FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION



FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY REPORT OF THE OCTOBER 13, 2009 COMMISSION PLENARY SESSION TAMPA, FLORIDA

Facilitation, Meeting and Process Design By



Report By Jeff A. Blair FCRC Consensus Center Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium Florida State University



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

This document is available in alternate formats upon request to Dept. of Community Affairs, Codes & Standards, 2555 Shumard Oak Blvd., Tallahassee, FL 32399, (850) 487-1824.

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

SUPPLEMENT TO THE OCTOBER 13, 2009 MINUTES

OVERVIEW OF COMMISSION'S KEY DECISIONS

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2008

Welcome

Chairman Rodriguez welcomed the Commission, staff and the public to Tampa and the October 2009 plenary session. The Chair indicated that the one-day Commission format provides time for workgroup meetings to be held in conjunction with Commission meetings and reduces travel and meeting costs. The Chair noted that the primary focus of October's meeting was to conduct rule development initiatives on Rule 9B-72.130, Product Approval, Application Limitations, and to select the foundations codes for the 2010 Florida Building Code Update.

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

Commission Attendance

Chairman Rodriguez conducted a roll-call and the following members were in attendance: Raul L. Rodriguez, AIA, Hamid Bahadori, Bob Boyer, Dick Browdy, Ed Carson, Kiko Franco, Herminio Gonzalez, Jim Goodloe, Ken Gregory, Dale Greiner, Tony Grippa, Jeff Gross, Jon Hamrick, Scott Mollan, Nicholas Nicholson, Rafael Palacios, John Scherer, Jim Schock, Chris Schulte, Drew Smith, Jeff Stone, Tim Tolbert, Mark Turner, and Randall Vann.

Absent:

Donald Dawkins.

DCA Staff Present

Joe Bigelow, Rick Dixon, Jim Hammers, Bruce Ketcham, Ila Jones, Mo Madani, Ann Stanton, and Jim Richmond.

Meeting Facilitation

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



Project Webpage

Information on the project, including agenda packets, meeting reports, and related documents may be found in downloadable formats at the project webpage below: http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/index.html

Agenda Review and Approval

The Commission voted unanimously, 24 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda for the October 13, 2009 meeting as amended. Following are the key agenda items approved for consideration:

- To Consider Regular Procedural Issues: Agenda Approval and Approval of the August 11, 2009 Minutes and Facilitator's Summary Report.
- To Consider/Decide on Chair's Discussion Issues/Recommendations.
- To Review and Update the Commission Workplan.
- To Consider/Decide on Accessibility Waiver Applications.
- To Consider/Decide on Approvals and Revocations of Products and Product Approval Entities.
- To Consider Applications for Accreditor and Course Approval.
- To Consider/Decide on Legal Issues, Binding Interpretations, and Petitions for Declaratory Statements.
- To Consider/Decide on Code Administration, Electrical, Energy, Plumbing, and Structural Technical Advisory Committees (TAC's) Report/Recommendations.
- To Consider/Decide on Product Approval/Manufactured Buildings and Education Program Oversight Committee (POC's) Reports/Recommendations.
- To Consider/Decide on Workgroup/Subcommittee Reports/Recommendations: Florida Accessibility Code, Florida Energy Code, Window/Wall, Pool Efficiency Subcommittee, and Swimming Pool Subcommittee.
- To Hear an Update on the Septic System Sizing Workgroup Project.
- To Conduct Rule Development Workshop on Rule 9B-72.130 Product Approval.
- To Consider the Schedule for Development and Adoption of the 2010 Florida Building Code.
- To Consider Selection of 2009 I-Codes for Foundation of the 2010 Florida Building Code.
- To Consider Product Approval Administrator Contract.
- To Consider Report to US Department of Energy on Equivalence of Florida Energy Code to ASHRAE 90.1-2005.
- To Consider Report on Florida Energy Code Impact on Utility Conservation Programs.
- To Discuss Commissioner Comments and Issues.
- To Receive Public Comment.
- To Review Committee Assignments and Issues for the Next Meeting—December 7 9, 2009 in Orlando.

Amendments to the Agenda:

Update on Septic System Sizing Workgroup project.

Recognition of Retiring Commissioners

Chairman Rodriguez expressed appreciation, on behalf of the Commission, for departing Commissioners Paul Kidwell, Bill Norkunas, and Matt Carlton for their service.

The Chair presented Paul Kidwell with a plaque commemorating his years of dedicated, professional, and selfless service on behalf of your profession, industry, the Commission, and the citizens of Florida. The Chair stated that Paul has been an excellent contributor to the Commission in his role representing "structural engineers". Paul has been instrumental in assisting the Commission to develop consensus on thorny issues such as the interior designers' being listed in the Code issue, where he set aside his personal desires in favor of crafting a consensus for the good of the code and commission. Paul served from February 20, 2002 - June 10, 2009.

The Chair expressed appreciation for Bill Norkunas' years of dedicated, professional, and selfless service on behalf of his profession, industry, the Commission, and the citizens of Florida. He has been an excellent contributor to the Commission in his role representing "persons with disabilities". Bill served from June 15, 2005 - June 10, 2009.

The Chair expressed appreciation for Matt Carlton's years of dedicated, professional, and selfless service on behalf of his profession, industry, the Commission, and the citizens of Florida. He has been an excellent contributor to the Commission in his role representing "general contractors". Matt served from August 30, 2007 - June 10, 2009.

Review and Approval of the August 11, 2009 Meeting Minutes and Facilitator's Summary Report

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 24 - 0 in favor, to approve the August 11, 2009 Meeting Minutes as presented and August 11, 2009 Facilitator's Summary Report as presented.

Amendments:

None were provided; however, the Commission noted that there were missing sections of the minutes that need to be included.

Chair's Discussion Issues and Recommendations

1. Appointments {Commission—TAC/POC(s)—Workgroup(s)}

The Chair made the following appointments, welcoming new appointments and thanking members who rotated-off. The appointments for October are as follows:

Accessibility TAC

Chris Masul was appointed to the Accessibility TAC. J.W. Longman was appointed to the Accessibility TAC.

Window/Wall Workgroup

Peter Helton was appointed to the Window Wall Workgroup. Dave Olmstead rotated-off of the Window Wall Workgroup.

Review and Update of Commission Workplan

Rick Dixon reviewed the updated Workplan with the Commission and answered member's questions. Rick requested and the Commission agreed to defer discussion on the proposed schedule for the development of the 2010 Florida Building Code until the specific agenda item later in the meeting.

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 24 - 0 in favor, to approve the updated Commission Workplan as presented.

(Included as Attachment 2—Commission's Updated Workplan)

Consideration of Accessibility Waiver Applications

The Commission reviewed and decided on the Waiver applications submitted for their consideration. (Included as Attachment 4—Accessibility Waiver Summary Report)

Consideration of Applications for Product and Entity Approval

Commissioner Carson presented the committee's recommendations for entities and Jeff Blair presented the committee's recommendations for product approvals. The results of product and entity applications are included as an attachment to this Report.

(Included as Attachment 6—Product and Entity Approval Report)

Consider Applications for Accreditor and Course Approval

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

Commission Actions—Education POC:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18-0 in favor, to approve advanced course # 372.0.

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 - 0 in favor, to approve advanced course # 373.0.

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 18 - 0 in favor, to approve advanced course # 375.0.

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 20 - 0 in favor, to approve administrative approval courses on a consent agenda as follows: # 258.1, 323.1, and 324.1.

(See Commission Minutes for Committee Report)

Consideration of Legal Issues

Appeals

None.

Product Approval Revocations

None.

Binding Interpretations

None.

Legal Report

Petitions For Declaratory Statements

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

Second Hearings

DCA09-DEC-129 by Rodger England of Bermuda Roof Co., Inc. DCA09-DEC-253* by C.S. Breslauer of Bermuda Roof Co, Inc

Motion—The Commission voted 21 - 0 in favor, to approve the draft order on the petition. *253 is an amendment to 129 and was assigned a petition number in error.

DCA09-DEC-254 by Mike Harris of Sea Shutters Inc.

Motion—The Commission voted 21 - 0 in favor, to approve the draft order on the petition.

DCA09-DEC- 257 by Mitch Thomas

Motion—The Commission voted 23 - 0 in favor, to approve the draft order on the petition as amended. (Amendment: indicate the order does not apply to licensure.

DCA09-DEC-260 by Joseph Scofield, Advanced Manufacturing & Power System, Inc.

Motion—The Commission voted 23 - 0 in favor, to approve the draft order on the petition as amended. (Amendment: indicate the order applies to occupied and unoccupied enclosures).

DCA09-DEC-263 by Steven Clisset of Windstrips LLC

Motion—The Commission voted 23 - 0 in favor, to approve the draft order on the petition.

First Hearings

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

Motion—The Commission voted 23 - 1 in favor, to approve the TAC's recommendation on the petition.

DCA09-DEC-309 by Alan Plante of Orange County Division of Building Safety

The petition was referred to the Plumbing TAC/Swimming Pool Subcommittee to the Plumbing TAC.

DCA09-DEC-269 by Thomas Ford, RA of Bhamani, Ford & Associates, Inc.

Motion—The Commission voted 24 - 0 in favor, to approve the TAC's recommendation on the petition.

(Included as Attachment 5—Legal Report)

Committee Reports and Recommendations

The Chair requested TAC/POC chairs to confine their reports to a brief summary of any key recommendations, emphasizing those issues requiring an action from the Commission. The Chair requested if the TAC/POC requires Commission action, to frame the needed action in the form of a proposed motion. This will ensure that the Commission understands exactly what the TAC/POC's are recommending, and the subsequent action requested of the Commission. The Chair explained that the complete reports/minutes will be entered into the record and included as a part of the Commission's report for review and approval at the next Commission meeting.

Florida Accessibility Code Workgroup Report and Recommendations

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

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 23 - 0 in favor to accept the report.

The Report may be viewed at the project webpage:

http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/accessibility-code.html

Code Administration TAC

Commissioner Gonzalez presented the Committee's report and recommendations.

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 21 - 0 in favor, to accept the report. (See Commission Minutes for Committee Report)

Education POC

Commissioner Browdy presented the Committee's report and recommendations.

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 21 - 0 in favor, to accept the report. (See Commission Minutes for Committee Report)

Electrical TAC

Commissioner Carson presented the Committee's report and recommendations.

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 21 - 0 in favor, to accept the report. (See Commission Minutes for Committee Report)

Florida Energy Code Workgroup Report and Recommendations

Jeff Blair reported on the Florida Energy Code Workgroup's meeting and answered member's questions.

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 21 - 0 in favor to accept the report. The Report may be viewed at the project webpage: http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/2010-Florida-Energy-Code.html

Energy TAC

Commissioner Greiner presented the Committee's report and recommendations.

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 21 - 0 in favor, to accept the report. (See Commission Minutes for Committee Report)

Plumbing TAC

Commissioner Vann presented the Committee's report and recommendations.

Commission Actions:

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

Structural TAC

Commissioner Schock presented the Committee's report and recommendations.

Commission Actions:

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

Product Approval POC

Commissioner Carson presented the Committee's report and recommendations.

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 21 - 0 in favor to accept the report.

Pool Efficiency Subcommittee to the Energy Code Workgroup Report and Recommendations

Jeff Blair reported on the Pool Efficiency Subcommittee to the Energy Code Workgroup's meeting and answered member's questions.

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 21 - 0 in favor to accept the report.

The Report may be viewed at the project webpage:

http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/Pool-Efficiency.html

Swimming Pool Subcommittee to the Plumbing TAC Report and Recommendations

Commissioner Gregory presented the Subcommittee's report and recommendations.

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 21 - 0 in favor, to accept the report.

Window Wall Report and Recommendations

Jeff Blair reported on the Window Wall Workgroup's meeting and answered member's questions.

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 23 - 0 in favor to accept the report.

The Report may be viewed at the project webpage:

http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/wwg.html

Septic System Sizing Workgroup Update

Jeff Blair provided the Commission with an update of on the septic System Workgroup project and answered member's questions. Jeff reported that DOH members have reported that the Florida Department of Health's (DOH) Technical Review and Advisory Panel (TRAP) have discussed the Universal Bedroom Definition/Septic System Sizing recommendations from the Commission's and DOH's Septic System Sizing Workgroup's recommendations and were not able to reach consensus on changes regarding the sizing of septic systems. The matter was tabled at the TRAP's August 2009 meeting pending future consideration.

Information of the project including relevant excerpts from the June 2008, February 2009, and August 2009 TRAP meetings may be viewed at the project webpage:

http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/ssswg.html

Rule Development Workshop on Rule 9B-72.130 Product Approval, Application Limitations and Amend BCIS Screens

At the August meeting the Commission voted to open Rule 9B-72.130 Product Approval, for the purpose of limiting the number of lines in an application to 150, and to conduct a rule development workshop at the October 2009 meeting. In addition, the BCIS screens will be modified to correlate with the change. The October Workshop provided an opportunity for public comment before the Commission proceeded with rule adoption.

