



Roofing

Glitch Modifications

This document created by the Florida Department of Community Affairs -
850-487-1824

Sub Code: Building

Total Mods for Roofing: 46

Date Submitted	3/2/2011	Section	1507.2.5	Proponent	T Stafford
Chapter	15	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Deletes a reference to specific provisions that no longer exist.

Rationale

Section 1609.5.2 no longer contains the reference to ASTM D 6381 or UL 2370. These standards have been replaced by ASTM D 7158 which is referenced for asphalt shingles.

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

1507.2.5 Asphalt shingles. Asphalt shingles shall have self-seal strips or be interlocking and comply with ASTM D 225 or ASTM D 3462. Shingles shall also comply with Table 1507.2.7.1. Asphalt shingle packaging shall bear labeling indicating compliance with one of the required classifications as shown in Table 1507.2.7.1 ~~or a listing by an approved testing agency in accordance with the requirements of Section 1609.5.2.~~

Date Submitted	3/17/2011	Section	1507.3	Proponent	Richard Olson
Chapter	15	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications

Table 1609.3.1, 1507.3.2, 1507.3.3, 1507.3.3.1, 1507.3.6, 1507.3.7, 1507.3.8, and 1507.3.9

Summary of Modification

The inclusion of the ASCE 710 wind speed maps in the Florida Building Code, Residential, necessitates the introduction of Vult and Vasd in order to allow the correct use of referenced standards based on ASCE 7-05 when using the new wind speed maps from ASCE 7-10.

Rationale

Utilizing the ASCE 7-10 wind speed maps in the Florida Building Code, Building, necessitates the introduction of the terms Vult and Vasd to be associated with the “ultimate” design wind speed and the “nominal” design wind speed. Because of the number of different provisions which use the wind speed map to “trigger” different requirements it was necessary to modify the conversion section (1609.3.1) so that those provisions were not changed. The terms “ultimate design wind speed” and “nominal design wind speed” were incorporate in numerous locations to aid in drawing the users attention to the different types of wind speeds – similar to what was done with the change from fastest mile to 3-second gust wind speeds. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict created by the adoption of the ASCE 7-10 wind speed maps. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

The impact is believed to be neutral.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

The impact is believed to be neutral.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Coordinates the application of referenced standards based on ASCE 7-05 with the ASCE 7-10 wind speed maps.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Coordinates the application of referenced standards based on ASCE 7-05 with the ASCE 7-10 wind speed maps.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Coordinates the application of referenced standards based on ASCE 7-05 with the ASCE 7-10 wind speed maps.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Coordinates the application of referenced standards based on ASCE 7-05 with the ASCE 7-10 wind speed maps.

1507.3.2 Deck slope. Concrete and clay roof tile shall be installed in accordance with the recommendations of FRSA/TRI 07320 where the V_{asd} as determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1 or the recommendations of RAS 118, 119 or 120.

1507.3.3 Underlayment. Unless otherwise noted, required underlayment shall conform to: ASTM D 226, Type II; ASTM D 2626; ASTM D 1970 or ASTM D 6380 mineral-surfaced roll roofing. Underlayment shall be applied according to the manufacturer's installation instruction or the recommendations of the FRSA/TRI 07320 where the basic wind speed, V_{asd} , is determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1 or the recommendations of RAS 118, 119 or 120.

1507.3.3.1 Slope and underlayment requirements. Refer to FRSA/TRI 07320 where the basic wind speed, V_{asd} , is determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1 for underlayment and slope requirements for specific roof tile systems or the recommendations of RAS 118, 119 or 120.

1507.3.6 Fasteners. Tile fasteners shall be corrosion resistant and not less than 11 gage, 5/16-inch (8.0 mm) head, and of sufficient length to penetrate the deck a minimum of 0.72 inch (19.1 mm) or through the thickness of the deck, whichever is less or in accordance with the FRSA/TRI 07320 where the basic wind speed, V_{asd} , is determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1 or in accordance with RAS 118, 119 or 120. Attaching wire for clay or concrete tile shall not be smaller than 0.083 inch (2.1 mm).

1507.3.7 Attachment. Clay and concrete roof tiles shall be fastened in accordance with Section 1609 or in accordance with FRSA/TRI 07320 where the basic wind speed, V_{asd} , is determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1

1507.3.8 Application. Tile shall be applied according to the manufacturer's installation instructions or the recommendation of the FRSA/TRI 07320 where the basic wind speed, V_{asd} , is determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1 or the recommendation of RAS 118, 119 or 120.

1507.3.9 Flashing. At the juncture of the roof vertical surfaces, flashing and counterflashing shall be provided in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions or the recommendation of the FRSA/TRI 07320 where the basic wind speed, V_{asd} , is determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1 or the recommendation of RAS 118, 119 or 120.

Date Submitted 3/11/2011
Chapter 15

Section 1517.5.2
Affects HVHZ Yes

Proponent Jaime Gascon
Attachments No

TAC Recommendation Pending Review
Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments No Alternate Language No

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Typo. Missing a space to clearly show 1_5/8 inches.

Rationale

Typo for correction in glitch cycle. Missing a space to clearly show 1_5/8 inches; not 15/8.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code
None.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code
None.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code
None.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public
None.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction
It strengthens the code by correcting a typo.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities
Does not discriminate.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code
Does not degrade; it corrects a typo.

1517.5.2 Such fasteners shall be applied through "Tin caps" no less than 1_5/8 inches (41 mm) and not more than 2 inches (51 mm) in diameter and of not less than 32 gage (0.010 inch) sheet metal. "Cap nails" or prefabricated fasteners with integral heads complying with this section shall be an acceptable substitute. All "tin caps," "cap nails" or prefabricated fasteners with integral heads shall be tested for corrosion resistance in compliance with TAS 114 Appendix E, Section 2 (ASTM G 85), and shall be product control listed. All of cartons or carton labels "tin caps," "cap nails" or prefabricated fasteners with integral heads shall be labeled to note compliance with the corrosion resistance requirements.

Date Submitted	3/17/2011	Section	1521.18.1	Proponent	Mo Madani
Chapter	15	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Revise section 1521.18.1 for consistency with Mod 3799.

Rationale

The proposed code change resolve conflict within the updated code. The mod has Florida specific need necessary to clarify the code intent and the poposed change has no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public
clarify the code by removing existing conflict.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction
Improve the code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities
It does not discriminate against products.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code
Make the code more effective.

1521.18.1 No PUF and/or elastomeric coating systems shall be applied over existing composition shingles.

Date Submitted	3/9/2011	Section	Table 1515.2	Proponent	Jaime Gascon
Chapter	15	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Corrects a typo as to where the roof slope designations were placed in the modified table.

Rationale

This glitch is an unintended result from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments into the model code. This correction is needed as it is part of the HVHZ and would create conflict and confusion if not corrected. Subsets are also tabed. There is no impact to small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

Helps with enforcement of the code by presenting the requirements correctly in the table.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

Correcting this glitch will minimize costs due to erroneous application or needless limitations.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

None.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Improves the code by publishing the requirements as intended; error free.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not discriminate.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

It improves the code by correcting a glitch.

TABLE 1515.2
MINIMUM SLOPE

SYSTEM TYPE	SLOPE
Fibrous Cement Shingles	4:12
Metal Panels	
Architectural	2:12
Metal Shingles	4:12
Mortar or Adhesive Tile	2:12
Mechanically Fastened Tile	4:12
Asphalt Shingles	4:12
Laminated	2:12
3-Tab	2:12
Quarry Slate	3- ¹ / ₂ :12
Wood	
Shakes	4:12
Shingles	3- ¹ / ₂ :12

Date Submitted 3/11/2011
Chapter 6

Section 611.7.1
Affects HVHZ No

Proponent Lisa Pate
Attachments No

TAC Recommendation Pending Review
Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments No Alternate Language No

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Typo - text does not match table 611.7.1.2 - to correct.

Rationale

Editorial correction and equivalency of standards. Under Section 611.7.1.2 it reads: "Supplemental fasteners as required by Table 611.7.1.2 shall be 8d ring shank nails with round heads and the following dimensions:

1. 0.113 inch (2.9 mm) nominal shank diameter.

