Code, Building, an alternative method of construction to that prescribed in the FBC is subject to review and approval by the local building official, when such alternative is substantiated to be equivalent of that prescribed in the FBC in quality, strength, effectiveness, durability and safety. Therefore, the Florida Building Commission has no authority to approve said alternate as part of the State Product Approval Program.

**Option #3/Staff:** The answer is No. The product in question must also demonstrate compliance with the appropriate impact resistance standard(s) as required by Section 1609.1.2.

Mr. Berman responded to Mr. Madani’s explanation and staff analysis.

**TAC Comments/Questions:**

Mr. Lavrich spoke on panels design and clarified the attachments are in the exception not the panel. He continued referencing in the analysis section d) Where panels are attached to masonry or masonry/stucco, they shall be attached using vibration-resistant anchors having a minimum ultimate withdrawal capacity of 1,500 pounds and explained his position on this section. Mr. Lavrich stated he did not see where product approval should be required for this product and provided further explanation of his decision.

Mr. Compton stated he agrees that this product does not need an approval and if they want product approval they will need to do the impact testing as they performed on the prior product. He stated this product falls under the exception.

Ms. Hammonds asked if they were speaking in regards to option #2 consistent with what the POCs and TACs have done in the past that this is outside of the Product Approval Program and should be approved by the local building official.

Mr. Compton stated he agrees with that but does not like the wording, he feels this is the exception and Option #2 needs to be re-worded.

Mr. Madani stated that although it is an alternative fastening what is really stated in the exception.

Mr. Compton explained the actual language, and the exception does not specify and as long as they meet the exception.

**DS 2016-048 (cont.):**

Mr. Hetzel stated first there is a principal involved as a prescriptive exception in the Code and with the prescriptive exception he does not feel product approval applies, and secondly if there is an alternative fastening this is where the alternate materials methods come in and would apply to whatever is being applied in the exception. He stated he would agree with Option # 2 and add the principal of prescriptive exception.

Mr. Lavrich stated that he does not agree with Mr. Hetzel's statement on alternative and he would still state this would not fall under the exception.

Mr. Gascon asked Mr. Berman question on his definition of part of the statement.

Mr. Berman responded to Mr. Gascon's question of the full definition of how this performance is completed.

Mr. Gascon explained his understanding of this fastener and stated an impact test could have a different result. He stated he thinks the impact test should be required and not under the exception currently in the code and the fastener should be tested and put under product approval. He also asked if the spacing is under the alternative.

Mr. Berman stated yes.

Mr. Chin stated the wood panel is intended to cover the opening and there would be an overhang and the intent of this new product would be the size of the panel and not cover the overhang and he agrees it does not match alternative and should meet the product approval.

Mr. Lavrich stated this product will not meet or pass the impact test. He further stated it will not be approved through the program. Mr. Lavrich stated they need to go under exception.

Mr. Schock stated his concern is how the system is going to be approved through the local authority and that it needs to be enforcement process.

Mr. Strawn stated he agrees with Mr. Schock and Mr. Gascon and this would open a door for additional products not coming through the program. He said this should go through the product approval process.

**Public Comment:**

Tom Johnston, Town and Country Industries stated the wood panel exemption was tested and in subsequent version it was stated as permanent anchorage and was massively inadequate. He said this product would not pass the TAS standards. He said ASTM would allow this go through but

**DS 2016-048 (cont.):**

not the impact. Mr. Johnston said a declaratory statement from Storm Stoppers a few years back shows this needs to be tested for the force of missile impact.

Ms. Hammonds clarified that the declaratory statement for Storm Stoppers was raised and she refreshed the POC and TAC that the Commission's decision was that this product did not meet the Product Approval requirements and would need to go through the local authorities for approval and testing. She further stated the final was local approval.

Mr. Belcher, International Hurricane Association, stated he sent out to his board and they favored Option #3 as provided by staff.

Ms. Peters then asked the Structural TAC for a motion or further discussion.

Mr. Lavrich entered a motion to accept staff Option #3. Mr. Fardelmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 10 to 0.

**DS 2016 -050 By John Rosende of Deco-Flash :**

Lucas Turner was present on call for Mr. Rosende and stated they are in favor of Option #1 selective.

Mr. Madani provided the background on the declaratory statement that was submitted by John Rosende of Deco-Flash and expanded on the staff analysis.