The Rule Development Workshop was opened and an opportunity was presented for public comment. Mo Madani presented the POC's recommendations on amendments to the Rule, and at the conclusion of public comment an opportunity was offered for Commission discussion, and then the Commission took the following action:

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 24 - 0 in favor, to proceed with rule adoption for Rule 9B-72.130, Product Approval, Application Limitations and Amending BCIS Screens to conform to the rule amendments, by integrating and noticing the adopted changes and proceeding with rule adoption by conducting a rule adoption hearing at the December 2009 meeting.

Consider the Schedule for Development and Adoption of the 2010 Florida Building Code Rick Dixon, FBC Executive Director, provided the Commission with staff's proposal for the schedule for the development and adoption of the 2010 Florida Building Code and answered member's questions.

Overview

The approach utilized for development of the 2007 Florida Building Code (FBC) involved updating the 2004 FBC using the 2006 International (I) codes as the foundation and adding Florida specific amendments. The Florida modifications are presented first as a Supplement to the I-codes published online then they were integrated into the 2006 I-codes and published as the 2007 FBC. The complexity of the interrelated codes and of the process of integrating Florida specifics into the I-codes results in publication errors as well as correlation problems between code volumes. These "glitches" were repaired after publication of the 2007 FBC through a streamlined code amendment process that resulted in publication online of a 2009 Supplement to the 2007 FBC and publication of replacement pages for the FBC documents roughly six months later.

The approach presented in the proposed draft plan defers printing of codebooks until after the completion of the glitch amendment fixes to the 2010 FBC. The 2010 FBC development and adoption will proceed consistent with the process required by law and Florida amendments to the 2009 I-codes (the new foundation codes as required by law) will be published online as a Supplement to the 2009 I Codes. The codebooks publishing process will begin when the Supplement is posted to the web. The glitch amendment proceeding will begin at this point also with the intent to limit glitch amendments to those identified by code professionals contracted to monitor the development of the 2010 FBC and to adopt the 2011 National Electric Code pursuant to law. At least one contractor will be hired to evaluate the FBC Update for errors and unintended consequences, conflicts with laws and rules, etc. Note, the contractor who will identify correlation issues and similar glitches may be the publishing contractor similar to what the ICC does when publishing new I codes based amendments approved through the ICC formal amendment review and approval process. The output of this glitch amendment process will be published on the web and the glitch amendments will be integrated into

the 2010 FBC documents before they are first made available for sale. Given the glitches will be limited and ideally identified by the publisher (and perhaps an additional contractor) the time to completion of the final printed codes will be short.

Note: The glitch amendment process authorized by law can be conducted at any point the Commission determines there is a significant error or glitch as specified in law that needs to be resolved by a code amendment. The glitch amendment proceedings should be narrowly focused and not used as an opportunity for parties to submit code change proposals that do not qualify with the conditions set forth in law. The glitch proceeding outlined in this plan attempts to meet that intent and limit the potential for what occurred during the glitch amendment proceeding for the 2007 FBC.

This plan complies with the requirement of law that conflicts between the FFPC and FBC must be avoided by timing implementation of the 2010 FBC to the last date the State Fire Marshal considers the 2010 FFPC can take effect pursuant to its law. The FFPC and FBC development include a process for correlating requirements between the new editions of each code. However, differing year editions of the two codes can be in conflict.

Following an opportunity for public comment, Commissioner question and answers, and Commission discussion the Commission took the following action:

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 24 - 0 in favor, to adopt the plan and schedule for the development and adoption of the 2010 Florida Building Code Update as presented. Including: TAC review of proposed code amendments serving as the rule development workshop, Commission review of TAC recommendations serving as the rule adoption hearing, and an effective date of December 31, 2011 for the 2010 Florida Building Code Update.

(Included as Attachment 3—2010 Code Development and Update Schedule)

Consider Selection of 2009 I Codes for Foundation of the 2010 Florida Building Code

The Chair explained that the Commission is required by law to wait six months after all volumes of the I-Codes are available prior to selecting the latest Edition of the I-Codes as the foundation for the Florida Building Code. The Chair indicated that the last volume of the I-Codes was available on April 2, 2009 and the six month time-frame was achieved, allowing the Commission to select the 2009 Edition of the I-Codes as the foundation for the 2010 Edition of the Florida Building Code. Following an opportunity for public comment the Commission took the following action:

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted, 23 - 1 in favor, to select the 2009 I-Codes as the foundation codes for the 2010 Edition of the Florida Building Code.

Product Approval Administrator Contract

Chairman Rodriguez explained that at the August 2009 meeting the Commission concluded rulemaking regarding Product Approval fees and decided to a fee split of 60% to the Commission and 40% to the Administrator. The Department met with the current Administrator (Ted Berman) to negotiate over the new split and the issue was referred to the POC for their recommendations. Any changes to the adopted fee distribution will need Commission approval. The Product Approval POC discussed the issue during their meeting and developed recommendations. Commissioner Carson provided the POC's recommendations and then an opportunity was presented for public comment. Following public comment the Commission discussed the issue and took the following action:

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted, 23 - 1 in favor, to adopt the POC's recommendations as follows: For the duration of the exiting contract (through June 30, 2009) the Administrator will maintain their current fee schedule for all services, and the residual of the revised fees will go to the Commission.

Consider Report to US Department of Energy on Equivalence of Florida Energy Code to ASHRAE 90.1-2005

Chairman Rodriguez indicated that States are required to certify that their energy codes are equivalent to a code identified by US DOE. Florida must certify that Florida Energy Code is equivalent to ASHRAE 90.1-2004 and FSEC has done the analysis supporting that Florida's Code is stronger than the ASHRAE 90.1-2004. The Energy TAC reviewed the analysis and recommended that the Commission send the certification to the United States Department of Energy (US DOE).

Following an opportunity for public comment, Commissioner questions and answers, and Commission discussion the Commission took the following action:

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 24 - 0 in favor, to send certification certifying that the Florida Energy Code is equivalent to ASHRAE 90.1-2004.

Consider Report on Florida Energy Code Impact on Utility Conservation Program

Chairman Rodriguez noted that as reported at the August meeting Chair the Commission received a letter from Jim Murley, chair of the Florida Energy and Climate Commission (FECC) indicating that the FECC is charged with providing comments to the Florida Public Service Commission concerning the updating of energy efficiency goals pursuant to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act. The FECC requested the Commission's assistance in providing input to the PSC regarding "assessment of building codes and appliance efficiency standards on the need for utility sponsored programs". The Commission had a report prepared providing the basic information for the 2007 Florida Building Code, and the Report has been updated for the 2010 Code development process, the revised Report and other existing documents will be used to provide the FECC with the information they need relative to their request.

Following an opportunity for public comment, Commissioner questions and answers, and Commission discussion the Commission took the following action:

Commission Actions:

Motion—The Commission voted unanimously, 24 - 0 in favor, to transmit the Report, "Florida Energy Code, The Baseline Efficiency for Florida Buildings", regarding assessment of building codes and appliance efficiency standards on the need for utility sponsored programs and relevant supporting documents to the Florida Energy and Climate Commission.

Commission Member Comment and Issues

Chairman Rodriguez invited Commission members to make and general comments to the Commission, or identify any issues or agenda items for the next Commission meeting (December 2009).

Commission Member Comments:

Grippa: inquired whether a committee had been established to evaluate the product approval fees issue. Response by Dixon: the Commission conducted a workshop on Monday, October 6, 2009 to solicit input and ideas regarding product approval process efficiency. There is also a standing budget committee that reviews financial issues and all commissioners are invited to attend their meetings

Grippa: indicted their was no rational basis for insurance premium credits, and there should be a process to ensure insurance premium credits are based on reasonable criteria.

Hamrick: requested that FSEC provided a tour for the Commission the next time the Commission meets in Melbourne, similar to the UF lab tour conducted in Gainesville.

Gregory: indicated that the Florida Building Code exception to the requirement for the pool pump GFI requirement for residential pools in the National Electrical Code, was not drafted as intended.

Gonzalez: Commission should consider charging fees for declaratory statements and accessibility waiver applications and include the recommendations in the Report to the 2010 Legislature.

Gonzalez: Commission has not met in South Florida in a number of years and should schedule a meeting there soon.

Gross: asked if the 2009 Supplement was available on-line.

Response by Madani: should be available in November.

Palacios: there is an Embassy Suites hotel in Fort Lauderdale that should accommodate the Commission's sleeping room and meeting space needs.

General Public Comment

Chairman Rodriguez invited members of the public to address the Commission on any issues under the Commission's purview.

Public Comments:

McMahan: the 2009 FBC Supplement will be available on-line November 1, 2009, and a CD version should be available in three months.

Adjourn

The Commission voted unanimously, 24 - 0 in favor, to adjourn the meeting at 12:05 PM.

ATTACHMENT 1

MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS

October 13, 2009—Tampa, Florida

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

1. Please assess the overall meeting.

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

2. Do you agree that each of the following meeting objectives was achieved?

- 9.58 Accessibility Waiver Applications.
- 9.37 Requests for Declaratory Statements.
- <u>9.58</u> Approval of Products and Product Approval Entities.
- <u>9.68</u> Chairs Issues and Recommendations.
- 9.68 Commission's Workplan and Meeting Schedule Review and Update.
- 9.68 TAC and POC Reports and Recommendations.
- 9.68 Workgroup and Committee Reports and Recommendations.
- 9.74 Rule Development Workshop on Rule 9B-72.130 Product Approval.
- 9.79 Schedule for Development and Adoption of the 2010 Florida Building Code.
- 9.79 Selection of 2009 I-Codes for Foundation of the 2010 Florida Building Code.
- 9.68 Discussion/Decision on Product Approval Administrator Contract.
- 9.42 Report to US DOE on Equivalence of Florida Energy Code to ASHRAE 90.1-2005.
- 9.42 Report on Florida Energy Code Impact on Utility Conservation Programs.

3. Please tell us how well the Facilitator helped the participants engage in the meeting.

- 9.63 The members followed the direction of the Facilitator.
- 9.89 The Facilitator made sure the concerns of all members were heard.
- 9.63 The Facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
- 9.79 Participant input was documented accurately in Meeting Notes and Facilitator's Report(s).

4. Please tell us your level of satisfaction with the meeting?

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

5. Please tell us your level of satisfaction with the meeting?

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

6. What did you like best about the meeting?

- Chairman's control skills.
- Plenary runs efficiently kudos to chairman and facilitator.
- Its' organization.
- Organization.
- Very nice facility.
- Starting the meeting on time.

7. How could the meeting have been improved?

- We need to limit all opening statements presentations to Commission to 5 minutes- be sure it is clearly published so presenters can properly schedule and time what they need to say. Also give the Chair the time to expand on a case-by-case basis. Then discussion would extend each topic as required. This is why I changed the 10 to a 5 (Regarding Declaratory Statements).
- Cut public comment time.
- Limit time on presentations.
- Limit budget discussions to sub-committees familiar with state government funding and budget processes.
- Sound was not clear.
- Improve sound system. Sound is not reaching the corner of the commission table.
- Have all people to speak into the microphone clearly.
- A break every 3 hours at least.
- Working pretty good.
- When discussing budgets and money please have a hand out with money amounts on it.

8. Do you have any other comments?

- Jeff Blair is outstanding. Could not function without him.
- Mo is well versed on the Code. Keep it up.
- Thanks to staff for a great job.
- Could we include a change to rule on products approval fees to cover budget needs by increasing fees to make up shortfall?
- Dolphins 31 Jets 27.

Comments on Specific Agenda Items:

None were provided.

PUBLIC-MEETING EVALUATION AND COMMENT RESULTS

None were completed.

ATTACHMENT 2

COMMISSION'S UPDATED WORKPLAN AND MEETING SCHEDULE

(Adopted Unanimously October 13, 2009)

MEETING DATES

2008

January 28,29 & 30 Cmsn March 17, 18 & 19 Cmsn May 5, 6 & 7 Cmsn June 23, 24 & 25 Cmsn August 18, 19 & 20 Cmsn October 13, 14 & 15 Cmsn December 8, 9 & 10 Cmsn World Golf Village, St. Augustine Embassy Suites, Tampa Crowne Plaza, Melbourne Rosen Centre, Orlando Naples Grande, Naples Embassy Suites, Tampa Embassy Suites, Tampa

2009

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

2010

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

2011

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

Meeting Location

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

Meeting Location

Tampa Embassy Suites Gainesville Hilton Crowne Plaza Melbourne Crowne Plaza Melbourne Gainesville Hiltlon Crowne Plaza Melbourne

Meeting Location

Reservation Deadline

January 11, 2009 March 06, 2009 March 08, 2009 July 20, 2009 September 11, 2009 November 06, 2009

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION 2009 WORKPLAN

Note: Red type indicates task originated as requirement of a law.

ANNUAL TASKS

1.	Report to	2010	Legis	slatu	re													
	Schedule: Commission identifies and receives draft recommendations											12/ 2/1	12/0 0	9				
	Status: Pending % Complete																	
Origination: Commission. Annual task authorized by statute																		
2.	Workpla	n Prio	ritiza	tion														
	Schedule: Survey sent to Commissioners 11/09											12/09						
	% Comp.	lete		1	— г		1	1	1			-	<u> </u>	1	I		1	7
									09	<u> </u>]
	nation: C	ommi	ssion	. An	nual i	task.			0%	0								
3.	2010 Con	nmissi	on E	ffect	ivene	ess Ass	essı	men	t Su	vey								
	Schedule Discussion Review re	n of su	•		ıment	t at Co1	nmi	issio	n me	etinį))					2/1 4/1		
	Status: Pending % Complete																	
										0/								
	Originati	ion·	Comi	nissi	ion. A	Innual	tas	k .	0	% 0								

25. Investigate a Consistent Definition of "Bedroom" for Department of Health On-site Septic System Sizing Regulations

0 1	•	•
b ah	~d:	1100
Sch	сии	uc.