The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Corrects a conflict within the new code - corrects a typo.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens and improves the code by correcting a typo.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not discriminate.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade code - makes it more effective by correcting a typo.

611.7.1 Roof decking attachment for site-built single-family residential structures. For site-built single-family residential structures the fastening shall be in accordance with Section 611.7.1.1 or 611.7.1.2 as appropriate for the existing construction. 8d nails shall be a minimum of ~~0.131~~ 0.113 inch (~~3.3 mm~~ 2.9 mm) in diameter and shall be a minimum of 2 1/4-inch (57 mm) long to qualify for the provisions of this section for existing nails regardless of head shape or head diameter.

Date Submitted	3/1/2011	Section	Table 611.8.1	Proponent	T Stafford
Chapter	6	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Modifies table for correlation with ASCE 7-2010 as adopted.

Rationale

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business. The changes are to correlate with ASCE 7-2010 as adopted.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

In table heading change “Basic Wind Speed” to “Ultimate Design Wind Speed, V_{ult} .”

Add new Note c and d as follows:

c. For Ultimate design wind speeds, V_{ult} greater than 170 mph, wind uplift forces shall be determined in accordance with Florida Building Code, Residential, Section R802.3 or ASCE 7.

d. Ultimate Design Wind Speeds determined from Figure 1609A in the Florida Building Code, Building or Figure R301.2(4) in the Florida Building Code, Residential.

Date Submitted	3/1/2011	Section	Table 1604.2	Proponent	T Stafford
Chapter	16	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Modify table for correlation with ASCE 7-2010 as adopted.

Rationale

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business. The modification is necessary to correlate with ASCE 7-2010 as adopted.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

In table heading change:

Maximum V_{asd} ~~3-Sec Gust Basic Wind Speed~~ ^{a,d}

Add new Note d to read as follows:

d. V_{asd} shall be determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1 of the Florida Building Code, Building or Section R301.2.1.3 of the Florida Building Code, Residential

Date Submitted	3/1/2011	Section	Table 1604.5.1	Proponent	T Stafford
Chapter	16	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Modify table to correlate with ASCE 7-2010 as adopted.

Rationale

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business. Modification is necessary to correlate with ASCE 7-2010 as adopted.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

In table heading change:

Maximum V_{asd} ~~3-Sec Gust Basic Wind Speed~~ ^a

Add new Note a to read as follows:

a. V_{asd} shall be determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1 of the Florida Building Code, Building or Section R301.2.1.3 of the Florida Building Code, Residential.

Date Submitted	3/1/2011	Section	Table 1604.5.2	Proponent	T Stafford
Chapter	16	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
Comments					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Modify table to correlate with ASCE 7-2010 as adopted.

Rationale

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business. The modification is necessary to provide correlation with ASCE 7-2010 as adopted.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

In table heading change:

Maximum V_{asd} ~~3-Sec Gust Basic Wind Speed~~^a

Add new Note a to read as follows:

a. V_{asd} shall be determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1 of the Florida Building Code, Building or Section R301.2.1.3 of the Florida Building Code, Residential.

Date Submitted	3/1/2011	Section	Table 1605.2	Proponent	T Stafford
Chapter	16	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Modifies table to provide correlation with ASCE 7-2010.

Rationale

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business. The modification is necessary to provide correlation with ASCE 7-2010 as adopted.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

In table heading change

Ultimate Design Basic Wind Speed, V_{ult} .

Add new Notes a and b as follows:

- a. For Ultimate design wind speeds, V_{ult} greater than 150 mph, uplift connection loads shall be determined in accordance with ASCE 7.
- b. Ultimate Design Wind Speeds determined from Figure 1609A in the Florida Building Code, Building or Figure R301.2(4) in the Florida Building Code, Residential.

Date Submitted	3/17/2011	Section	R905.3	Proponent	Richard Olson
Chapter	8	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications

Table R301.2.1.3, R905.3.2, R905.3.3, R905.3.3.1, R905.3.6, R905.3.7, R905.3.7.1, and R905.3.8

Summary of Modification

The inclusion of the ASCE 710 wind speed maps in the Florida Building Code, Residential, necessitates the introduction of Vult and Vasd in order to allow the correct use of referenced standards based on ASCE 7-05 when using the new wind speed maps from ASCE 7-10.

Rationale

Utilizing the ASCE 7-10 wind speed maps in the Florida Building Code, Residential, necessitates the introduction of the terms Vult and Vasd to be associated with the "ultimate" design wind speed and the "nominal" design wind speed. Because of the number of different provisions which use the wind speed map to "trigger" different requirements it was necessary to modify the conversion section (1609.3.1) so that those provisions were not changed. The terms "ultimate design wind speed" and "nominal design wind speed" were incorporate in numerous locations to aid in drawing the users attention to the different types of wind speeds – similar to what was done with the change from fastest mile to 3-second gust wind speeds. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict created by the adoption of the ASCE 7-10 wind speed maps. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

The cost impact is believed to be neutral.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

The cost impact is believed to be neutral.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Coordinates the application of referenced standards based on ASCE 7-05 with the ASCE 7-10 wind speed maps.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Coordinates the application of referenced standards based on ASCE 7-05 with the ASCE 7-10 wind speed maps.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Coordinates the application of referenced standards based on ASCE 7-05 with the ASCE 7-10 wind speed maps.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Coordinates the application of referenced standards based on ASCE 7-05 with the ASCE 7-10 wind speed maps.

R905.3 Clay and concrete tile. The installation of clay and concrete shall be in accordance with the recommendations of FRSA/TRI 07320 where the V_{asd} is determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1 or the recommendations of RAS 118, 119 or 120.

R905.3.2 Deck slope. Clay and concrete roof tile shall be installed on roof slopes in accordance with the recommendations of FRSA/TRI 07320 where the V_{asd} is determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1 or the recommendations of RAS 118, 119 or 120.

R905.3.3. Underlayment. Required underlayment shall conform with ASTM D 226, Type II; ASTM D 2626 Type II; ASTM D 1970 or ASTM D 6380 Class M and shall be installed in accordance with the recommendations of FRSA/TRI 07320 where the V_{asd} is determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1 or the recommendations of RAS 118, 119 or 120.

R905.3.3.1 Slope and underlayment requirements.

Refer to FRSA/TRI 07320 where the V_{asd} is determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1 or RAS 118, 119 or 120 for underlayment and slope requirements for specific roof tile systems.

R905.3.6 Fasteners. Nails shall be corrosion-resistant and not less than 11 gage, 5/16-inch (mm) head, and of sufficient length to penetrate the deck a minimum of $\frac{3}{4}$ inch (19.1 mm) or

through the thickness of the deck, whichever is less or in accordance with the recommendations of FRSA/TRI 07320 where the V_{asd} is determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1 or in accordance with the recommendations of RAS 118, 119 or 120. Attaching wire for clay or concrete tile shall not be smaller than 0.083 (2.1 mm).

R905.3.7 Application. Tile shall be applied in accordance with this chapter and the manufacturer's installation instructions, or recommendation of FRSA/TRI 07320 based on the following:

Attachment. Clay and concrete roof tile shall be fastened in accordance with FRSA/TRI 07320 where the V_{asd} is determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1.

R905.3.7.1. Hip and Ridge tiles. Hip and ridge tiles shall be installed in accordance with the recommendations of FRSA/TRI 07320 where the V_{asd} is determined in accordance with Section 1609.3.1.

Date Submitted	3/11/2011	Section	R903.2.1	Proponent	Lisa Pate
Chapter	9	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

To correct typo - to match Table 1503.2 in Chapter 15 Building.

Rationale

To correct typo in code. This chart does not match the chart in Chapter 15 Building, Table 1503.2 Metal Flashing Material. To make consistent. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarifies and make a correction to a typo in the new code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens and improves the code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not discriminate.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade the code - makes it more effective.