**Question:**

Does the product in FL20760 fall within the scope of Product Approval Rule 61G20-3.001?

**Answer:**

Option #1/Petitioner: Petitioner and Petitioner's representative clearly believe that this product does fall within the scope of the rule and should be allowed. This is because the window products will be installed through the Deco-Flash product and to the substrate, the Deco-Flash is also a structural component and part of the load path from the window to the substrate.

Option #2/Petitioner/Staff: Petitioner and Petitioner's representative clearly believe that this product does fall within the scope of the rule and should be allowed. This is because the window products will be installed through the Deco-Flash product and to the substrate, the Deco-Flash is also a structural component and part of the load path from the window to the

**DS 2016 -050 (cont.):**

substrate. However, the scope of the approval is limited to an approved window or door which lists Deco-Flash as component part of an approved door or window assembly.

Option #3/Staff: No, this product is outside the scope of the state product approval program. However, the product in question is subject to approval by the local authority having jurisdiction

**TAC Comments/Questions:**

Mr. Compton stated his concerns and feels Option #2 is a better option and needs to be part of the Deco-Flash.

Mr. Schock stated he agreed that this should be part of the system and he feels Option #2 is the best option.

Mr. Gascon asked about dimensions of the product and what those dimensions are.

Mr. Turner responded to Mr. Gascon's question regarding dimensions and language that could be added to Option #2.

Mr. Gascon stated he feels that Option #2 amending response to add further limitations in the limits of use of the product that indicates that the buff system must be specified on the penetration product approval.

Mr. Strawn responded that he leaning on Option #2 and provided reason for this option.

Mr. Lavrich stated looking at the product on the site, there is a video with installation. He said there are no structural issues, it is flashing and he feels Option #3.

Mr. Turner responded to the video Mr. Lavrich was viewing and the one in question has different components and he agrees with Option #2.

Mr. Lavrich stated from an engineering standpoint he would like to see the dimensions and he does not see that this is structural and asked for explanation.

Mr. Turner provided the requested information for Mr. Lavrich.

Mr. Strawn stated he thinks this product would require some shimming would that be correct.

Mr. Turner stated yes.

**DS 2016 -050 (cont.):**

Mr. Strawn said this is a second component that should be tested.

Mr. Turner said that can be done through engineering analysis.

Mr. Compton stated he agrees with Mr. Strawn, he stated his concern with Option #2. He said it needs to be tested.

Mr. Hetzel said he is leaning toward Option #3, if Option #2 there should be some language change in sentence two and should be more defined.

Mr. Kim stated this product should be under Option #2 or maybe number 3.

**Public Comments:**

None

Ms. Peters then asked for a motion from the Structural TAC.

Mr. Lavrich entered a motion to approve Option #3. Mr. Hetzel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 10 to 0.

**TAC Comment:**

None

**Pubic Comment:**

Mr. Lucas stated he was disappointed with the decision and explained why.

Mr. Compton explained the reasoning of the decision.

Mr. Lucas again provided the reasoning for this request.

Ms. Hammonds advised for clarification stated they can still use the product under local product approval. She advised the Commission will take up the recommendations on August 17<sup>th</sup> in Ft. Lauderdale and that they are welcome to attend and make statements to them at that time.

Ms. Peters advised this is an onsite.

**DS 2016 -050 (cont.):**

Mr. Lucas stated his clients are requiring this approval.

Mr. Madani said the local jurisdiction does have authority to approve.

Mr. Schock advised that is correct and that they can come to the Commission Meeting and provide further information.

Mr. Strawn suggested an option to include as a component in the product approval.

Mr. Rosende provided rebuttal and why he felt this was not correct and provided examples. He further stated he could not understand their decision.

Mr. Compton provided the differences that they are referencing thus the reason for the decision.

Ms. Peters stated the decision stated the decisions of the TAC and POC have been made so any further discussion should be brought before the Commission.

Mr. Rosende made a final statement windows are tested without bucks and what do you do with a retro window.

Mr. Madani stated they do not approve separate.

Mr. Rosende stated exactly.

Mr. Schock stated this has been discussed enough and will need to be taken to the Commission.

Ms. Peters completed final roll call. All original 10 members were remaining on the call.

The meeting adjourned at 11:28 a.m.