Appoint a Commission Ad Hoc committee	3/19/08
DOH appoint members to work with Commission Ad Hoc committee	3/08-4/08
Task group meetings	5/7/08
	10/15/08
	4/7/09
DOH TRAP meets	Summer 09
Report to Commission and DOH	10/09
Additional consideration by TRAP	1/10

Status: In Progress

% Complete

-	 1										
											000
											889

Origination: The initiative to develop consistency between building department and health department

judgments of the number of bedrooms in a home as it applies to onsite sewage treatment system sizing

was suggested by Commissioner Browdy for two legislative sessions and the joint project with Department of Health was established by mutual agreement during the 2007 Legislative Session.

30. Develop Criteria for Evaluation Entity Approval and Adopt by Rule or Develop Recommendation for 2009 Legislature for Entities to be Recognized in Law

Schedule:

Product Approval POC considers at meetings 8/08-12/08
Recommendation to Commission for vote 12/10/08

Option 1: Selected

Recommend adding entities to list in law

Commission includes in report to Legislature (See Task 36) 2/09

Status: Completed – Commission recommendation was in bill that died

% Complete

Commission decides to implement option 2
Option 2: Recognize IAPMO by Rule
Rule Development Workshop by conference call
Rule Adoption Hearing by conference call
Rule effective

7/20/09
Rule effective

Origination: The 2008 Legislature directed the Commission to review the list of Product Evaluation

Entities currently identified in law and either recommend modifications to the list or establish criteria

for approval of additional entities by rule and report on those criteria to the 2009 Legislature.

3.	Evaluate Swimming Pool Entrapment Standards Application to Existing Pool	ls
	Schedule: Appoint Subcommittee to the Plumbing TAC	4/8/09
	Workgroup meetings	6/8/09 8/12/09
	Declaratory Statement request to clarify current code Commission considers any legislative recommendation	2/09 12/09
	Status: Pending % Complete	
	40%	

Origination: Plumbing TAC recommendation approved by Commission June 2008. Proposed by Spa and Pool association.

43. Coordination with Florida Department of Health on Accessible Restroom Requirements in Public Pool Licensing Regulations

Project Deferred to 2010 FBC Development Process Schedule: Staff Meetings DOH submits proposed rule changes 2/10 2010 FBC development proceeding (see schedule) Status: Pending % Complete

Origination: Commissioner Norkunas' recommendation to the Commission approved at the June 2008 meeting.

20%

50.	Evaluation of Standards to Address Corrosive Gypsum Board Outgassing											
	Schedule:											
	DOH led Committee appointed	2/09										
	Meetings	4/09-9/09										

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

Recommendation to Commission

DOH rule amendment and 2010 FBC submitted by **(DOH preliminary determination is no health hazard so no rule will be pursued for now.)**

Sta	tus:		Pe.	ndii	g								
%	Comp	lete											
			30	%									

Origination: State Incident Action Plan assignment resulting from the state emergency management mobilization to address "Chinese Drywall".

2010 FBC UPDATE DEVELOPMENT TASKS

Code Assembly Process

22. Evaluate and Adopt the Development Process for the 2010 Florida Building Code

Schedule:	
Chairman appoints a study committee 1/08	
Committee meets to review and develop recommendation on 2010 FBC	12/10/0
compilation approach	
Committee expanded to consider code development proceedings and schedule	4/7/09
and declaratory statements process	
Committee meetings	6/8/09
Commission conducts public hearing and adopts plan	10/09
Status: Pendino	
% Complete Status: Pending	
	75%

Origination: Chairman and Staff planning for the 2010 FBC development.

Hurricane Protection Requirements

9. Load Side - Wind Pressure Research Schedule: Commission approved redirection of WBD project Phase II 3/07 Amend contract with UF/ARA 4/07

Contract for Phase III 9/07
Progress reporting 9/30/07 12/10/07 12/10/07 1/30/08Report on Phase III (Note: August 2008 mtng canceled due to TS Fay) 10/08 & 12/08
Continued support of hurricane wind testing indefinite

Status: Substantially Complete

9	6 Cc	mp	lete										
]
													 95%

Origination: Hurricane Research Advisory Committee identified design pressure requirement errors while conducting wind tunnel testing for the Panhandle wind-borne debris projected directed by the Legislature. Subsequent research was conducted to provide the base of improved roof edge design pressure requirements.

10. Resistance Side - Component and Cladding & MWFRS Research

Schedule:	
Legislature appropriates funding	5/07
Contract with UF to conduct research 9/07	
(Includes post hurricane building damage assessment survey contingency)	
HRAC develops research priority list	1/08
Report on Phase III	10/08 & 12/08
Contract extension for additional testing	1/09
Reporting	4/09
Reporting at HRAC	10/09

indefinite

Status: In Progress
% Complete

Continued support of window/wall, soffit and other building component testing

50%

Origination: Hurricane Research Advisory Committee identified building failures in 2004 and 2005 hurricanes, recommended quick-fixes for some and identified areas needing further research before standards are established. The Commission sought funding and research work was initiated in 2007.

24. Evaluate Hurricane Wind Pressure and Wind Driven Rain Criteria for Soffit Systems and Establish Labeling Requirements

Schedule:

Appoint workgroup		3/19/08
Include task in UF components and cladding contract	3/08	
Workgroup meetings		11/6/08
		2/4/09

	4/8/09
	7/09-9/09
Recommendations ready to propose for 2010 FBC	2/10
Report to Structural TAC and Commission	2/10/10
Additional requirements pursued through 2010 FBC development proceeding	

	Status:	Penaing	
% Complete			
		50%	

Origination: Soffit manufacturers requested formation of a work group to develop label requirements

similar to the Commission's action for windows, shutters and garage doors then expanded the request to

include developing installation requirements. Investigation of performance and development of the basis

for installation requirements is one of the elements of the components and cladding research being conducted under Task 10.

31. Develop Criteria for Use of Gravel Roof Systems

Schedule: RECOMMEND DELAY DUE 10 BUDGE1 CO	INSTRAINTS
Appoint Workgroup	2/09
- Workgroup meetings	4/09
	6/09
	8/00
Recommendations for 2010 FBC for Commission review	10/09
Proposals for 2010 FBC submitted	12/09

	Status:	Pending	
% Complete			
	0%		

Origination: During the evaluation of whether gravel roof systems should be prohibited by the 2007 FBC, Task 19, the Florida Roofing and Sheet Metal Association and Commission agreed to retain gravel roof systems and apply the HVHZ criteria throughout the state initially then develop improvements to the systems.

38. Evaluate Adoption of Flood Standards in the Florida Building Code

Schedule:

Workgroup appointed	12/08
DEM contract with FSU/CRC	1/09
Workgroup meetings	3/25

	4/29	
	5/29	
Review companion local ordinance	9/10	
Recommendations to Structural TAC & Commission	8/09	
Proposals for 2010 FBC submitted for adoption	3/10	
(0 0040 EDO 1 1 1 1 1 1)		

(See 2010 FBC development schedule)

							5	tatus	s:	Per	ndın	\boldsymbol{g}			
%	6 Co	mpi	lete												
															 880/

Origination: The Florida Division of Emergency Management and FEMA requested the policy established in 2000 regarding flood requirements adoption outside the building code be reviewed. DEM

will provide a grant to fund the project.

49. Evaluate Resolution of CCCL and V Zone Requirement Inconsistencies

Schedule: Future project. Funds are limited in FY 2009-2010.

			Stat	tus:	F	end	ing .	App	rova	ıl of	Floa	od S	tand	lard	s We	orkg	rou	o Re	con	nme	ndai	tion
0	6 Co	mp.	lete																			

Origination: The Flood Standards Workgroup's report recommended this issue be addressed by a separate workgroup for resolution.

44. Evaluate Storefront and Curtain Wall Glazing Labeling for the 2010 Florida Building Code

Schedule:Workgroup appointed2/09Workgroup meetings6/15/09Recommendations to Commission12/09Proposals for 2010 FBC submitted for adoption3/10

(See 2010 FBC development schedule)

							S	tatus	s:		Per	ndin	g			
%	Co	mpl	lete													
									.59	%						

Origination: Industry request at the December 2008 Commission meeting.

Energy Code

The 2008 Legislature established several directions for development of the Florida Energy Code provisions of the 2010 Florida Building Code. The broadest direction is the requirement for 20% increase in efficiency and the other tasks fall under it. Three additional not legislated energy code related tasks are on the work plan also. All tasks must be coordinated for determination of the requirements for the 2010 Code. Consequently, they are organized under the broad task.

Primary Task -

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

Origination: The 2008 Legislature directed the Commission to enact specific increase in building energy efficiency requirements in HB 697 (Building Code) and HB 7135 (Energy).

This task initiates the study and development of a schedule of increasing requirements, the first of which are to be enacted in the 2010 FBC whose development begins in 2009.

Sub-Tasks -

27. Develop Rule for Energy Code Cost Effectiveness Test (HB 68)	87 and HB 7135)
Schedule for Sub-Task 27:	
Appoint Work Group	12/9/08
Work Group/TAC meetings to develop recommendation	2/3/09
	3/5/09
	3/27/09
Rule Development Workshop	4/09
Rule Adoption Hearing	6/09
Notice of Change published	7/3/09
Rule Effective	9/1/09
Status: Complete	
% Complete	
	100%

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

39. Study Energy Conservation Measures for Replacement of Air Conditioning Equipment

Origination: Recommendation of the Energy TAC resulting from consideration of Energy Code amendment proposals regarding replacement air-conditioning systems at the October 2008 meeting. Approved by the Commission October 15,2008.

Sc	he	d	11/	۰.
σc_I	ıι	u	ш	.

Work Group/TAC considers options and develops consensus plan	3/27/09
	4/30/09
	5/28//09
Recommendations to Commission	12/09
Proposals for 2010 FBC submitted for adoption	3/10
(See 2010 FBC development schedule)	

Status: In progress

% Complete

/ U C	,0111	$\rho \iota c \iota$	C												
											l	l	759	70	

48. Develop Strategic Plan for Energy Standards Revision Pursuant to s.553.9061, F.S.

Subtask 46

Schedule:	
Workgroup appointed	12/9/08
Workgroup meetings	4/30/09
	5/28/09
	8/11/09
	9/3/09
	10/14/10
	11/12/09
Recommendations to Commission	12/09

Status: In Progress

% C	omp	olete	•						0					
											60	%		

Origination: The 2008 Legislature directed the Commission to enact specific increases in building energy efficiency requirements in HB 697 (Building Code) and HB 7135 (Energy). This sub- task initiates the study

and development of a schedule.

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

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

Schedule:

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

					S	tatu	s:	Pe.	ndit	ıg				
% C o	mpi	lete												
								2	20%					

Origination: In addition to the directives indicated in Task 35 and sub-tasks, the 2008 Legislature amended the building code law to require the IECC be adopted as a foundation code to be amended not less stringent than the Florida Energy Efficiency Code for Building Construction. The building code law requires updating the Code every three years with the 2010 FBC the next edition.

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

Schedule:

To be conducted as part of 2010 FEC recommendations development Task 47

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

26. Investigate Humidity Control Problems for Hot and Humid Climates

Schedule: In Progress

To be conducted throughout the project

Origination: The original workgroup recommended not pursuing special ratings for AC equipment used in hot and humid climates and recommended addressing the concerns with matching equipment moisture removal capabilities to building latent and sensible heat loads through the Florida Energy Code. Potential moisture control problems will be a part of the consideration for how to achieve improved building energy efficiencies directed by law.

	Status: for Sub-Task	rs 42 & 26:	Pending							
% Complete			_							
20%										

29. Develop Criteria for Energy Efficient Pool and Spa Systems

Subtask 29

Schedule:

Pool Sub-workgroup appointed	4/8/09
Workgroup meetings	6/8/09
	8/12/09
	2/10
Proposals for 2010 FBC submitted for adoption	3/10

(See 2010 FBC development schedule)

Status:	Pending
---------	---------

% Complete

50%																							

Origination:

Energy act of 2008 (HB 7135) directs adoption of pool pump efficiencies in the 2010 FBC. During discussions with the Florida Spa and Pool Association regarding energy efficiency requirements for pool pumps members suggested improved efficiency could be achieved through criteria for pool hydronic system design.

45. Evaluate Requirements for Green Roofs Recognition in Florida Building Code

Subtask 45

Cool Roofs Workgroup appointed	4/8/09
Workgroup meetings	12/09
Recommendations to Commission	12/09
Proposals for 2010 FBC submitted for adoption	12/09

(See 2010 FBC development schedule)

				Si	tatus	s:		Per	ndin	g			
% Complet	e'												
							10%	,)					

Origination: Energy act of 2008 (HB 7135) directs the Commission to include, as a minimum, certain technologies for achieving enhanced building efficiency targets established by the Act in the Florida Energy Code. Energy efficient roofs are one category. The Building Code act of 2008 (HB 697) directs the Commission to facilitate and promote the use of certain renewable energy technologies. The Roofing TAC requested a special committee to address green roofs at the December 2008 Commission meeting.