Table R903.2.1 METAL FLASHING MATERIAL

MATERIAL	GAGE MINIMUM THICKNESS (Inches)	GAGE	WEIGHT (lbs per sq ft)
Copper	0.024		1 (16 oz)
Aluminum	0.024		28
Stainless Steel		28	
Galvanized Steel	0.0179	26(zinc Coated G90)	26 (zinc coated G90)
Aluminum Zinc	0.0179	26 (AZ50 Alum Zinc)	26 (AZ50 Alum Zinc)
Zinc Alloy	0.027		
Lead			2.5 (40 oz)
Painted Terne			1.25 (20 oz)

Date Submitted 3/11/2011
Chapter 9

Section R905.7.7
Affects HVHZ No

Proponent Lisa Pate
Attachments No

TAC Recommendation Pending Review
Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments No Alternate Language No

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

To correct a typo -to match text with existing Table R905.7.7.

Rationale

To correct a type. Table R905.7.7 is for wood shingle weather exposure and roof slope, not wood shakes. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

None.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens and improves the code to make it consistent.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not discriminate.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade code but makes it more effective.

R905.7.7 WOOD SHAKE SHINGLE WEATHER EXPOSURE AND ROOF SLOPE

Date Submitted	2/28/2011	Section	Table R905.10.3(1)	Proponent	T Stafford
Chapter	9	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Deletes Table R905.10.3(1) which is not referenced in the body of the code and conflicts with Table R905.4.4.

Rationale

The Supplement as printed contains 2 tables that provide the same information;

1. Table 905.4.4 that is consistent with the Florida Building Code, Building. There are also numerous references to Table 905.4.4 within the body of the code that would have to be corrected if this table were removed.

2. Table 905.10.3(1) which is not consistent and there are no references to this Table in the body of the code.

Retain Table 905.4.4 and delete Table 905.10.3(1)

The proposed change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Table R905.10.3(1) Reserved.

Date Submitted 3/17/2011
Chapter 44

Section R4402.10.18.1
Affects HVHZ Yes

Proponent Mo Madani
Attachments No

TAC Recommendation Pending Review
Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments No **Alternate Language** No

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Revise section R4402.10.18.1 to remove conflict currently exist with Mod 3800 (R4402.10.17.1).

Rationale

The proposed modification will resolve a conflict currently exist between R4402.10.17.1 and R4402.10.18.1 with regard to the treatment of roof coating. There is Florida specific need necessary to resolve the conflict and there should be no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

The proposal will clarify the code and improve enforcement.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Clarify the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Improve the code by resolving conflict.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not discriminate against products.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Improve the effectiveness of the Code.

R4402.10.18.1 No sprayed polyurethane foam (PUF) and/or elastomeric coating systems shall be applied over existing composition shingles.

Date Submitted	3/8/2011	Section 1		Proponent	T Stafford
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
Comments					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Correlation with ASCE 7-10

Rationale

Correlation with ASCE 7. The values shown in Table 1 have been calculated based on ASCE 7-05. When these numbers were calculated, the assumption was that the wind speed was 146 mph and the Exposure Category was C. With the new provisions, the wind speed varies in the HVHZ depending on the Risk Category. Additionally, Exposure D has been reintroduced for water surfaces.

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

1. Scope

This standard covers the procedure for determining the Moment of Resistance (M_r) and Minimum Characteristic Resistance Load (F') to install a tile system on buildings of a specified roof slope and height. Compliance with the requirements and procedures herein specified, where the pressures (P) have been determined based on Table 1 of this standard, do not require additional signed and sealed engineering design calculation. All other calculations must be prepared, signed and sealed by a professional engineer or registered architect. Table 1 is applicable to wind speeds of 185 mph, Risk Category II Buildings and exposure category C.

TABLE 1					
MINIMUM DESIGN WIND UPLIFT PRESSURES IN PSF FOR FIELD (P(1), PERIMETER (P(2) AND CORNER (P(3) AREAS OF ROOF FOR EXPOSURE C BUILDINGS WITH A ROOF MEAN HEIGHT AS SPECIFIED ¹					
Roof slope	> 2:12 to = 6:12			> 6:12 to = 12:12	
Roof mean height	P(1)	P(2)	P(3)	P(1)	P(2) and P(3)
$\leq 20'$	-45.1 -75.2	-78.6 -131	-116.2 -193.7	-49.1 -81.8	-57.5 95.8
>20' to $\leq 25'$	-47.3 -78.8	-82.3 -137.2	-121.8 -203	-51.2 -85.3	-60.4 -100.7
>25' to $\leq 30'$	-49.2 -82	-85.7 -142.8	-126.8 -211.3	-53.6 -89.3	-62.9 -104.8
>30' to $\leq 35'$	-50.9 -84.8	-88.5 -147.5	-130.9 -218.2	-55.3 -92.2	-65 -108.3
> 35' to $\leq 40'$	-52.3 -87.2	-91.0 -151.2	-134.6 -224.3	-56.9 -94.8	-66.8 -111.3

1 Values in accordance with ASCE 7. See Section 1 for limits. ~~05 (Wind Speed: 146 mph).~~

2 For Hip Roofs with slope $\leq 5.5: 12$, P(3) shall be treated as P(2). ~~[Mod 2014r/2104r]~~

Date Submitted	3/10/2011	Section	RAS 127	Proponent	Michael Goolsby
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	Yes
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Establishing correlation of ASCE 7-10 with RAS 127.

Rationale

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the unintended conflict created within the updated code. The Roofing Application Standard is revised to provide appropriate design pressures for both Exposure Category 'C' and 'D' in simplified tables. The use of allowable design pressures is necessary for product approval comparisons in order to establish adequate component and cladding attachment. The proposed code change will have no negative impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

ROOFING APPLICATION STANDARD (RAS) No. 127

PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING THE MOMENT OF RESISTANCE AND MINIMUM CHARACTERISTIC RESISTANCE LOAD TO INSTALL A TILE SYSTEM ON A BUILDING OF A SPECIFIED ROOF SLOPE AND HEIGHT

1. Scope

This standard covers the procedure for determining the Moment of Resistance (M_r) and Minimum Characteristic Resistance Load (F') to install a tile system on buildings of a specified roof slope and height. Compliance with the requirements and procedures herein specified, where the pressures (P_{asd}) have been determined based on Table 1 or Table 2 of this standard, as applicable, do not require additional signed and sealed engineering design calculation. All other calculations must be prepared, signed and sealed by a professional engineer or registered architect. Table 1 is applicable to a wind speed of 175 mph, risk category II buildings, and exposure category C. Table 2 is applicable to a wind speed of 175 mph, risk category II buildings, and exposure category D.

2. How to determine the Moment Resistance (M_r) (Moment Based Systems)

2.1 Determine the minimum design wind pressures for the field, perimeter and corner areas (P_{asd} 1, P_{asd} 2 and P_{asd} 3, respectively) using the values given in Table 1 or Table 2, as applicable, or those obtained by engineering analysis prepared, signed and sealed by a professional engineer or registered architect based on ASCE 7.

2.2 Locate the aerodynamic multiplier (?) in tile Product Approval.

2.3 Determine the restoring moment due to gravity (M_g) per Product Approval.

2.4 Determine the attachment resistance (M_t) per Product Approval.

2.5 Determine the Moment of Resistance (M_r) per following formula:

2.6 Compare the values for M_r with the values for M_f noted in the Product Approval. If the M_f values are greater than or equal to the M_r values, for each area of the roof [i.e., field P_{asd} (1), perimeter P_{asd} (2) and corner P_{asd} (3) areas], then the tile attachment method is acceptable.

3. How to determine the Minimum Characteristic Resistance Load (F') (Uplift Based System)

3.1 Determine the minimum design pressures for the field, perimeter and corner areas [P_{asd} (1), P_{asd} (2) and P_{asd} (3), respectively] using the values given in Table 1 or Table 2, as applicable, or those obtained by engineering analysis prepared, signed and sealed by a professional engineer or registered architect based on the criteria set forth in ASCE 7.

3.2 Determine the angle (θ) of roof slope, from Table 1 or Table 2, as applicable,.

3.3 Determine the length (l), width (w) and average tile weight (W) of tile, per Product Approval.

3.4 Determine the required uplift resistance (F_r) per following formula:

$$F_r = [(P_{asd} \times l \times w) - W] \times \cos \theta$$

3.5 Compare the values for F_r with the values for F' noted in the Product Approval. If the F' values are greater than or equal to the F_r values, for each area of roof [i.e., field P_{asd} (1) perimeter (P_{asd} (2) and corner P_{asd} (3) areas], then the tile attachment method is acceptable.

TABLE 1— Risk Category II Exposure Category 'C'¹

MINIMUM DESIGN WIND UPLIFT PRESSURES IN PSF FOR FIELD (P_{asd} (1), PERIMETER (P_{asd} (2)
AND CORNER (P_{asd} (3) AREAS OF ROOFS

					<u>asd (3)</u>
<=20'	-45.1 -39.1	-78.6 -68.1	-116.2 -100.7	-49.1 -42.8	-57.5 -50.0
>20' to <=25'	-47.3 -40.9	-82.3 -71.3	-121.8 -105.4	-51.2 -44.8	-60.4 -52.3
>25' to <=30'	-49.2 -42.4	-85.7 -73.9	-126.8 -109.3	-53.6 -46.4	-62.9 -54.3
>30' to <=35'	-50.9 -43.9	-88.5 -76.6	-130.9 -113.2	-55.3 -48.1	-65.0 -56.2
>35 to <=40'	-52.3 -45.1	-91.0 -78.7	-134.6 -116.3	-56.9 -49.4	-66.8 -57.8

¹ Calculated in accordance with ASCE 7.05 (~~Wind Speed: 146 mph~~).

² For Hip Roofs with slope <=5.5: 12, P_{asd} (3) shall be treated as P_{asd} (2). ~~[Mod 2014r/2104r]~~

³ $P_{asd} = 0.6P_{ult}$

TABLE 2– Risk Category II Exposure Category 'D'¹

**MINIMUM DESIGN WIND UPLIFT PRESSURES IN PSF FOR FIELD (P_{asd} (1), PERIMETER (P_{asd} (2)
AND CORNER (P_{asd} (3) AREAS OF ROOFS**

FOR EXPOSURE D BUILDINGS WITH A ROOF MEAN HEIGHT AS SPECIFIED³

<u>ROOF</u>	<u>> 2:12 to < 6:12</u>			<u>> 6:12 to < 12:12</u>	
<u>SLOPE</u>					
<u>Roof mean height</u>	<u>P_{asd} (1)</u>	<u>P_{asd} (2)</u>	<u>P_{asd} (3)²</u>	<u>P_{asd} (1)</u>	<u>P_{asd} (2) & P_{asd} (3)</u>
<=20'	-47.0	-81.9	-121.0	-51.4	-60.1
>20' to <=25'	-48.8	-85.0	-125.7	-53.4	-62.4
>25' to <=30'	-50.3	-87.7	-129.6	-55.0	-64.4
>30' to <=35'	-51.5	-89.8	-132.7	-56.4	-65.9
>35 to <=40'	-52.7	-91.9	-135.8	-57.7	-67.9

¹ Calculated in accordance with ASCE 7

² For Hip Roofs with slope <=5.5: 12, P_{asd} (3) shall be treated as P_{asd} (2).

³ $P_{asd} = 0.6P_{ult}$

TABLE 23
WHERE TO OBTAIN INFORMATION

Description	Symbol	Where to find
Design Pressure	P_{asd} (1) or P_{asd} (2) or P_{asd} (3)	Table 1 or Table 2, as applicable, or by an engineer analysis prepared, signed and sealed by a professional engineer based on ASCE 7
Mean Roof Height	H	Job Site
Roof Slope	θ	Job Site
Aerodynamic Multiplier	λ	Product Approval
Restoring Moment due to Gravity	M_g	Product Approval
Attachment Resistance	M_f	Product Approval
Required Moment Resistance	M_r	Calculated
Minimum Characteristic Resistance Load	F'	Product Approval
Required Uplift Resistance	F_r	Calculated
Average Tile Weight	W	Product Approval
Tile Dimensions	l=length w=width	Product Approval

All calculations must be submitted to the building official at the time of permitting.

ROOFING APPLICATION STANDARD (RAS) No. 127
PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING THE MOMENT OF RESISTANCE AND MINIMUM CHARACTERISTIC
RESISTANCE LOAD TO INSTALL A TILE SYSTEM ON A BUILDING OF A SPECIFIED ROOF SLOPE AND
HEIGHT

1. Scope

This standard covers the procedure for determining the Moment of Resistance (M_r) and Minimum Characteristic Resistance Load (F') to install a tile system on buildings of a specified roof slope and height. Compliance with the requirements and procedures herein specified, where the pressures (P_{asd}) have been determined based on Table 1 or Table 2 of this standard, as applicable, do not require additional signed and sealed engineering design calculation. All other calculations must be prepared, signed and sealed by a professional engineer or registered architect. Table 1 is applicable to a wind speed of 175 mph, risk category II buildings, and exposure category C. Table 2 is applicable to a wind speed of 175 mph, risk category II buildings, and exposure category D.

2. How to determine the Moment Resistance (M_r) (Moment Based Systems)

2.1 Determine the minimum design wind pressures for the field, perimeter and corner areas (P_{asd} 1, P_{asd} 2 and P_{asd} 3, respectively) using the values given in Table 1 or Table 2, as applicable, or those obtained by engineering analysis prepared, signed and sealed by a professional engineer or registered architect based on ASCE 7.

2.2 Locate the aerodynamic multiplier (λ) in tile Product Approval.

2.3 Determine the restoring moment due to gravity (M_g) per Product Approval.

2.4 Determine the attachment resistance (M_r) per Product Approval.

2.5 Determine the Moment of Resistance (M_r) per following formula:

$$M_r = (P_{asd} \times \lambda) - M_g$$

2.6 Compare the values for M_r , with the values for M_r , noted in the Product Approval. If the M_r values are greater than or equal to the M_r values, for each area of the roof [i.e., field P_{asd} (1), perimeter P_{asd} (2) and corner P_{asd} (3) areas], then the tile attachment method is acceptable.

3. How to determine the Minimum Characteristic Resistance Load (F') (Uplift Based System)

3.1 Determine the minimum design pressures for the field, perimeter and corner areas [P_{asd} (1), P_{asd} (2) and P_{asd} (3), respectively] using the values given in Table 1 or Table 2, as applicable, or those obtained by engineering analysis prepared, signed and sealed by a professional engineer or registered architect based on the criteria set forth in ASCE 7.

3.2 Determine the angle (θ) of roof slope, from Table 1 or Table 2, as applicable.

3.3 Determine the length (l), width (w) and average tile weight (W) of tile, per Product Approval.

3.4 Determine the required uplift resistance (F_r) per following formula:

$$F_r = [(P_{\text{asd}} \times l \times w) - W] \times \cos \theta$$

3.5 Compare the values for F_r with the values for F' noted in the Product Approval. If the F' values are greater than or equal to the F_r values, for each area of roof [i.e., field P_{asd} (1) perimeter (P_{asd} (2) and corner P_{asd} (3) areas], then the tile attachment method is acceptable.

TABLE 1– Risk Category II Exposure Category 'C'¹ MINIMUM DESIGN WIND UPLIFT PRESSURES IN PSF FOR FIELD (P_{asd} (1), PERIMETER (P_{asd} (2) AND CORNER (P_{asd} (3) AREAS OF ROOFS FOR EXPOSURE C BUILDINGS WITH A ROOF MEAN HEIGHT AS SPECIFIED^{1,3}					
ROOF SLOPE	> 2:12 to ≤ 6:12			> 6:12 to ≤ 12:12	
Roof mean height	P_{asd} (1)	P_{asd} (2)	P_{asd} (3) ²	P_{asd} (1)	P_{asd} (2) & P_{asd} (3)
≤20'	45.1 <u>39.1</u>	78.6 <u>68.1</u>	116.2 <u>100.7</u>	49.1 <u>42.8</u>	57.5 <u>50.0</u>
>20' to ≤25'	47.3 <u>40.9</u>	82.3 <u>71.3</u>	121.8 <u>105.4</u>	51.2 <u>44.8</u>	60.4 <u>52.3</u>
>25' to ≤30'	49.2 <u>42.4</u>	85.7 <u>73.9</u>	126.8 <u>109.3</u>	53.6 <u>46.4</u>	62.9 <u>54.3</u>
>30' to ≤35'	50.9 <u>43.9</u>	88.5 <u>76.6</u>	130.9 <u>113.2</u>	55.3 <u>48.1</u>	65.0 <u>56.2</u>
>35 to ≤40'	52.3 <u>45.1</u>	91.0 <u>78.7</u>	134.6 <u>116.3</u>	56.9 <u>49.4</u>	66.8 <u>57.8</u>

¹ Calculated in accordance with ASCE 7-05 (Wind Speed: 146 mph).