OTHER ENERGY AND GREEN TECHNOLOGY TASKS

Energy

47. Evaluate Equivalence of 2009 Florida Energy Code Commercial Building Requirements to ASHRAE 90.1-2004 and Certify to the U.S. Department of Energy

Schedule:

Evaluation conducted by staff/contractor	3/09-8/09
TAC considers evaluation report	10/09
Recommendations to Commission	10/13/09
Commission reports to Governor's Office and DOE	10/09

C4 - 4-- - -

Dandina

							3	tatus	s:	rei	nam	g				
%	Co	mpi	lete													
															750	

Origination: This task is required by federal law. Title III of the Energy Conservation and Production Act, as amended, (42 U.S.C. 6833(b)(2)(B)(i)) requires that each state must certify equivalence of its energy code

the edition of ASHRAE 90.1 that the U.S. Department of Energy determines sets the energy efficiency standard for commercial buildings.

Green Technologies

Schedule:

Primary Task -

Water Conservation Initiatives

Sub-Tasks -

34. Evaluate Rainwater Collection and Reuse for Process Water and Other "Green" Technologies in Coordination with DOH, Health Officials, DEP and Other Water Management Agencies

Origination: Plumbing TAC recommendation approved by Commission June 2008. Also, of special note is the 2008 Energy Act (HB 7153) establishes water conservation policies that parallel energy conservation policies, some of which were assigned to the Commission. The building code law directs the Commission to address new technologies in the codes and the field of "green technologies" is advancing rapidly. Standards essential to the development and recognition of safe products and systems are a responsibility of the Commission.

Evaluate in-home waste water recycling in coordination with Department of Health and Department 6. of Environmental Protection (Previous Task 14)

RECOMMEND DELAY DUE TO BUDGET CONSTRAINTS

Origination: This task was originated based on overtures by the Florida Department of Health and Florida Department of Environmental Protection. It was first addressed for the 2007 FBC and resulted in the inclusion of the Florida Department of Health requirements for within home grey water capture and reuse for irrigation outside homes. Reuse inside homes was not completely

addressed.

Schedule: RECOMMEND DELAY DUE TO BUDGET CONS	TRAINTS
Appoint Workgroup	2/09
Workgroup meetings	4/09
	6/09
	8/09
Recommendations for 2010 FBC for Commission review	10/09
Proposals for 2010 FBC submitted	12/09

							S_i	tatu	s:	Per	ndin	\boldsymbol{g}			
%	Co	mpi	lete												

ACCESSIBILITY CODE UPDATE

40. Develop Integration of Florida Accessibility Law into the 2009? Standards for Accessible Design Being Adopted by the US Department of Justice

Schedule: Appoint work group Staff Developed Starting Draft Meetings	12/12/08 1/09 2/2/09 4/6/09 6/9/09 8/10/09 10/12/09 12/7/09
Recommendation to Commission Public Hearings Commission adopts recommendation to Governor and Legislature Report to Legislature	2010 2010 2010 2011

Status: % Complete					Pending																
																	40	9%			

Origination: Recommended by Access TAC and approved by Commission at October 2008 meeting.

ATTACHMENT 3

2010 FLORIDA BUILDING CODE DEVELOPMENT AND UPDATE SCHEDULE

2010 Update to the Florida Building Code

Printed 2009 International Codes published and available to the public 2009 I Codes must be available to public for 6 months prior to selection	4/2/09
Commission selects 2009 I Codes as foundation for 2010 FBC (Oct Cmsn meeting)	10/13/09
Staff evaluates changes of 2006 to 2009 I Codes for overlap with Florida amendments	4/09-11/09
TACs review existing Florida amendments that overlap with 2006 to 2009 I code changes and develop recommendations for retaining the Florida amendment or the new I code requirement. (see subtask below)	12/6-9/09
All existing Florida amendments compiled in 2009 I Codes format posted to website including TAC recommendations for "overlapping" amendments	2/1/10
Note: Proposed amendments to existing "Florida specific" code requireme	
must be made to the section numbers provided in this document. Staff wil	l not
correlate proposals for proponents.	2 /1 /10
Local amendments posted to the website FFPC to FBC correlations/overlaps identified and recommendations developed	2/1/10 1/10-2/10
(see subtask below)	1/10-2/10
Submittal of new proposed amendments for the 2010 FBC opens	3/1/10
New proposed amendments for the 2010 FBC due and process closes	4/2/10
Proposed amendments posted to the Commission website by	5/1/10
45 day comment period ends (By law- 45 day min before TAC review)	6/15/10
TACs review proposed Florida amendments and make recommendations	8/9-10/10
at Rule Development Workshop(August 2010 Commission meeting)	, ,
TAC recommendations posted to the website	9/3/10
45 day comment period ends (By law- 45 day min before Commission review)	10/18/10
TACs review comments on their recommendations and prepare public comment for the Rule Hearing	11/15/10
Commission considers TAC recommendations on proposed amendments at the Rule Adoption Hearing (December 2010 Commission meeting)	12/7-8/10
File the Rule adopting the 2010 FBC and post the Supplement on the website	2/1/11
2010 Florida Building Code Rule is final	3/1/11
Code amended to resolve glitches (see Glitch schedule below)	4/11-6/11
Code printed with first cycle glitch fixes and available to public (see Glitch schedule below)	10/1/11
Code implemented (By law- no sooner than 6 months from available to public) Note: By law this is the latest date the Florida Fire Code can be implemented. The goal is to implement the FFPC and FBC concurrently.	12/31/11

Subtasks:

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

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

Joint Fire TAC/Fire Code Advisory Council review of I Codes/NFPA 1/NFPA 101	10/09-8/10
changes for overlaps/conflicts	
Contractor reviews Building and Fire codes and reports	1/10
Joint Fire TAC/FCAC meetings to develop recommended fixes	1/10
Recommended correlation fixes posted to the web	2/1/10
Fire TAC reviews proposed building code amendments for fixes	8/9-10/10
(Note: Law requires the Commission and State Fire Marshal to maintain the FBC and FFPC	, ,
for consistency to avoid conflicting requirements. A contractor will identify new overlaps resulting	
from changes in the new editions of the I codes and NFPA codes for consideration by the joint Fire TAC	
and Fire Code Advisory Council and decision on FBC amendments by the Commission)	

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

2. Glitch Amendments to the 2010 Florida Building Code

Schedule:	- 1. 1
2010 FBC Supplement published online	2/1/11
Glitch amendment submittal DEADLINE	3/1/11
(Note: The Code publisher will identify correlation glitches and unintended consequences of Florida	
specific amendments in the final 2010 FBC Supplement for correction by glitch amendment. See subtask	
for adoption of the 2011 NEC via the glitch proceeding)	
Rule development workshop (April Commission meeting)	4/5/11
Rule adoption hearing (June Commission meeting)	6/7/11
Glitch Rule adopted (filed)	7/1/11
Code printed with first cycle glitch fixes and available to the public	9/1/11
2010 FBC effective	12/31/11
Note: By law this is the latest date the Florida Fire Prevention Code can be implemented.	
The goal is to implement the FFPC and FBC concurrently.	
Subtask:	
Review 2011 NEC (Note: not subject to glitch proposal submittal deadline)	1/11-2/11
Proposal to adopt 2011 NEC submittal deadline	3/1/11
1	4/5/11
Recommend whether to adopt as glitch (August Commission meeting)	4/3/11
Adoption per schedule above	

Intervals Between Milestones:

Time	From	То
6 months	2009 I Codes available to public	Commission selects 2009 I Codes
10 months	2009 I Codes available for review	2007 FBC Supplement ¹ ready for amendments
(2/1/10)		7
10 months	2009 I Codes available for review	Florida mod overlaps with I Code Changes;
		local amendments; FFPC Correlations: identified
		for review in the update proceeding. $(2/1/10)$
12 months	2009 I Codes available for review	Amendment proposals due date $(4/2/10)$
2 month	Supplement ¹ ready for amendments	Amendment proposals due date (4/2/10)
1 month	Amendment proposals due date	Amendment proposals posted to web (5/1/10)
45 days	Proposed amendments posted to web	Comment period on proposals ends (6/15/10)
7 weeks	Comment period ends	TACs review proposed amendments at Rule Workshop
3 weeks	TACs review amendments@RDW	TAC recommendations posted to web
45 days	TAC recmnds posted to web	Comment period on TAC recommendations ends
1 month	Comment period ends	TACs review comments provide public Commission
2 months	Comment period ends	Commission considers TAC recmds. at Rule Hearing
7 weeks	Rule Adoption Hearing	Rule filed and 2010 FBC Supplement ² posted to web
1 month ³	2010 Supplement ² on web	Glitch amendment submittal deadline
1 month	Amendment deadline	Rule Development Workshop
2 months	Rule Development Workshop	Rule Adoption Hearing
1 month	Rule Hearing	Rule filed/adopted
2 months ⁴	Rule filed/adopted	Codebooks available to the public
4 months	Codebooks available	Code implementation date

- 1. This Supplement includes all Florida specific amendments to the 2006 I Codes converted to the 2009 I codes format. All new Florida specific amendments for the 2010 Code must be proposed to this Supplement and the 2009 I codes where not modified by the Supplement.
- 2. This Supplement presents all Florida specific amendments to the 2009 I Codes coming out of the Update proceeding including existing Florida amendments to the 2006 I Codes carried forward and all approved new amendments for the 2010 FBC. This supplement will be evaluated for conflicts with the FFPC, errors, unintended consequences, etc.
- 3. Note: The initial glitch cycle will address adoption of the 2011 NEC and true glitches identified during the Supplement** development process. Later glitch cycles will be conducted to make corrections identified between completion of the Code and implementation or beyond. Glitch amendment proceedings can be initiated at any time the Commission determines there to be a major glitch (pursuant to criteria for glitches) in the law.
- 4. Integration of Florida Supplement into the I-codes begins February 2011 and will be completed before completion of the glitch amendments. Integration of glitch amendments into the draft 2010 FBC will proceed quickly.

ATTACHMENT 4

ACCESSIBILITY WAIVER SUMMARY

Waivers from Accessibility Code Requirements—October 13, 2009

1. Urbana Retail Tenant Building

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to and from the open air rooftop parking at a new, \$1,400,000 office building. According to the applicant, site constraints prevented installation of all parking spaces required by local zoning regulations from being provided at ground level; however, all accessible parking is available on grade, with an accessible path of travel to the main entrance. Estimates of \$48,050 and \$57,000 were submitted for installation of an elevator. The Commission voted at the August, 2009 meeting to grant the waiver for vertical accessibility to the rooftop parking deck. The Final Order did not specify all conditions imposed on the applicant; therefore, the Commission voted to amend action previously taken to approve the waiver, provided an additional parking space is provided at ground level, to petition to the city to provide additional on street parking, and in the event the tenant space is occupied by a health care provider, to add one accessible parking space to the rooftop.

2. Winter Haven Fire Safety Complex

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to the second floor of a new, \$2,900,000 fire station. The applicant also requested that toilet rooms for the firefighters be constructed without accessible features since persons with disabilities could not be employed as firefighters. Estimates of \$85,240 (inclusive) and \$57,200 (equipment only) were submitted for installation of an elevator and \$6,114 for accessible toilet facilities. An accessible toilet room has been planned adjacent to the lobby of the building's public area. The entire project was designed using UFAS, which permits living quarters and toilet facilities for firefighters to be inaccessible. The Department of Justice issued a letter dated July 9, 2009 indicating that regardless of the requirements that firefighters must demonstrate a range of strength and mobility, all areas in fire stations must be accessible to potentially accommodate other types of employees, public officials or limited access by the public.

Action: Deny, based on the position of the Department of Justice.

3. Dick Brown Park – Dave Manzo Field.

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to all rows of seats in two aluminum bleachers costing \$101,251. Accessible seating is planned for the first row of each bleacher. No estimates were provided; however, the applicant stated it would increase the cost of the project tenfold to make each row accessible. The Council recommended that the application be dismissed as it was reviewed twice previously and no additional information was submitted, nor was their a representative of the applicant present.

Action: Dismiss without prejudice for lack of sufficient information.

4. Italia Villa Hotel

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to the portion of the building containing a second floor. The oldest portion of the structure was originally built in the early 1900's, with an addition in the 1930's and a second addition provided during the 1960's. The project is undergoing a \$750,000 alteration and documentation has been provided by the local historic preservation officer that it would be structurally infeasible to install an elevator and would damage the historic significance of the

building if one were provided. There are 13 rooms in the hotel and all facilities available on the second floor are also provided on the accessible first floor. The alteration also includes installation of a sloped walkway to access the hotel entrance..

Action: Grant, based on demonstration of extreme hardship and negative impact to the historic character of the building.

5. FAU/UF Joint Use Facility

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to all tiers of seats in a classroom. Access is provided at the mid-level from the main lobby and at the lower section via a ramp outside the classroom. According to the applicant, the multi-level design is intended to provide the most efficient and comfortable sight lines for students to learn through a case study teaching methodology. Visual and verbal interaction between students and instructors is available from every seat in the facility. Furthermore, there is no fixed seating in the classroom which would permit students with disabilities to sit anywhere on the two accessible levels.