² For Hip Roofs with slope ≤5.5: 12, P_{asd} (3) shall be treated as P_{asd} (2). ~~{Mod 2014r/2104r}~~

³ $P_{\text{asd}} = 0.6P_{\text{ult}}$

TABLE 2– Risk Category II Exposure Category 'D'¹ MINIMUM DESIGN WIND UPLIFT PRESSURES IN PSF FOR FIELD (P_{asd} (1), PERIMETER (P_{asd} (2) AND CORNER (P_{asd} (3) AREAS OF ROOFS FOR EXPOSURE D BUILDINGS WITH A ROOF MEAN HEIGHT AS SPECIFIED³					
ROOF SLOPE	> 2:12 to < 6:12			> 6:12 to < 12:12	
Roof mean height	P_{asd} (1)	P_{asd} (2)	P_{asd} (3) ²	P_{asd} (1)	P_{asd} (2) & P_{asd} (3)
≤20'	47.0	81.9	121.0	51.4	60.1
>20' to ≤25'	48.8	85.0	125.7	53.4	62.4
>25' to ≤30'	50.3	87.7	129.6	55.0	64.4
>30' to ≤35'	51.5	89.8	132.7	56.4	65.9
>35 to ≤40'	52.7	91.9	135.8	57.7	67.9

¹ Calculated in accordance with ASCE 7

² For Hip Roofs with slope ≤5.5: 12, P_{asd} (3) shall be treated as P_{asd} (2).

³ $P_{\text{asd}} = 0.6P_{\text{ult}}$

TABLE 23

WHERE TO OBTAIN INFORMATION		
Description	Symbol	Where to find
Design Pressure	P_{asd} (1) or P_{asd} (2) or P_{asd} (3)	Table 1 <u>or Table 2, as applicable,</u> or by an engineer analysis prepared, signed and sealed by a professional engineer based on ASCE 7
Mean Roof Height	H	Job Site
Roof Slope	θ	Job Site
Aerodynamic Multiplier	λ	Product Approval
Restoring Moment due to Gravity	M_g	Product Approval
Attachment Resistance	M_r	Product Approval
Required Moment Resistance	M_r	Calculated
Minimum Characteristic Resistance Load	F'	Product Approval
Required Uplift Resistance	F_r	Calculated
Average Tile Weight	W	Product Approval
Tile Dimensions	l=length w=width	Product Approval

All calculations must be submitted to the building official at the time of permitting.

Date Submitted	3/8/2011	Section 3.1		Proponent	T Stafford
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Correlation with ASCE 7-10

Rationale

Correlation with ASCE 7. The values shown in Table 1 have been calculated based on ASCE 7-05. When these numbers were calculated, the assumption was that the wind speed was 146 mph and the Exposure Category was C. With the new provisions, the wind speed varies in the HVHZ depending on the Risk Category. Additionally, Exposure D has been reintroduced for water surfaces. Values in Table 1 are converted to ultimate design pressures by dividing by 0.6.

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

3.1 This application standard applies to:

- a. exposure C category buildings; and
- b. building heights of less than or equal to 40 feet; and
- c. roof incline (pitch) is not greater than 1/2 in.:12 in.
- d. risk category II buildings.

TABLE 1

**MINIMUM DESIGN WIND UPLIFT PRESSURES, IN PSF FOR FIELD
(P(1), PERIMETER (P(2)**

**AND CORNER (P(3) AREAS OF ROOFS FOR EXPOSURE 'C'
BUILDINGS**

Roof mean height (below)	P(1) Field	P(2) Perimeter	P(3) Corners
20	<u>-49.2 -82</u>	<u>-82.6 -137.7</u>	<u>-124.3 -207.2</u>
25	<u>-51.4 -85.7</u>	<u>-86.3 -143.8</u>	<u>-129.9 -216.5</u>
30	<u>-53.6 -89.3</u>	<u>-89.9 -149.8</u>	<u>-135.3 -225.5</u>
35	<u>-55.2 -92</u>	<u>-92.7 -154.5</u>	<u>-139.5 -232.5</u>
40	<u>-56.9 -94.8</u>	<u>-95.4 -159</u>	<u>-143.6 -239.3</u>

1 Calculated in accordance with ASCE 7.

Date Submitted	3/10/2011	Section	RAS 128	Proponent	Michael Goolsby
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Establishing correlation of ASCE 7-10 with RAS 128.

Rationale

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the unintended conflict created within the updated code. The Roofing Application Standard is revised to provide appropriate design pressures for both Exposure Category 'C' and 'D' in simplified tables. The use of allowable design pressures is necessary for product approval comparisons in order to establish adequate component and cladding attachment. The proposed code change will have no negative impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

ROOFING APPLICATION STANDARD (RAS) No. 128**STANDARD PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING APPLICABLE WIND DESIGN PRESSURES FOR LOW SLOPE ROOF****1. Scope**

1.1 This roofing application standard has been developed to provide a responsive method of complying with the requirements of Chapters 15 & 16 (High-Velocity Hurricane Zones) of the Florida Building Code, Building . Compliance with the requirements and procedures herein specified, where the pressures (P_{asd}) have been determined based on ~~Table R128-1~~ Table 1 or Table 2, of this standard, as applicable, do not require additional signed and sealed engineering design calculations. All other calculations must be prepared, signed and sealed by a professional engineer or registered architect.

2. Definitions

2.1 For definitions of terms used in this application standard, refer to ASTM D 1079 and the Florida Building Code, Building.

3. Applicability

3.1 This application standard applies to:

- a. exposure C and D category buildings; and
- b. building heights of less than or equal to 40 feet; and
- c. roof incline (pitch) is not greater than 1/2 in.:12 in.

3.2 Using Table 1 or Table 2 below, as applicable, determine the minimum design pressure for each respective roof area, which corresponds to the applicable roof height range.

TABLE 1 – Risk Category II Exposure Category 'C' ¹			
MINIMUM DESIGN WIND UPLIFT PRESSURES, IN PSF FOR FIELD (P_{asd} (1), PERIMETER (P_{asd} (2)			
AND CORNER (P_{asd} (3) AREAS OF ROOFS FOR EXPOSURE 'C' BUILDINGS ²			
Roof mean height (below)	P_{asd} (1) Field	P_{asd} (2) (Perimeter)	P_{asd} (3) (Corners)
20	-49.2 -42.8	-82.6 -71.7	-124.3 -108.0
25	-51.4 -44.8	-86.3 -75.1	-129.9 -113.0
30	-53.6 -46.4	-89.9 -77.8	-135.3 -117.2
35	-55.2 -48.1	-92.7 -80.6	-139.5 -121.3
40	-56.9 -49.4	-95.4 -82.9	-143.6 -124.7

¹ Calculated in accordance with ASCE 7.

$$^2 P_{asd} = 0.6P_{ult}$$

TABLE 2– Risk Category II Exposure Category 'D'			
MINIMUM DESIGN WIND UPLIFT PRESSURES, IN PSF FOR FIELD (P_{asd} (1), PERIMETER (P_{asd} (2)			
AND CORNER (P_{asd} (3) AREAS OF ROOFS FOR EXPOSURE 'D' BUILDINGS			
Roof mean height (below)	P_{asd} (1) Field	P_{asd} (2) (Perimeter)	P_{asd} (3) (Corners)
20	-51.4	-86.2	-129.7
25	-53.4	-89.5	-134.7
30	-55.0	-92.3	-138.9
35	-56.4	-94.5	-142.3
40	-57.7	-96.8	-145.6

3.3 Referencing the selected Roof Assembly Product Approval, check that the listed maximum allowable design pressure for the particular approved system meets or exceeds those listed in Table 1 or Table 2 above, as applicable.

Date Submitted 3/8/2011

Section 1.6

Proponent

T Stafford

Chapter 1

Affects HVHZ No

Attachments

No

TAC Recommendation Pending Review

Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments

No

Alternate Language

No

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Correlation with ASCE 7-10

Rationale

Correlation with ASCE 7.

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

TAS 101-95 11

1.6 For the purposes of the testing required in TAS 101-95, design pressures calculated in accordance with ASCE 7 are permitted to be multiplied by 0.6.

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	4.4.2	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction.

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not discriminate.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade, clarifies intent of code.

TESTING APPLICATION STANDARD (TAS) No. 101-95

TEST PROCEDURE FOR STATIC UPLIFT RESISTANCE OF MORTAR OR ADHESIVE SET

Revise Section 1.4 to read as follows:

1.4 All testing and calculations shall be conducted by an approved testing agency and all test reports, including calculations, shall be signed by a Registered Design Professional per F.S., Section 471 or 481 ~~Professional Engineer or Registered Roof Consultant.~~ {3538}

Revise 4.4.2 to read as follows:

4.4.2 ~~The Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction ~~local building official~~ shall determine the acceptability of system installation based on results from engineering design calculations in compliance with RAS 127. These calculations shall be: 1) performed for all buildings having a roof mean height greater than 40 feet; 2) performed, signed and sealed by a Registered Design Professional per F.S., Section 471 or 481 ~~Professional Engineer or Registered Architect~~; and, 3) shall take precedence over the procedures outlined in Section 4.4.1. {3538}

Revise Section 7.2 to read as follows:

7.2 Underlayment

7.2.1 Underlayment shall be a standard 30/90 system with a 30 lb. ASTM D 226, Type II anchor sheet and an ~~ASTM D 249~~ ASTM D 6380 CLASS M mineral surface roll roofing as the top ply.

7.2.2 The anchor sheet shall be mechanically attached to the wood sheathing with 12 ga. roofing nails and ¹⁵/₈ in. ~~1⁵/₈ in.~~ tin caps, in a 12 in. grid pattern staggered in two rows in the field and 6 in. o.c. attachment at any laps. The mineral surface top ply shall be applied in a full mopping of ASTM D 312, Type IV asphalt. {3539}

Revise Section 7.6.4 to read as follows:

7.6.4 All tile shall be applied with a minimum 3 in. head lap unless restricted by product design. {3539}

Revise Section 7.6.5 to read as follows:

7.6.5 The first course shall consist of two tiles installed at the lower edge of the test deck. The second course shall consist of the 'test tile' installed over the first course, insuring for a minimum 3 in. head lap, unless restricted by product design. Tile in the first course which are not tested shall be installed to insure the "test tile," in the second course, is at the correct angle relative to the sheathing. . {3539}

Revise Section 7.8 to read as follows:

10.3.3 Determine the percent deviation from the mean (S'_F) using the information from Section ~~10.3.2.1~~ 10.3.2 and the following equation. {3539}

No change to the remaining text.

Revise Section 10.4 to read as follows:

10.4 Minimum Characteristic Resistance load (F')

10.4.1 The mean ultimate load, F , used to determine the minimum characteristic resistance load (F') shall be adjusted when the attachment system is used to provide resistance to more than one (1) roof tile by dividing the mean ultimate load by a load factor. For systems where the attachment provides resistance to a single roof tile the load factor shall be 1. For systems where the attachment provides resistance for two (2) roof tiles the load factor shall be 2. For systems where the attachment provides resistance for more than two (2) roof tiles the load factor shall be calculated and applied.

$$F' = \frac{F}{\text{Load Factor}}$$

~~10.4.1~~ 10.4.2 Determine the minimum characteristic resistance load (F') using the mean ultimate load (F) and the following equation.

where,

F' = minimum characteristic resistance load;

F = mean ultimate load;

MS = margin of safety = 2; and,

W = average weight.

NOTE: The requirement noted in Section 10.3.3.1 shall be met prior to determining the minimum characteristic resistance load (F'). {4343}

Revise Section 11.1.3 to read as follows:

11.1.3 A detailed report of the method of test specimen construction, including a photograph of the test specimen and certification by a Registered Design Professional per F.S., Section 471 or 481 Professional Engineer or Registered Roof Consultant that the test specimen was constructed in compliance with the specifications of this Protocol. {3538}

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	4.4.2	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not degrade

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TESTING APPLICATION STANDARD (TAS) No. 101-95

TEST PROCEDURE FOR STATIC UPLIFT RESISTANCE OF MORTAR OR ADHESIVE SET

Revise Section 1.4 to read as follows:

1.4 All testing and calculations shall be conducted by an approved testing agency and all test reports, including calculations, shall be signed by a Registered Design Professional per F.S., Section 471 or 481 ~~Professional Engineer or Registered Roof Consultant.~~ {3538}

Revise 4.4.2 to read as follows:

4.4.2 ~~The Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction ~~local building official~~ shall determine the acceptability of system installation based on results from engineering design calculations in compliance with RAS 127. These calculations shall be: 1) performed for all buildings having a roof mean height greater than 40 feet; 2) performed, signed and sealed by a Registered Design Professional per F.S., Section 471 or 481 ~~Professional Engineer or Registered Architect~~; and, 3) shall take precedence over the procedures outlined in Section 4.4.1. {3538}

Revise Section 7.2 to read as follows:

7.2 Underlayment

7.2.1 Underlayment shall be a standard 30/90 system with a 30 lb. ASTM D 226, Type II anchor sheet and an ~~ASTM D 249~~ ASTM D 6380 CLASS M mineral surface roll roofing as the top ply.

7.2.2 The anchor sheet shall be mechanically attached to the wood sheathing with 12 ga. roofing nails and ¹⁵/₈ in. ~~1⁵/₈ in.~~ tin caps, in a 12 in. grid pattern staggered in two rows in the field and 6 in. o.c. attachment at any laps. The mineral surface top ply shall be applied in a full mopping of ASTM D 312, Type IV asphalt. {3539}

Revise Section 7.6.4 to read as follows:

7.6.4 All tile shall be applied with a minimum 3 in. head lap unless restricted by product design. {3539}

Revise Section 7.6.5 to read as follows:

7.6.5 The first course shall consist of two tiles installed at the lower edge of the test deck. The second course shall consist of the 'test tile' installed over the first course, insuring for a minimum 3 in. head lap, unless restricted by product design. Tile in the first course which are not tested shall be installed to insure the "test tile," in the second course, is at the correct angle relative to the sheathing. . {3539}

Revise Section 7.8 to read as follows:

10.3.3 Determine the percent deviation from the mean (S'_F) using the information from Section ~~10.3.2.1~~ 10.3.2 and the following equation. {3539}

No change to the remaining text.

Revise Section 10.4 to read as follows:

10.4 Minimum Characteristic Resistance load (F')

10.4.1 The mean ultimate load, F , used to determine the minimum characteristic resistance load (F') shall be adjusted when the attachment system is used to provide resistance to more than one (1) roof tile by dividing the mean ultimate load by a load factor. For systems where the attachment provides resistance to a single roof tile the load factor shall be 1. For systems where the attachment provides resistance for two (2) roof tiles the load factor shall be 2. For systems where the attachment provides resistance for more than two (2) roof tiles the load factor shall be calculated and applied.

$$F' = \frac{F}{\text{Load Factor}}$$

~~10.4.1~~ 10.4.2 Determine the minimum characteristic resistance load (F') using the mean ultimate load (F) and the following equation.

where,

F' = minimum characteristic resistance load;

F = mean ultimate load;

MS = margin of safety = 2; and,

W = average weight.