Action: Grant, based on demonstration of extreme hardship and technical infeasibility.

6. Orange Bowl Field at Monroe Park

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to all rows of seats in two seats of bleachers in a public park. There will be 750 seats in each set of bleachers, with 10 accessible seating areas, with companion seats in each. The accessible seats are located in the lower levels of the bleachers, accessed by ramps. The project will cost \$5,650,000, which includes installation of a synthetic turf field and resurfacing the existing track. An adjacent two story building has a press box on the second level, which is accessible by an elevator as well as stairs.

Action: Grant, based on technical infeasibility.

7. Marquis

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to the cold plunge pool located in the spa area of a new, \$185,000,000 high rise residential building. Mechanical, electrical and plumbing requirements as well as HRS rules constrict the amount of space available adjacent to the pool in the spa. A pool deck spa has comparable facilities, but entrance into the water requires the assistance of an attendant. The spas and saunas have been designed to be accessible, and the only issue is independent access to the pool. The building official concluded that the pool deck facility is equivalent to the services provided in the main spa area.

Action: Defer to permit the applicant to research options, such as a removable lift to allow persons with disabilities access to the plunge pool.

8. Miami Mar, Inc.

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to the new 2,147 square foot second floor addition in an existing warehouse. The project will cost \$76,000 and was originally permitted to include installation of a lift. The applicant stated there will only be five employees on the second floor and does not feel it is necessary to make the area accessible. The building official disagreed and determined that there was the potential for 21 staff persons on the second level. Estimates were provided of \$18,200 and \$18,800 respectively for providing a lift.

Action: Grant, based on disproportionate cost.

9. Steven Sanders

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to an office building undergoing a \$60,000 alteration. An estimate of \$21,250 to install a lift was submitted. According to the applicant, the

same services are provided on the accessible first floor as are on the second. The Council recommended deferring action on the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to provide more information, specifically with respect to cost. The toilet rooms on the second floor are not accessible.

Action: Defer for additional information.

10. US Foodservice

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from installing visual fire alarms a maximum of 80 inches above the finish floor or 6 inches below the ceiling, whichever is lower. The project is a food distribution center with a 246,628 square foot warehouse containing both dry and refrigerated storage areas. Employees use forklifts to move supplies from one area to the next and frequently damage or destroy the alarms when mounted at the specified height. The applicant wishes to relocate the alarms to the higher height specified in NFPA 72-2002 Table 7.5.4.1.1(b), which would permit the alarms to be mounted up to 30 feet from finish floor. The new ADAAG Standards for Accessible Design does not specify a mounting height, but refers to NFPA 72 for specifications. The Council recommended dismissing the application, as there is no authority to waive life safety standards.

Action: Dismiss for lack of jurisdiction.

11. 1100 North Olive Avenue

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to the second floor of a law office. The building was previously converted from a residence to an office facility; however, the owner allowed the occupational license to lapse, and during its review the building department noted some noncompliant areas, including the need for vertical accessibility. According to the application, the structure was built during the 1920's, but no documentation was submitted. Estimates were provided of \$71,500 and \$73,950 to install an elevator. The cost of construction is \$3,250 to provide a new required exit, emergency lights and drinking fountain. According to the building official, equivalent facilities are provided on the accessible first floor.

Action: Grant, based on disproportionate cost.

12. Blossom House

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to the 1,000 square second floor of an existing building. The 2,132 square foot first floor presently houses a flower shop and the owner would like to offer the second floor to a separate tenant, with a private exterior stair to the entrance. The project is in the preliminary design phase and no working drawings have been provided. The preliminary estimate of the scope of work is \$26,075 and it would cost an additional \$20,500 to install a lift. It is highly unlikely that the owner will proceed with the expansion if a waiver is not obtained.

Action: Grant, based on disproportionate cost.

13. State College of Florida (F/K/A Manatee Community College)

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to four rows of seats in two 75 seat lecture halls undergoing a \$277,161 alteration. The remodeling is being done to enhance the acoustics, to eliminate the 1:10 sloped floor and upgrade fire code requirements. Each if the auditoriums will have four accessible seating areas in the front and rear with companion seats; however, the accessible seats are located on the ends of the rows. Estimates of \$60,080 and \$66,682 were submitted as the cost to provide lifts, which exceeds 20 percent of the cost of the alteration.

Action: Grant, based on disproportionate cost.

14. Michelle Hazen

Issue: The applicant obtained a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to the second floor offices of a renovated historic building in 2008. As a condition of the waiver, the final order stipulated that there be no more than five persons employed on the second floor and not be open to the public. Since that time, the applicant has been unable to locate a tenant willing to comply with those conditions, resulting in an unusable building. According to the applicant, the renovation work cost \$113,303 and to provide an elevator would cost an additional \$47,944, which exceeds twenty percent of the cost of the alteration. Action: Grant and amend action previously taken to waive access to the second floor based on

disproportionate cost.

15. Dino Laudati Salon

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to a 400 square foot mezzanine in a hair salon. The facility was previously mixed use and is being renovated to provide salon services on both levels. The scope of the work is \$87,000 in alterations; and a \$24,396 estimate was submitted for installation of a lift. All services provided on the mezzanine are duplicated on the accessible first level. Action: Grant, based on disproportionate cost.

16. Congo River Golf

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to 9 holes of a new 18 hole miniature golf course costing \$600,000. The course will include the playing area and a village with a Golf Cubhouse, Party Room/Arcade with toilet rooms and a Gift Shop, which are fully accessible. The course is designed to permit persons with mobility impairments to play nine holes or golf with alternate pin/hole placements to provide the experience of playing 18 holes. Signage and score card information will also be provided for instructions on the accessible route and pin placement. According to the applicant, the cost of acquiring additional land would not be feasible to create landscape features, unique hole layouts and water features.

Action: Grant, based on unnecessary and extreme hardship.

17. University of South Florida – St. Petersburg Campus

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to a mezzanine used for cardio exercise in an existing building undergoing a \$138,427 alteration, of which, \$81,661 represents the actual construction cost. The scope of the work includes converting one racquetball court to become a weight training area. Because of the building's high ceiling, the applicant is able to construct a new mezzanine that will house cardio training equipment. According to the applicant, it is the University's policy to provide one of each type of equipment located on the mezzanine on the accessible first level.

Action: Grant, provided stairs are built that would accommodate installation of a lift at a later date.

18. Palm Beach Ice Works.

Issue: The applicant is requesting a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to all rows of seats in the east mezzanine. The west mezzanine will have an elevator and the applicant would prefer to have all accessible seating in that location. The project is an alteration, but no construction costs for the overall project were provided. However, an estimate of \$47,402 was submitted for installation of an elevator.

Action: Grant, provided two additional seats are provided at the rink level and all accessible seats are located in the west mezzanine.

19. South Walton Montessori Academy

Issue: Unknown.

Action: Dismiss without prejudice for lack of information.

20. Gallop's Karate School/Crystal's After School Program

Issue: The applicant requested a waiver from providing vertical accessibility to the second floor of a 17,727 square foot building housing an after school program on the first floor and a karate school on the second. The building was constructed prior to adoption of the vertical accessibility requirements. Accessible entrances are provided at grade level of both floors and the intervening stairway is used by employees to travel from one program to the other, which are under the same ownership. Estimates of \$35,000-\$40,000 were provided for the cost of an elevator and \$23,850 for a wheelchair lift. According to the applicant, work already done to make the building more accessible would render the lift disproportionate when those costs were added to the equipment cost.

Action: Grant, based on extreme hardship.

ATTACHMENT 5

LEGAL REPORT

Second Hearing Legal Report October 13, 2009

(First Hearing heard August 11, 2009)

DCA09-DEC-129 by Rodger England of Bermuda Roof Co., Inc. DCA09-DEC-253 by C.S. Breslauer of Bermuda Roof Co, Inc.

Note: Dec. 253 is an amendment to Dec. 129.

Question #1: Can we use SSTD-11-99 testing results for hips and ridges as a basis for obtaining approval for the use of the mortar adhesive system in the HVHZ?

Answer: No. The product in question falls outside the scope of Rule 9B-72 with regard to hip and ridge as applied to the HVHZ.

Question #2: Should a hip and ridge system with demonstrated performance that is equal or superior to the current system in use in the HVHZ be allowed?

Answer: Yes. Subject to approval of the local authority have jurisdiction.

Question #3: Should the Commission issue a declarative statement supporting the use of a new technology such as the mortar adhesive hip and ridge tile system in all areas of the state based on the fact that it exceeds the state minimum Building Code requirements?

Answer: No. The Commission has no authority to approve alternative to a prescriptive requirement of the Code.

DCA09-DEC-214 by Thomas E. Smith of General Home Development Corporation of Pinellas (the request is outside the scope of the scope of the Dec. statement process and is recommended for dismissal. The subject of the Dec. is a request for waiving the code requirements for fire sprinkler installation in group R occupancies).

DCA09-DEC-254 by Mike Harris of Sea Shutters Inc.

Question #1: Can a non-porous impact protective system in Wind Zone 1, 2 or 3 which is not on an essential facility and was tested independently of fenestration assembly be

installed in a manner which would allow glazing contact resulting in breakage?

Answer: Yes. In accordance with the "Conclusions of Law" of DCA08-DEC-002 (see Item 2

above) and based on current standards, the intent of the Code is to prevent internal

pressurization, and breakage is permissible.

Question #2: Can a non-porous impact protective system in Wind Zone 1, 2 or 3 which are not on an essential facility and were tested independently of fenestration assembly be installed over an opening or window regardless of its design pressure rating?

Answer: Application/ installation of a non-porous impact protective system must be in accordance with the limitations of use of the product as demonstrated using the

applicable testing standard referenced in the FBC.

Question #3: Can a porous impact protective system in any Wind Zone and was tested

independently of the fenestration assembly be installed in a manner which would

allow glazing contact resulting in breakage?

Answer: No. Glazing breakage not allowed.

Question #4: Can a porous impact protective system in any Wind Zone and was tested

independently of the fenestration assemble be installed over opening of window

regardless of its design pressure rating?

Answer: Application/installation of a porous impact protective system must be in accordance

with the limitations of use of the product as demonstrated using the applicable

testing standard referenced in the FBC.

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

Question: Does the installation of lightweight material (such as vinyl mesh) murals on the exterior of existing

buildings require a building permit as might otherwise be required by Section 105.1 of the FBC (2004)

and 2007 editions)?"

Answer: Yes. According to Section 403 of the Florida Building Code, Existing Building and Section 3107 of

the Florida Building Code, Building the level of work described falls within the scope of the Florida

Building Code "regulated by the Code" and for that a building permit would be required.

Note: Petitioner requested that the petition be referred back to the TAC so that more info. can be provided to clarify specific applications for the project in question and to allow the Petitioner the opportunity to attend the TAC meeting.

DCA09-DEC-260 by Joseph Scofield of Advanced Manufacturing & Power System, Inc.

Question One: Is a generator enclosure a building as defined in the Florida Building Code, whether or not it is intended to be occupied?

Answer: Yes, according to the definition of the term "Building" (see Section 202 above), any structure used for sheltering any use is considered a "building".

Question Two: Does the structure fall within the purview of the Florida Building Code?

Answer: Yes, section 101.2 of the Florida Building Code states in part, that it is applicable to the construction of every building <u>or</u> structure.

DCA09-DEC-257 by Mitch Thomas

Question One: Does the Florida Building Code pertain to the installation of low voltage electrical systems (phone/

data/ security/ Closed Circuit TV/ fire/ security alarm systems/ page & music-speaker systems /

fiber optics)?

Answer: Yes, section 101.4.1 of the Florida Building Code references chapter 27 of the FBC. Chapter 27

establishes NFPA-70 (the NEC) as the applicable code. Additionally, the NEC contains requirements

for such electrical wiring installations.

Question Two: Is a permit required for installation of low voltage electrical systems (phone/data/security/Closed

Circuit TV/ fire/ security alarm systems/ page & music-speaker systems / fiber optics)?

Answer: Yes, section 105.1 of the Florida Building Code mandates in part, that a permit be obtained prior to

the commencement of any electrical installation which is regulated by the code, unless the authority having jurisdiction has promulgated rules granting certain exemptions form the code for single

family dwellings in accordance with section 102.2.5 of the FBC, Building

DCA09-DEC-263 by Steven Clisset of Windstrips LLC

Question: Does the Windstrips product fall under the scope of Rule 9B-72 under the category "roofing" and subcategory "products introduced as a result of new technology"?

Answer: No. The porduct in question falls out side the scope of Rule 9B-72. However, as per Section 104.2.8, approval of this product is within the scope of local authority having jurisdication

Section 553.73(10)(d), F.S., Review of FBC/FFPC Local Interpretation Conflict-Requested by Bill R. Moore of Waldrop Group Regarding Bonita Springs Project SFM Case No: 10416309-FM

Question #1: Can the local authority having jurisdiction waive code safety requirements that are specifically provided by Code? FFPC NFPA 101 4.6.1 thru 4.6.1.3.

Answer: No. The authority having jurisdiction can not waive the code requirements.