NOTE: The requirement noted in Section 10.3.3.1 shall be met prior to determining the minimum characteristic resistance load (F'). {4343}

Revise Section 11.1.3 to read as follows:

11.1.3 A detailed report of the method of test specimen construction, including a photograph of the test specimen and certification by a Registered Design Professional per F.S., Section 471 or 481 Professional Engineer or Registered Roof Consultant that the test specimen was constructed in compliance with the specifications of this Protocol. {3538}

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	4.4.2	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not degrade

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

Testing Application Standards (TAS)

Chapter No. 102-95 - Test Procedure for Static Uplift Resistance of Mechanically Attached, Rigid Roof Systems

1.4 All testing and calculations shall be conducted by an approved testing agency and all test reports, including calculations, shall be signed by a **Registered Design Professional per F.S., Section 471 or 481** Professional Engineer ~~or Registered Roof Consultant~~.

4.4.2 ~~The Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction ~~local building official~~ shall determine the acceptability of system installation based on results from engineering design calculations in compliance with RAS 127. These calculations shall be: 1) performed for all buildings having a roof mean height greater than 40 feet; 2) performed, signed and sealed by a **Registered Design Professional per F.S., Section 471 or 481** Professional Engineer ~~or a Registered Architect~~; and, 3) shall take precedence over the procedures outlined in Section 4.4.1.

7.2.1 Underlayment shall be a standard 30/90 system with a 30 lb ASTM D 226, type II anchor sheet and an ASTM D-249 ASTM D 6380 CLASS M mineral surface roll roofing as the top ply.

7.8 The test specimen shall be inspected by a **Registered Design Professional per F.S., Section 471 or 481** Professional Engineer ~~or Registered Roof Consultant~~ who shall certify, in the final test report, that it was constructed in compliance with the provisions of this Protocol.

10.1.3 A detailed report of the method of test specimen construction, including a photograph of the test specimen and certification by a **Registered Design Professional per F.S., Section 471 or 481** Professional Engineer ~~or Registered Roof Consultant~~ that the test specimen was constructed in compliance with the specifications of the Protocol.

{3540}

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	4.42	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not degrade

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 102(A)

4.4.2 The ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction shall determine the acceptability of system installation based on results from engineering design calculations in compliance with RAS 127. These calculations shall be: 1) performed for all buildings having a roof mean height greater than 40 feet; 2) performed, signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer or Registered Architect; and, 3) shall take precedence over the procedures outlined in Section 4.4.1.

Date Submitted	3/9/2011	Section	7.1.1.2	Proponent	Jaime Gascon
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Corrects a glitch where inches are specified and it should be feet for the dimension of a wind uplift test deck.

Rationale

This glitch is an unintended consequence from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments. The change occurs in a test protocol, which is specific to Florida, and would not have a negative impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

Corrects the required size of test deck, and removes the need to interpret the section.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

Corrects a glitch, and curtails delays that could be caused by the error.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Corrects a glitch and improves the code for easier enforcement.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Corrects a glitch and improves the code for easier enforcement.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not discriminate; it corrects a glitch.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

It improves the code by correcting a glitch.

7.1.1.2 Four (4) 8'-~~in.~~ x 8' test decks shall be constructed of 40/20 ¹⁹/₃₂ in. APA Rated Sheathing attached to wood joists spaced 24 o.c. Each test deck shall consist of four (4) panels of said sheathing, the corners of which shall meet at the center of each test deck, leaving a ¹/₈ in. gap between panels.

Date Submitted 3/8/2011

Section 1.3

Proponent

T Stafford

Chapter 1

Affects HVHZ No

Attachments

No

TAC Recommendation Pending Review

Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments No

Alternate Language

No

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Correlation with ASCE 7-10

Rationale

Correlation with ASCE 7.

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

TAS 105-98 11

1.3 For the purposes of the testing required in TAS 105-11, design pressures calculated in accordance with ASCE 7 are permitted to be multiplied by 0.6.

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	11.1	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not degrade

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 107

11.1 A test report will be provided to the ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction confirming successful compliance with the test provisions of this Protocol. Completion of this test Protocol is one in a series of Testing Application Standards required by the Florida Building Code, Building for Product Approval of non-rigid, discontinuous Roof System Assemblies.

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	4.1	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not degrade

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 108

4.1 Use of this protocol is limited to systems which are air permeable, as determined in compliance with TAS 116 or deemed air permeable by the ~~chief code compliance officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction, in which the unsealed, overlapping, rigid components have a length between 1.0 and 1.75 feet; an exposed width between 0.73 and 1.25 feet; and a thickness not greater than 1.3 in.

Note: The ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction may waive the requirement for air permeability testing in compliance with TAS 116.

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	11.1	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not degrade

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 112

11.1 The ~~chief code compliance officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction shall certify that the tile is in compliance with this protocol by the issuance of a Product Approval to the applicant. Tile forms part of a system that requires testing under additional protocols for usage in the high- velocity hurricane zone jurisdiction.

Date Submitted	3/8/2011	Section	1.9	Proponent	T Stafford
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Correlation with ASCE 7-10

Rationale

Correlation with ASCE 7.

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

TAS 114-95 11

1.9 Design pressures calculated in accordance with ASCE 7 are permitted to be multiplied by 0.6 for the purposes of comparing to tested pressures in TAS 114-11.

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	4.4.1	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not degrade

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 114

4.4.1 The effective date of a protocol mandates that all products tested for Approval after the effective date must satisfy the requirements of that protocol. Products Approved under a previous Protocol must comply with the new version by the effective date or such date established by the ~~chief code compliance officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction or else forfeit Product Approval. The effective date may apply to the entire protocol, or, where so indicated, only to specific paragraphs of the protocol.

8.1.1 This protocol is intended to evaluate a roof system assembly for its performance as it relates to accelerated weathering, corrosion of metal parts, F.I.T. performance (Fatigue, Indentation and Temperature), fire, foot traffic, hail, leakage, and wind. The applicant may submit up to five roof system assemblies in its Application for Product Approval. The ~~chief code compliance officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction shall respond, in writing, stating which tests shall be required for sufficient evidence of compliance.

8.2.3 Tests of alternate constructions may be waived by the ~~chief code compliance officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction if considered less hazardous than those previously tested.

8.3.2.3 Simulated uplift testing:

* * *

• The ~~chief code compliance officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction may, at his/her option, accept and publish in Product Approvals roof system assemblies that do not meet the minimum 90 psf (4.2 kPa) uplift criteria providing the manufacturer has one or more assemblies that meet the minimum uplift criteria.

9.2.1.3 The ~~chief code compliance officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction may rely on continued listing of approved systems in the annual Factory Mutual Approval Guide and quarterly supplements as confirmation of requirements under this section.

9.2.2.2 The ~~chief code compliance officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction shall review established procedures from recognized testing and listing agencies to confirm compliance with the requests set forth herein.

Date Submitted 3/8/2011

Section 7.6

Proponent

T Stafford

Chapter 1

Affects HVHZ No

Attachments

No

TAC Recommendation Pending Review

Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments

No

Alternate Language

No

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Correlation with ASCE 7-10

Rationale

Correlation with ASCE 7.

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

TAS 114-95 11

7.6 Design pressures calculated in accordance with ASCE 7 are permitted to be multiplied by 0.6 for the purposes of comparing to tested pressures in TAS 114-11.

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	4.2	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not degrade

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 116

4.2 The procedures and calculations outlined herein provide a means of determining the air permeability (Cd) for a rigid, discontinuous roof system. This value shall be listed in the system manufacturer's roof system assembly Product Approval for reference by the chief code compliance officer to determine whether the system is air permeable or air impermeable. The ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction may nullify this testing requirement for systems which are generally considered air permeable.

4.3 The test criteria will be based on testing, under the provisions of this Protocol, of rigid, prepared roof coverings which are generally considered air impermeable (i.e. metal roof systems, and lap sealed, rigid prepared roof coverings). This criteria shall be determined by September 1, 1994. Until that date, the ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction shall judge as to whether a prepared roof covering is air permeable or air impermeable.