Question #2: From a review of Exhibit A, does the single stair (means of egress) with two exit doors comply with code section FFPC NFPA 101 38.2.4.1?

Question: No.

First Hearing – October 13, 2009 – Legal Report

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

Question 1: Does the installation of lightweight material (such as vinyl mesh) murals on the exterior of existing buildings, where the material does not encroach the public right-of-way, require a

building permit as might otherwise be required by under Section 105.1 of the FBC (2004 and 2007 editions)?"

Answer: Yes. According to Section 403 of the Florida Building Code, Existing Building and Section

3107 of the Florida Building Code, Building the level of work described falls within the scope of the Florida Building Code "regulated by the Code" and for that a building permit

would be required.

Question 2: If the answer to question (1) above is in the affirmative, then, on an

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

(2007 edition) (FBC-EB)?

Answer: The level of work in question is specific to an existing installation

which falls outside the scope of the Declaratory Statement process.

The Declaratory Statement process is limited in scope to future projects.

Question 3: Regarding the scenarios set forth in questions (1) and (2) above, would the vinyl murals

described in questions (2) and (3) above be considered "structural elements" for the purpose of FBC –EB?

Answer: Yes. The product in question will impose additional dead load (gravity

load due to the weight of all materials) which has to be supported by the existing building

and transferred to the structural members of the existing building

<u>DCA09-DEC-309</u> by Alan Plante of Orange County Division of Building Safety (The Petitioner requested that the Dec. be Deferred to the December Commission meeting)

DCA09-DEC-269 by Thomas Ford, RA of Bhamani, Ford & Associates, Inc

Question 1: Is the voltage drop of 2 percent as stated in 13-413.1.ABC.1.1 intended as such or is it a

scrivener's error?

Answer: Yes, Section 13-413.AB.1.1 of the *Florida Building Code*, *Building*, intended to limit the voltage

drop for feeders and customer-owned service conductors to 2 percent at design load. It is

not a scrivener's error.

Question 2: Why is the FBC so restrictive for the feeder conductor voltage drop at 2 percent and why is

it not in agreement with the NEC?

Answer: According to Section 102.4 of the *Florida Building Code, Building*, specific energy

conservation requirements in the code take precedence over the informational language in the National Electric Code. There is no conflict between the two.

ATTACHMENT 6

PRODUCT AND ENTITY APPROVAL REPORT

ID	Manufacturer	Category	Subcategory	TBA	POC	FBC	Comments	Stat.
Certification Method - FBC Voted Approval								
228-R6	Simonton Windows	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
1086-R5	Andersen Corporation	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
1092-R4	Andersen Corporation	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
1095-R4	Andersen Corporation	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
1097-R4	Andersen Corporation	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
1544-R4	Sealoflex, Inc.	Roofing	Cements- Adhesives- Coatings	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
1722-R3	Elixir Industries Georgia Door Division	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
1825-R4	VELUX America Inc.	Sky Lights	Skylight	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
2253-R4	ECO-Block, LLC	Structural Components	Insulation Form Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
2425-R2	Architectural Integrated Metals Inc.	Structural Components	Roof Deck	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
2452-R2	Mulia, Inc.	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

2689-R3	KELLY CO- 2001 INC.	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	
2920-R4	Sealoflex, Inc.	Roofing	Waterproofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	
3265-R2	Ingersoll-Rand	Exterior Doors	Exterior Door Components	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	
3281-R2	United Enertech	Panel Walls	Wall Louver	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	
3284-R2	United Enertech	Panel Walls	Wall Louver	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	
4571-R3	Lincoln Wood Products, Inc. / Timeline Vinyl Products, Inc.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	
4673-R2	KML Windows, Inc.	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	
5968-R3	Hunter Panels	Roofing	Roofing Insulation	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	
6118-R1	Hager Companies	Exterior Doors	Exterior Door Components	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	
6233-R4	Gerard Roofing	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	
6542-R5	Lincoln Wood Products, Inc. / Timeline Vinyl Products, Inc.	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	
6642-R3	Lincoln Wood Products, Inc. / Timeline Vinyl Products, Inc.	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	

6683-R4	Lincoln Wood Products, Inc. / Timeline Vinyl Products, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
7078-R1	RC Aluminum Industries, Inc.	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
7289-R2	KML Windows, Inc.	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
7424-R1	W. P. Hickman Co.	Roofing	Roofing Accessories that are an Integral Part of the Roofing System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
7460-R2	Lincoln Wood Products, Inc. / Timeline Vinyl Products, Inc.	Windows	Awning	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
7461-R2	Lincoln Wood Products, Inc. / Timeline Vinyl Products, Inc.	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
7576-R2	RC Aluminum Industries, Inc.	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
7612-R3	Simonton Windows	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
8293-R1	Hager Companies	Exterior Doors	Exterior Door Components	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
8605-R1	ParexLahabra, Incorporated	Panel Walls	Exterior Insulation Finish System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
8787-R2	Kawneer Company, Inc.	Panel Walls	Storefronts	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

8801-R1	RC Aluminum Industries, Inc.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
8834-R1	RC Aluminum Industries, Inc.	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
8863-R1	Andersen Corporation	Windows	Awning	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9133-R1	Kolbe Windows and Doors - Wausau	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9180-R1	ParexLahabra, Incorporated	Panel Walls	Exterior Insulation Finish System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9251-R1	Alenco	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9408-R1	Kolbe Windows and Doors - Manawa	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10165-R2	Peetz Windows and Doors, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10171-R3	Marvin Windows and Doors	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10297-R5	JELD-WEN	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10356-R2	Ingersoll Rand Security Technologies	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10428-R1	Wayne-Dalton Corp.	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10972-R1	JELD-WEN	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
10973-R1	JELD-WEN	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change

11047-R1	Kolbe Windows and Doors - Manawa	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11059-R1	Kolbe Windows and Doors - Manawa	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11064-R1	Kolbe Windows and Doors - Manawa	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11073-R1	Kolbe Windows and Doors - Manawa	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11109-R1	JELD-WEN	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11117-R1	JELD-WEN	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
11119-R1	JELD-WEN	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
11206-R3	Pella Corporation	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11415-R3	JELD-WEN	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11469-R2	Pella Corporation	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11502-R1	Pella Corporation	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11670-R1	Kolbe Windows and Doors - Manawa	Windows	Awning	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11683-R1	Kolbe Windows and Doors - Manawa	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11726-R2	JELD-WEN	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11825-R2	MI Windows and Doors	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

11827-R2	MI Windows and Doors	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11834-R2	Atrium Companies Inc.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11869-R1	JELD-WEN	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11942-R1	M W Manufacturers Inc.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12234-R1	MI Windows and Doors	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12250-R2	MI Windows and Doors	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12356	INDUSTRIAL MILLWORK CORP	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12453	YKK AP America	Panel Walls	Curtain Walls	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12476-R1	MI Windows and Doors	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12586-R1	MI Windows and Doors	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12683	EcoStar	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12755	Kolbe Windows and Doors - Wausau	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12895	KST Coatings, A Business Unit of the Sherwin- Williams Company	Roofing	Cements- Adhesives- Coatings	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12900	Reliable Products	Panel Walls	Wall Louver	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12901	Nystrom	Panel Walls	Wall Louver	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New

12914	Tri-Ply, Inc.	Roofing	Modified				Recommend	New
	-		Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Approval	
12923	Bemo USA	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12927	Winco Window Company	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12932	Hager Companies	Exterior Doors	Exterior Door Components	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12937	Pella Corporation	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12938	Pella Corporation	Windows	Awning	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12939	Pella Corporation	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12941	Greenheck Fan Corporation	Panel Walls	Wall Louver	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12942	The Airolite Company, LLC	Panel Walls	Wall Louver	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12943	Enclos Corporation	Panel Walls	Curtain Walls	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12944	Stanley Security Solutions	Exterior Doors	Exterior Door Components	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12945	Enclos Corporation	Panel Walls	Curtain Walls	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12952	Pella Corporation	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12953	Rainbow Clay Tiles & Pavers	Roofing	Roofing Tiles	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12955	Kolbe Windows and Doors - Wausau	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12956	JELD-WEN	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12957	Gorell Enterprises Inc.	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12958	Stanley Security Solutions	Exterior Doors	Exterior Door Components	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New

									-
12960	RC Aluminum Industries, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New	
12961	RC Aluminum Industries, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New	
12964	JELD-WEN	Windows	Mullions	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New	
12968	General Aluminum Company	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New	
12972	Florida Extruders International, Inc.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New	
12973	Florida Extruders International, Inc.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New	
12981	Alternate Energy Technologies, LLC	Roofing	Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New	
12983	Alenco	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New	-
12985	Hurd Windows and Doors, Inc.	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New	
12986	Hurd Windows and Doors, Inc.	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New	
12992	Exeter Architectural Products	Shutters	Storm Panels	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New	
12998	Allied Building Products Corp.	Roofing	Asphalt Shingles	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New	
13000	Paradigm Window Solutions	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New	
13011	Light House Windows & Doors	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New	

13024	Light House Windows & Doors	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13035	Andersen Corporation	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13089	Architectural Integrated Metals Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
Evaluation by Engineer/ Architect -FBC Voted Approval								
163-R3	Custom Window Systems, Inc.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
1654-R5	POLYGLASS USA	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
1867-R2	Superior Window Corp.	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
2144-R3	Sealoflex, Inc.	Roofing	Liquid Applied Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
2193-R3	Atlantic-Pacific International Marketing, Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
2617-R2	Superior Window Corp.	Windows	Projected	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
4065-R6	Silverline Building Products Corp.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
4092-R4	Custom Window Systems, Inc.	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
4093-R4	Custom Window Systems, Inc.	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
4452-R3	Custom Window Systems, Inc.	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

4609-R2	Roller Star USA	Shutters	Roll-up	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
4718-R1	Metals USA Building Products	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
4822-R1	South AL Metal Sales	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
5259-R6	POLYGLASS USA	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
5444-R2	CertainTeed Corporation- Roofing	Roofing	Asphalt Shingles	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
5822-R1	Smart Vent, Inc.	Structural Components	Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
5825-R2	QMI	Shutters	Roll-up	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
5830-R2	QMI	Shutters	Roll-up	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
7925-R1	ASHE industries	Structural Components	Roof Deck	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
8134-R3	Alside Window Company	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
8324-R2	Silverline Building Products Corp.	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
8664-R1	SunSky Metal,LLC	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
8804-R1	CPI Daylighting Inc.	Structural Components	Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

9517-R2	DaVinci Roofscapes, LLC	Roofing	Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9604-R2	MGM Industries	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9607-R2	MGM Industries	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9625-R2	Gentek Building Products	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9627-R2	Revere Building Products	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9798-R3	Flex Membrane International, Inc.	Roofing	Single Ply Roof Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9834-R2	Alside Window Company	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9886-R2	Gentek Building Products	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9890-R2	Revere Building Products	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
9909-R2	Associated Materials Inc.	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10450-R1	Tarco Roofing	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10453-R2	Alside Window Company	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10463-R2	Gentek Building Products	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10464-R2	Revere Building Products	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10465-R2	Associated Materials Inc.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

10626-R2	GAF Materials Corporation	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10687-R1	Classic Products, Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
10779-R1	Vi Win Tech	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10906-R1	Vi Win Tech	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10907-R1	Vi Win Tech	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10991-R2	Alside Window Company	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11137-R2	Gentek Building Products	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11139-R2	Revere Building Products	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11141-R2	Associated Materials Inc.	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11242-R1	Bemo USA	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11243-R1	Bemo USA	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11450-R1	Stanek Vinyl Windows	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11685-R1	Atrium Companies Inc.	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11720-R1	Associated Materials Inc.	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
11996	Hormann LLC	Exterior Doors	Sectional Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12163	Four Seasons Solar Products LLC	Structural Components	Roof Deck	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New

12297-R1	Silverline Building Products Corp.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12513-R1	CENTRIA	Panel Walls	Curtain Walls	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12671	TEMO Sunrooms, Inc.	Structural Components	Roof Deck	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12673	Royal Group Technologies, Inc.	Panel Walls	Siding	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12710	Wojan Window and Door Corp.	Windows	Awning	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12770	American Shutter Systems Association, Inc.	Shutters	Roll-up	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12809-R1	West Tampa Glass Company	Panel Walls	Curtain Walls	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
12846	Shield Technology Group, Inc.	Shutters	Fabric Storm Panel	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12853	NFP National Fenestration Product, Inc.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12881	K-G Metals	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12884	NFP National Fenestration Product, Inc.	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12887	Crest Metal Doors, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12908	EFCO Corporation	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12924	CertainTeed Corporation- Roofing	Roofing	Roofing Slate	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12925	YKK AP	Panel Walls	Storefronts	a	a	a	Recommend	New

	America						Approval	
12926	YKK AP America	Panel Walls	Storefronts	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12965	PGT Industries	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12966	JM Metals (Innovative Distribution LLC)	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12967	Advanced Green Technologies	Roofing	Roofing Accessories that are an Integral Part of the Roofing System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12969	Wojan Window and Door Corp.	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12970	Wojan Window and Door Corp.	Windows	Projected	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12971	Wojan Window and Door Corp.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12974	Wojan Window and Door Corp.	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12979	Windoor Incorporated	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12980	Atlantic-Pacific International Marketing, Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12982	Paradigm Window Solutions	Windows	Mullions	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12988	Architectural Building Components	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12989	General Aluminum	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New

	Company							
12990	General Aluminum Company	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12991	Worldwide Door Components, Inc	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12994	Stanek Vinyl Windows	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12995	Metal Sales Manufacturing Corporation	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13001	BASF Polyurethane Foam Enterprises LLC	Roofing	Cements- Adhesives- Coatings	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13006	Custom Window Systems, Inc.	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13008	Custom Window Systems, Inc.	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13009	Custom Window Systems, Inc.	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13010	Custom Window Systems, Inc.	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13012	Custom Window Systems, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13013	Ingersoll-Rand	Exterior Doors	Exterior Door Components	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13015	Light House Windows & Doors	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13016	Light House Windows & Doors	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New

13017	The Hurricane	Windows	Horizontal				Recommend	New
	Window and Door Factory		Slider	a	a	a	Approval	
13019	The Hurricane Window and Door Factory	Windows	Mullions	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13020	The Hurricane Window and Door Factory	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13021	Morin - a Kingspan Company	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13023	Mid Florida Metal Roofing Supply/Supplies, Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13025	MFM Building Products Corp.	Roofing	Modified Bitumen Roof System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13027	Alenco	Windows	Single Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13036	Aztec Steel Buildings Corp.	Structural Components	Roof Deck	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13037	PGT Industries	Windows	Awning	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13039	PGT Industries	Windows	Horizontal Slider	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13040	PGT Industries	Windows	Double Hung	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13044	Gulf Coast Supply and Mfg., Inc.	Roofing	Metal Roofing	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13045	PGT Industries	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13049	PGT Industries	Windows	Casement	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13053	PGT Industries	Windows	Mullions	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13056	YKK AP	Panel Walls	Curtain Walls	a	a	a	Recommend	New

	America						Approval	
13061	Kaba Ilco Inc.	Exterior Doors	Exterior Door Components	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13065	Plastpro Inc. / Nanya Plastics Corp.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13067	MGM Industries	Windows	Fixed	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13083	Gentek Building Products	Panel Walls	Soffits	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13088	TNT Carports	Structural Components	Structural Wall	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
Evaluation by Test Report - FBC Voted Approval								
6599-R1	CPI Daylighting Inc.	Structural Components	Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
10280-R1	Major Industries	Panel Walls	Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12328-R1	TAMKO Building Products, Inc.	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12816-R1	Owens Corning	Roofing	Roofing Accessories that are an Integral Part of the Roofing System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
Evaluation by Evaluation Entity - FBC Voted Approval								

814-R2	amvic inc.	Structural Components	Insulation Form Systems	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
5113-R1	Simpson Strong- Tie Co.	Panel Walls	Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
12663-R1	Synergy Pacific Engineered Timber LTD	Structural Components	Engineered Lumber	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
12750-R1	National Gypsum Services Company	Structural Components	Structural Wall	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Editorial Change
12875	Nichiha Corporation	Panel Walls	Siding	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12917	Greenheck Fan Corporation	Roofing	Roofing Accessories that are an Integral Part of the Roofing System	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12918	AFM Corporation	Roofing	Roofing Insulation	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
12978	Windoor Incorporated	Exterior Doors	Sliding Exterior Door Assemblies	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
13029	Owens Corning	Roofing	Underlayments	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	New
Entities - TBA Reviewers Recommend Approval								
TST 1527	Hurricane Test Laboratory LLC - FL	Product Testing Laboratory		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision
TST 3160	Timberco Inc dba TECO	Product Testing Laboratory		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision

	ı					1	•		
QUA 2401	Timberco Inc dba TECO	Product Quality Assurance Agency		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	
QUA 3214	CEL Consulting	Product Quality Assurance Agency		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	
QUA 3726	Pyramid1, Inc	Product Quality Assurance Agency		a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	
Discussion Items									
6193-R1	Greenblock Worldwide	Structural Components	Insulation Form Systems		С	С	Testing indicated on application would indicate that product(s) comply with building code requirements for use within HVHZ and outside HVHZ. There is a supplement evaluation provided by Evaluation Entity (ICC-ES) indicating that the use within HVHZ has not been evaluated, and is outside the scope of the supplement. Recommend Conditional Approval with condition of: Indicate "No"	Revision	

Description Products Products Products Introduced as a Result of New Technology Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement for exterior cement plaster. Product was tested for negative pressure to evaluate attachment to building of the assembly with the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 98-72. Recommend Denial-Product is outside the scope of Rule 98		•								
11192 BASF Construction Chemicals, LLC Panel Walls Result of New Technology Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement for exterior cement plaster. Product was tested for negative pressure to evaluate attachment to building of the assembly with the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 98-72. Recommend Denial - Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product was tested for negative pressure to evaluate attachment to building of the assembly with the product being a discussed on the basis of the product being a vittin the scope of Rule 98-72. Recommend Denial - Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 98-72. Recommend Denial - Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fiber to be used as reinforcement plaster. Product is a glass fibe							for use within			
Construction Chemicals, LLC Introduced as a Result of New Technology Technology Technology y y y y y y y y y y y y							HVHZ.			
Construction Chemicals, LLC Introduced as a Result of New Technology Technology Technology y y y y y y y y y y y y										
Construction Chemicals, LLC Introduced as a Result of New Technology Technology Technology y y y y y y y y y y y y										
Construction Chemicals, LLC Introduced as a Result of New Technology Technology Technology y y y y y y y y y y y y										
Construction Chemicals, LLC Introduced as a Result of New Technology Technology Technology y y y y y y y y y y y y										
Construction Chemicals, LLC Introduced as a Result of New Technology Technology Technology y y y y y y y y y y y y										
Construction Chemicals, LLC Introduced as a Result of New Technology Technology Technology y y y y y y y y y y y y										
Construction Chemicals, LLC Introduced as a Result of New Technology Technology Technology y y y y y y y y y y y y										
Construction Chemicals, LLC Introduced as a Result of New Technology Technology Technology y y y y y y y y y y y y	11102	DACE	Danal Walls	Products			Product is a	Now		
Chemicals, LLC Result of New Technology Result of New Technology I sed as reinforcement for exterior cement plaster. Product was tested for negative pressure to evaluate attachment to building of the assembly with the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule	11192		ranei wans					New		
Technology reinforcement for exterior cement plaster. Product was tested for negative pressure to evaluate attachment to building of the assembly with the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule reinforcement for exterior cement for exemption commend to the product being within the scope of Rule scope of Rule		Chemicals IIC					used as			
for exterior cement plaster. Product was tested for negative pressure to evaluate attachment to building of the assembly with the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule		Chemicals, ELC								
cement plaster. Product was tested for negative pressure to evaluate attachment to building of the assembly with the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule				recimology						
Product was tested for negative pressure to evaluate attachment to building of the assembly with the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule										
tested for negative pressure to evaluate attachment to building of the assembly with the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule							Product was			
negative pressure to evaluate attachment to building of the assembly with the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule										
pressure to evaluate attachment to building of the assembly with the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule										
attachment to building of the assembly with the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule										
building of the assembly with the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule										
assembly with the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule										
y y the product being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule							building of the			
being a component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule							assembly with			
component. The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule					У	У	the product			
The application should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule										
should be discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule							component.			
discussed on the basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule							The application			
basis of the product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule										
product being within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule										
within the scope of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule										
of Rule 9B-72. Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule							within the scope			
Recommend Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule							of Rule 9R-72			
Denial - Product is outside the scope of Rule										
is outside the scope of Rule										
scope of Rule							is outside the			
							scope of Rule			

13042	Hurd Windows and Doors, Inc.	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a	С	С	Applicant requests a conditional to add Impact resistance to application. Recommend Conditional Approval with condition of:	New	
				a	С	С	Conditional Approval with condition of: Indicate "Yes"		
e nents							for Impact Resistance.		
aluation by gineer/ chitect									
453-R2	Exclusive Wood Doors	Exterior Doors	Swinging Exterior Door Assemblies	a			Recommend Approval	Revision	

T - 172		
2453-R2	Public Comment	Regarding
	by Rick Wright	Exclusive Wood
		Doors FL #
		2453 R2 please
		note the
		following:
		1. The approval
		shows
		compliance for
		the HVHZ in an
		Outswing and
		Inswing non-
		impact
		configuration
		both wood panel
		opaque and full
		lite glazed
		product.
		a. In order to
		meet the TAS
		protocols you
		are required to
		test three
		identical
		specimens of
		the largest size
		(since water
		infiltration is
		claimed for the
		outswing model
		then 3 outswing
		specimens
		should have
		been tested and
		1 additional
		specimen for
		inswing should
		have been tested
		to allow for
		inswing units
		where a proper
		overhang exists
		to protect for
		to protect for

water infiltration) Note: Report # CTLA 836W is for I specimen glazed non-impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Report # CTLA 836W is for I specimen opaque non- impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Conclusion — Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and WI originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact product.				
Note: Report # CTLA 836W is for 1 specimen glazed non-impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Report # CTLA 836W1 is for 1 specimen opaque non- impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Conclusion — Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact				
Report # CTLA 836W is for 1 specimen glazed non-impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Report # CTLA 836W1 is for 1 specimen opaque non- impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Conclusion — Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W1 is substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact				
836W is for I specimen glazed non-impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Report # CTLA 836W1 is for 1 specimen opaque non- impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Conclusion — Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as non-impact			Note:	
836W is for I specimen glazed non-impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Report # CTLA 836W1 is for 1 specimen opaque non- impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Conclusion — Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as non-impact			Report # CTLA	
non-impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Report # CTLA 836W1 is for 1 specimen opaque non- impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Conclusion — Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock line. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			836W is for 1	
non-impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Report # CTLA 836W1 is for 1 specimen opaque non- impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Conclusion — Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock line. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			specimen glazed	
OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Report # CTLA 836W1 is for 1 specimen opaque non- impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Conclusion— Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact				
tested to PA202 Report # CTLA 836W1 is for 1 specimen opaque non- impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Conclusion — Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as an on-impact			OXXO Inswing	
Report # CTLA 836W1 is for 1 specimen opaque non- impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Conclusion — Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact				
836W1 is for 1 specimen opaque non- impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Conclusion — Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact				
opaque non- impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Conclusion – Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact				
impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Conclusion — Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			specimen	
impact OXXO Inswing tested to PA202 Conclusion — Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			opaque non-	
to PA202 Conclusion — Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			impact OXXO	
Conclusion — Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			Inswing tested	
Based on my understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact				
understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			Conclusion –	
understanding of the protocols this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			Based on my	
this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA-836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			understanding	
this product as listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA-836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			of the protocols	
listed and substantiated in Report # CTLA-836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			this product as	
Report # CTLA- 836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			listed and	
836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			substantiated in	
836W and W1 originally issued under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			Report # CTLA-	
under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			836W and W1	
under the name of Artistic Door and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			originally issued	
and Lock Inc. does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			under the name	
does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact			of Artistic Door	
does not qualify for HVHZ use as a non-impact				
for HVHZ use as a non-impact				
as a non-impact			for HVHZ use	

2453-R2	Public Comment	0.77	h a a m m m a a a a l	
2453-R2			he approval	
	by Rick Wright	shov		
	(Cont.)	com	pliance for	
			HVHZ in an	
		Outs	swing and	
		Insw	ving impact	
		conf	figuration	
			full lite	
		glaz	ed product.	
		Note	۵۰	
			ort # CTLA	
		836	W2 is for 3	
			eimens	
			ed impact	
			XO Inswing	
			outswing	
			ed to PA202,	
			/203. Spec 1	
			tested for	
		was pa	202 as an	
			wing model.	
			cimen 2 was	
		Spec	ed to PA	
		201/	/203 as an	
		Outs	wing model	
		and	Specimen 3	
			tested to PA	
			/203 as an	
		insw	ving model.	
		Con	clusion –	
			required	
		num	aber of	
		teste		
			eimens has	
			been met for	
			HVHZ or	
			N-HVHZ as	
			onstrated by	
			supporting	
			lence.	
		CVIG		

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
2453-R2 Response by On Comment #	
Emma T. 1 - Mr. Wright	
Mellinger is not correct in	
his	
understanding	
of the protocols;	
TAS 202	
requires only	
that a single	
specimen be tested.TAS 202	
has been met for	
an outswing,	
glazed unit, an	
inswing glazed	
unit, and an	
inswing wood	
panel unit	
(thereby also	
qualifying an	
outswing wood	
panel unit).The	
configuration	
shall be	
approved for	
both HVHZ and	
Non-HVHZ as	
submitted in	
FL2453-R2.	
2453-R2 Response by On Comment #	
Emma T. On Comment # 2 - Mr. Wright	
Mellinger is correct. Upon	
further review	
of the test	
reports, only 2	
units were	
impact-tested	
under protocols	
TAS 201/203.	
Exclusive Wood	
Doors therefore	
withdraws its	

		approval for impact-resistance pending further testing.
2453-R2	Public Comment by Jaime Gascon	The insulated glass specified needs to specify safety glass for the lites per FBC 2406.3 - Hazardous Locations, and match that used for testing if to be used in the HVHZ.