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	8.1	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not degrade

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 121

8.1 The authority having jurisdiction may periodically purchase commercial quantities of the approved product for testing at approved Testing Agencies to confirm compliance with the provisions of the ASTM Standard or Testing Application Standards. Failure to meet the minimum physical property and performance properties of the test standard shall constitute grounds for rejection of the lots and suspension of the Product Approval. In cases of rejection the ~~chief code compliance officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction shall request removal of the rejected lot number(s) from commercial sale.

8.2 The ~~chief code compliance officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction may, after rejection of one or more lots, require third party quality control inspection as a provision to lifting of approval suspension.

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	10.1	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction in 123 Appendix A

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not degrade

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 123

10.1 The ~~chief code compliance officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction may periodically purchase commercial quantities of the Approved product for testing to confirm compliance with the provisions of this protocol. Failure to meet the minimum requirements set forth in this protocol shall constitute grounds for rejection of the lots and suspension of the Product Approval. In cases of rejection the ~~chief code compliance officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction shall request removal of the rejected lot number(s) from commercial sale.

Date Submitted	3/8/2011	Section	1.7	Proponent	T Stafford
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	No	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Correlation with ASCE 7-10

Rationale

Correlation with ASCE 7.

The proposed code change corrects a conflict within the updated code. The Florida specific need is established due to the conflict within the updated code. The proposed code change will have no impact on small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

No impact.

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

No impact.

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Not applicable. Corrects a conflict within the updated code.

TAS 124-95 11

1.7 Design pressures calculated in accordance with ASCE 7 are permitted to be multiplied by 0.6 for the purposes of comparing to tested pressures in TAS 124-11.

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	11.2 - 14.1	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not degrade

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 131

11.2 If the results of any tests do not conform to the requirements of this specification, retesting to determine conformity shall be performed as required by the ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction.

14.1 Upon request of the ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction, a manufacturer may be required to certify that the material was manufactured and tested in accordance with this Protocol. Additional testing for confirmation may be required by an approved testing agency.

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	10.	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not degrade

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 132**10. Rejection and Reinspection**

10.1 The ~~Building Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction may periodically purchase commercial quantities of the approved product for testing at Approved Testing Agencies to confirm compliance with the provisions of this Protocol. Failure to meet the minimum requirements set forth in Section 5 shall constitute grounds for rejection of the lots and suspension of the Product Approval. In cases of rejection the Authority Having Jurisdiction shall request removal of the rejected lot number(s) from commercial sale.

10.2 The ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction may, after rejection of one or more lots, require third party quality control inspection as a provision to lifting of Approval suspension.

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	1.2 - 1.3	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not degrade

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 135

1.2 The designation of fiberglass reinforced composite products between tile, shingles or panels, and the corresponding test requirements thereof, shall be made by the ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction.

1.3 The designation of non-asbestos, fiber cement products between shingles, shakes or panels, and the corresponding test requirements thereof, shall be made by the ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction.

Date Submitted	2/25/2011	Section	11.1 - 11.2	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not degrade

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 138

11.1 The Authority Having Jurisdiction may periodically purchase commercial quantities of the approved product for testing at Approved Testing Agencies to confirm compliance with the provisions of this Protocol. Failure to meet the minimum requirements set forth in Sections 6 and 7 shall constitute grounds for rejection of the lots and suspension of the Product Approval. In cases of rejection the ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction shall request removal of the rejected lot number(s) from commercial sale.

11.2 The ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction may, after rejection of one or more lots, require third party quality control inspection as a provision to lifting of Approval suspension.

Date Submitted	2/28/2011	Section	9.1 9.2	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not discriminate.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 139

9.1 The Authority Having Jurisdiction may periodically purchase commercial quantities of the approved product for testing at Approved Testing Agencies to confirm compliance with the provisions of this Protocol. Failure to meet the minimum requirements set forth in Sections 5 and 6 shall constitute grounds for rejection of the lots and suspension of the Product Approval. In cases of rejection the ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction shall request removal of the rejected lot number(s) from commercial sale.

9.2 The ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction may, after rejection of one or more lots, require third party quality control inspection as a provision to lifting of Approval suspension.

Date Submitted	2/28/2011	Section	8.1 - 8.2	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not discriminate.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 140

8.1 The Authority Having Jurisdiction may periodically purchase commercial quantities of the approved product for testing at Approved Testing Agencies to confirm compliance with the provisions of this Protocol. Failure to meet the minimum requirements set forth in Sections 5 and 6 shall constitute grounds for rejection of the lots and suspension of the Product Approval. In cases of rejection the ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction shall request removal of the rejected lot number(s) from commercial sale.

8.2 The ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction may, after rejection of one or more lots, require third party quality control inspection as a provision to lifting of Approval suspension.

Date Submitted 2/28/2011
Chapter 1

Section 10.1 10.2
Affects HVHZ Yes

Proponent Oriol Haage
Attachments No

TAC Recommendation Pending Review
Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments No **Alternate Language** No

Related Modifications

Summary of Modification

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements

Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not discriminate.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 141

10.1 The Authority Having Jurisdiction may periodically purchase commercial quantities of the approved product for testing at Approved Testing Agencies to confirm compliance with the provisions of this Protocol. Failure to meet the minimum requirements set forth in Sections 5 and 6 shall constitute grounds for rejection of the lots and suspension of the Product Approval. In cases of rejection the ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction shall request removal of the rejected lot number(s) from commercial sale.

10.2 The ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction may, after rejection of one or more lots, require third party quality control inspection as a provision to lifting of Approval suspension.

Date Submitted	2/28/2011	Section	9.1 - 9.2	Proponent	Oriol Haage
Chapter	1	Affects HVHZ	Yes	Attachments	No
TAC Recommendation	Pending Review				
Commission Action	Pending Review				
<u>Comments</u>					
General Comments	No	Alternate Language		No	

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not discriminate.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 142

9.1 The Authority Having Jurisdiction may periodically purchase commercial quantities of the approved product for testing at Approved Testing Agencies to confirm compliance with the provisions of this Protocol. Failure to meet the minimum requirements set forth in Sections 5 and 6 shall constitute grounds for rejection of the lots and suspension of the Product Approval. In cases of rejection the ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction shall request removal of the rejected lot number(s) from commercial sale.

9.2 The ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction may, after rejection of one or more lots, require third party quality control inspection as a provision to lifting of Approval suspension.

Date Submitted 2/28/2011

Section 9.1 - 9.2

Proponent Oriol Haage

Chapter 1

Affects HVHZ Yes

Attachments No

TAC Recommendation Pending Review

Commission Action Pending Review

Comments

General Comments No

Alternate Language No

Related Modifications**Summary of Modification**

Replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction

Rationale

Editorial correction to replace Chief Code Compliance Officer terminology with Authority Having Jurisdiction. This glitch modification is necessary based on unintended results from the integration of previously adopted Florida-specific amendments with the FBC. This will not impact small business.

Fiscal Impact Statement**Impact to local entity relative to enforcement of code**

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to building and property owners relative to cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Impact to industry relative to the cost of compliance with code

None. Clarification of terminology

Requirements**Has a reasonable and substantial connection with the health, safety, and welfare of the general public**

Clarification of terminology allows for enhanced interpretation and enforcement of the code.

Strengthens or improves the code, and provides equivalent or better products, methods, or systems of construction

Strengthens code through clarification of terminology.

Does not discriminate against materials, products, methods, or systems of construction of demonstrated capabilities

Does not discriminate.

Does not degrade the effectiveness of the code

Does not degrade

TAS 143

9.1 The Authority Having Jurisdiction may periodically purchase commercial quantities of the approved product for testing at Approved Testing Agencies to confirm compliance with the provisions of this Protocol. Failure to meet the minimum requirements set forth in Sections 5 and 6 shall constitute grounds for rejection of the lots and suspension of the Product Approval. In cases of rejection the ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction shall request removal of the rejected lot number(s) from commercial sale.

9.2 The ~~Chief Code Compliance Officer~~ Authority Having Jurisdiction may, after rejection of one or more lots, require third party quality control inspection as a provision to lifting of Approval suspension.