2452 P2	D		Til 1 1.		
2453-R2	Response by		The glass shown		
	Emma T.		in the		
	Mellinger		installation		
			drawing is the		
			glass tested.		
			The assemblies		
			were tested with		
			either 9/16"		
			laminated		
			annealed glass,		
			or ¼" tempered		
			glass on the		
			exterior of the		
			insulated glass		
			assembly. Both		
			of these meet		
			the requirements		
			of safety		
			glazing.		
			The 1/8"		
			decorative		
			leaded art glass		
			on the interior		
			of the insulated		
			glass assemblies		
			does not meet		
			the requirements		
			of safety		
			glazing.		
			To address Mr.		
			Gascon's		
			comments, it is		
			proposed to		
			replace the		
			leaded art glass		
			with a lite of		
			1/8" tempered		
			glass as the		
			interior lite of		
			the insulated		
			glass assembly.		
			This proposal		
			should be		
			SHOULD DC		

_			 			
				acceptable		
				because the		
				leaded art glass		
				does not		
				contribute to the		
				structural		
				strength of the		
				assembly, so		
				replacing it with		
				tempered glass		
				will not		
				diminish the		
				assembly's		
				performance.		
				The installation		
				drawing will be		
				revised to show		
				1/8" clear		
				tempered glass		
				on the interior		
				of the assembly,		
				and leaded art		
				glass in the air		
				gap. A		
				specification		
				note will be		
				added to the		
				installation		
				drawing stating		
				"glazing shall		
				comply with		
				requirements for		
				safety glazing		
				stipulated by		
				CPSC 16 CFR		
				Part 1201."		
	2453-R2	Response by		With this public		
		Rene Kaemmer		comment		
				pending more		
				testing for the		
				Impact resistant		
				units, herewith		
				EWD withdraws		
L				L 11D Williams	1	

2453-R2	Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator			<u>d</u>	p	d	the application for Impact resistance until further notice but would like to go forward with the Wind load non-Impact door approvals. The applicant was requested to provide copies of the test reports in order to verify the public comments and responses. The test reports have not been provided. Recommend Deferral with conditions of: Withdraw impact products. Provide safety glazing for the insulated glass. Provide administrator with copies of the test reports		
							the test reports for the non- impact products for further review of application.		
6417-R2	Transparent Protection Systems, Inc.	Shutters	Storm Panels	a	a	a	Recommend Approval	Revision	

6417-R2	Public Comment	In regards to the
	by Steve	above revision,
	Tinklepaugh	I've noticed my
		competitor has
		increased both
		their maximum
		span and design
		pressure without
		additional test
		samples. The
		test reports
		stated in the
		evaluation
		report date back
		to 2007 being
		the latest used.
		It is my
		understanding
		that according to
		test protocol the
		largest span
		must be
		supported with a
		corresponding
		test sample
		achieving the
		stated design
		pressure, and
		that rational
		analysis cannot
		be used to
		increase spans
		or pressures.
		1 1 2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2

T	I	T- 1	
6417-R2	Response by	In response to	
	Frank L.	the below-	
	Bennardo	referenced	
		public	
		comment, please	
		be advised that	
		this inquiry is	
		retaliation from	
		my client's	
		competitor	
		resulting from a	
		complaint filed	
		by my client at	
		the last POC	
		Meeting, and is	
		unjustified. All	
		substantiating	
		paperwork is in	
		order and there	
		is no reason not	
		to approve this	
		application.	
		The Test	
		substantiation is	
		found in the	
		Report #04-009-	
		FE-ASTM,	
		from	
		Construction	
		Testing	
		Corporation	
		(CTC) 2004	
		(attached, sealed	
		hardcopy to	
		follow sent from	
		my client). You	
		will see that the	
		tallest span	
		(144") was	
		properly tested	
		with 3 samples	
		for ASTM	
		E1886-1996	
		L1000-1990	

					along with E330. There		
					has been no		
					rational analysis		
					to increase		
					spans beyond		
					their tested		
					limits.This		
					testing has been		
					reviewed by this		
					office and was		
					Validated by an		
					independent		
					third party		
					Engineer.		
					Eligilicei.		
	6417-R2	Commentary and			The public		
		Recommendation			commentator		
		by Administrator			was correct on		
					indicating		
					higher pressures		
					without		
					additional		
					testing. Both		
					applications		
					FL6417-R1 and		
					FL6417-R2		
					have been		
					evaluated		
					utilizing the		
					same test		
					reports and		
					FL6417-R2		
					indicates higher		
_				 •			

							design proessures on the long spans for positive connection. Applicant provided us with sign and sealed copies of test report indicating testing at the same spans and loads as indicated on the installation instruction drawings for FL6417-R2. Therefore the recommendation for approval remains.	
11288-R3	CertainTeed Corporation- Roofing	Roofing	Underlayments	a	-	-	Recommend Approval	Revision
11288-R3	Public Comment by Robert Nieminen						CertainTeed has alerted us to an error in Section 5.4 of our Evaluation Report, whereby two of the membranes listed as "No" for use with Slate should be listed as "Yes". CertainTeed would like this error corrected during the	

Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator Exterior Confidence	1	1	1	ı		1	1	T	T	
Tight Part								current Approval cycle.		
Public Comment by Richard A. Snyder 11288-R3 Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator C								request Conditional Approval of the file under the premise that we will correct this section of our Evaluation Report within the allotted timeframe after the Commission		
by Richard A. Snyder 11288-R3	11288 P3	Public Comment								
Snyder Snyder	11200-K3									
Description Property Proper								Nieminen's		
Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator Commendation Conditional Approval with condition of: Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator Commentary and Recommendation Conditional Approval with condition of: Commentary and Recommendation Report correct Use of the two membranes Indicating "No" For use with slate. Commentary and Recommendation Conditional Approval with condition of: Consection 5.4 On Section 5.4		Silydei								
Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator Conditional Approval with condition of: On Section 5.4 of Evaluation Report correct use of the two membranes indicating "No" for use with slate. Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator Commentary and Recommendation Conditional Approval with condition of: On Section 5.4 of Evaluation Report correct use of the two membranes indicating "No" for use with slate. Commentary and Approval New										
Recommendation by Administrator Recommendation by Administrator Conditional Approval with condition of: On Section 5.4 of Evaluation Report correct use of the two membranes indicating "No" for use with slate. Recommend Tip27 Mahon Door Corporation Doors Exterior Doors Exterior Door Assemblies Recommendation by Administrator Report correct Approval New Application has been withdrawn, no further action	11288-R3	Commentary and								
c c c c C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C		Recommendation						Conditional		
C C C C C C C C C C		by Administrator						Approval with		
11927 Mahon Door Exterior Doors Exterior Doors Assemblies 11927 Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator E C C C C C C C C C C C C Report correct use of the two membranes indicating "No" for use with slate. Recommend Approval Application has been withdrawn, no further action										
11927 Mahon Door Exterior Doors Exterior Doors Exterior Doors Assemblies 11927 Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator Commendation Recommendation Recommendation								On Section 5.4		
11927 Mahon Door Exterior Doors Exterior Doors Exterior Doors Assemblies 11927 Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator Report correct use of the two membranes indicating "No" for use with slate. Recommend Recommend Approval Application has been withdrawn, no further action					C	C	C			
11927 Mahon Door Exterior Roll-Up Roproval Corporation Doors Exterior Door Assemblies 11927 Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator Roll-Up Assemblies Assemblies Approval Application has been withdrawn, no further action					<u> =</u>					
Indicating "No" For use with Slate.										
11927 Mahon Door Corporation Doors Exterior Door Assemblies Recommendation by Administrator Roll-Up W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W										
11927 Mahon Door Exterior Doors Exterior Doors Exterior Doors Exterior Door Assemblies 11927 Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator Commentary and Recommendation by Adminis										
11927 Mahon Door Exterior Roll-Up Exterior Doors Exterior Door Assemblies 11927 Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator Exterior Door a Approval Assemblies Application has been withdrawn, no further action										
Corporation Doors Exterior Door a Approval 11927 Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator Exterior Door a Approval Application has been withdrawn, no further action								state.		
Corporation Doors Exterior Door a Approval 11927 Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator Exterior Door a Approval Application has been withdrawn, no further action										
Assemblies 11927 Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator Assemblies Assemblies Application has been withdrawn, no further action	11927								New	
11927 Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator C W W W Administrator Application has been withdrawn, no further action		Corporation	Doors		a	_	_	Approval		
Recommendation by Administrator				Assemblies						
by Administrator	11927									
by Administrator - no further action					c	w	w	been withdrawn,		
<u>is required</u>		by Administrator			<u> ~</u>	"	"	no further action		
								<u>is required</u>		

Evaluation by Evaluation Entity 8283-R1 Tamlyn Structural Components Public Comment by Randy Shackelford Public Comment by Randy Shackelford Tamlyn Tamlyn Public Comment by Randy Shackelford Tamlyn Revision Recomment The installation instructions for the product are just general notes; they do not give specific installation instructions for the products in the application. At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced Structural Members in Referenced									
Evaluation Entity Structural Components Wood Connectors e - - Recommend Approval Revision									
Evaluation Entity Structural Components Wood Connectors e - Recommend Approval Revision	Evaluation by								
Entity 8283-R1 Tamlyn Structural Components Components Public Comment by Randy Shackelford Public Comment by Revision At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
8283-R1 Tamlyn Structural Components Connectors Public Comment by Randy Shackelford Public Comment by Revision Revision Personance I The installation instructions for the product are just general notes; they do not give specific installation instructions for the products in the application. At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
8283-R1 Public Comment by Randy Shackelford I. The installation instructions for each product are just general notes; they do not give specific installation instructions for the products in the application. At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced		Tamlvn	Structural	Wood				Recommend	Revision
Public Comment by Randy Shackelford 1. The installation instructions for each product are just general notes; they do not give specific installation instructions for the products in the application. At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			a	-	-		
by Randy Shackelford installation instructions for each product are just general notes; they do not give specific installation instructions for the products in the application. At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced			- F						
Shackelford instructions for each product are just general notes; they do not give specific installation instructions for the products in the application. At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced	8283-R1								
each product are just general notes; they do not give specific installation instructions for the products in the application. At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced		by Randy							
just general notes; they do not give specific installation instructions for the products in the application. At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced		Shackelford							
notes; they do not give specific installation instructions for the products in the application. At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
not give specific installation instructions for the products in the application. At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced								just general	
installation instructions for the products in the application. At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
instructions for the products in the application. At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced								not give specific	
the products in the application. At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
the application. At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
At a minimum, they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
they need to show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
show number, size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
size, and type of fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
fasteners required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
required for each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced								size, and type of	
each product. 2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced								fasteners	
2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced								required for	
2. SS straps have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced								each product.	
have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
have capacity governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced								2. SS straps	
governed by steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced								have capacity	
steel calculation. Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced								governed by	
Include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced									
Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced								the Design of	
Steel Structural Members in Referenced								Cold-formed	
Members in Referenced									
Referenced									
								Standards.	

			1
8283-R1	Response by	ICC-ES has	
	Vipin Tolat and	provided	
	Barry A.	response to item	
	Johnson, PE	1(See email	
		from Barry	
		Johnson below).	
		As far as item 2	
		is concerned, I	
		have no	
		problem	
		including	
		standard NAS-	
		01 or SG02-01	
		under AISI,	
		chapter 35, FBC	
		2007 in the	
		application. But	
		this will require	
		for you to	
		reopen the	
		application and	
		ICC-ES will	
		have to	
		revalidate it. I	
		am requesting	
		that this be	
		waived at this	
		time because not	
		including it in	
		the application	
		is not going to	
		change the	
		design. It is	
		unfair to come	
		up with this	
		requirement this	
		late in the	
		application	
		process. In	
		response to his	
		comment	
		Number 1, we	
		should indicate	
		SHOULD HIGHCARC	

_								
							that the number,	
							size and type of	
							fastener	
							required is	
							included in the	
							evaluation	
							report. Sections	
							4.0 and 5.1 of	
							the evaluation	
							report require	
							installation	
							based on the	
							report in addtion	
							to	
							manufacturer's	
							instructions. I	
							will look closer	
							at Number 2.	
							Barry A.	
							Johnson, PE,	
							Senior Staff	
							Engineer, ICC	
							Evaluation	
							Service, Inc.	
	8283-R1	Commentary and					Recommend	
		Recommendation					Conditional	
		by Administrator					Approval with	
							conditions of:	
							On the	
							Installation	
							Instructions area	
							of the	
							application	
				c	c	c	include the ICC-	
							ES evaluation	
							report in	
							addition to the	
							manufacturers	
							notes. On the	
							<u>Testing</u>	
							<u>Standards</u>	
L							section of the	

							application include 2001 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-formed Steel Structural Members in Referenced Standards of application.		
12331	Proactive Technology Inc	Roofing	Roofing Insulation	a	-	-	Recommend Approval	New	
12331	Commentary and Recommendation by Administrator			<u>c</u>	d	c	Recommend Conditional Approval with condition of: Provide Certificate of Independence by evaluator. On limits of use indicate "The boards are used as a component of an approved roof-covering assembly." On Installation Instructions remove all details not related to roofing insulation.		