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OVERVIEW

At the June 2004 Commission meeting, and at the request of stakeholder groups among them BOAF, the Florida Building Commission voted unanimously to convene a work group tasked with reviewing issues related to the local product approval process. In order to initiate the process, Chairman Rodriguez appointed 13 members to the group and tasked them with developing a package of consensus recommendations for consideration by the full Commission at their August 31, 2004 meeting in Miami.

At August 31, 2004 Commission meeting, the Chair indicated that after reviewing the report and recommendations from the Workgroup, and based on the Workgroup’s recommendations and the Commission’s discussions during the August 2, 2004 teleconference meeting, he decided to expand the charge of the workgroup to include developing recommendations for clarifications and refinements to the entire product approval system, for local and state approval. The Chair indicated that state and local approval are linked and should be reviewed together. He also decided to expand the representation on the workgroup to include roofing and exterior doors.

Chairman Rodriguez announced that the workgroup’s meetings will be a facilitated process, and there will be between 4 and 6 meetings, held approximately once a month.

The Chair appointed the following members to the group and charged them with representing their respective interest groups during the course of their meetings:

MEMBERS AND REPRESENTATION

Architects
Larry Schneider
Pete Tagliarini

Building Officials
Dale Greiner
Christ Sanidas
Ronnie Spooner

Certification Agencies
John Hill

Door Manufacturer
Tim Collum
Engineers
Steve Bassett

Evaluation Entities
Herminio Gonzalez

General Contractors
Ed Carson

Local Government
George Wiggins

Product Manufacturers
Dave Olmstead
Craig Parrino

Residential Contractors
Dick Browdy

Roofing Contractors
Chris Schulte

MEETING SCHEDULE

August 11, 2004 (Local Product Approval Workgroup) Orlando
October 20, 2004 (Product Approval Workgroup II) Orlando
January 11 – 12, 2005 (Product Approval Workgroup III) Orlando
February 8 – 9, 2005 (Product Approval Workgroup IV) Ocala
March 28 - 29, 2005 (Product Approval Workgroup V) Orlando
OVERVIEW OF WORK GROUP’S KEY DECISIONS

TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2005

Agenda Review and Work Group Plan Overview
The Work Group voted unanimously, 13 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented. Following are the key agenda items approved for Meeting III:

• To Approve Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda, Report, and Workplan)
• To Consider Issues in Turn and Identify Additional Options
• To Propose Options for Identified Issues
• To Evaluate and Rank Proposed Options
• To Refine Options Enjoying a High Level of Acceptability
• To Consider Public Comment
• To Identify Needed Next Steps, Assignments, and Agenda Items For Next Meeting

Member Attendance
The following members attended Meeting III:


DCA Staff Attendance
Buster Case, Rick Dixon, and Mo Madani.

Facilitation
The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair.

Recess
The Work Group voted unanimously, 13 - 0 in favor, to recess at 5:50 PM.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 2005

Agenda Review
The Work Group voted unanimously, 12 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented.

Review and Approval of the October 20, 2004 Report
The Work Group voted unanimously, 12 - 0 in favor, to approve the October 20, 2004 Report as presented.

Adjourn
The Work Group voted unanimously, 13 - 0 in favor, to adjourn at 1:00 PM.
Overview of Meeting Process
The facilitator prepared a worksheet for use during the meeting. The worksheet listed the issues and options as identified by Workgroup members and DCA staff.

Under each option there was a four-point acceptability ranking scale designed to gauge the level of support for each of the proposed options. The facilitator explained that members and the public were free to pose additional issues and to propose additional options for each of the identified issues. The following scale was used to gauge the level of support for each of the options:

| Acceptability Ranking Scale | 4 = acceptable, I agree | 3 = acceptable, I agree with minor reservations | 2 = not acceptable, I don’t agree unless major reservations addressed | 1 = not acceptable |

During the course of the meeting and prior to any acceptability ranking of options, members of the public were offered an opportunity to comment on each of the proposals evaluated by the Work Group in turn.

Members agreed that rather than deciding on specific language for revisions to rule and or law, they would reach agreement on key concepts related to each of the issues and allow legal staff to draft rule language for review at subsequent meetings. Further, the workgroup agreed that they would take no formal motions until all of the issues were evaluated, and the Work Group was prepared to approve a package of recommendations for submittal to the Commission.

ASSIGNMENTS AND ITEMS NEEDED FOR THE NEXT MEETING:

- Provide amplification at the meeting for members and at a speakers’ table.
- The Workgroup agreed that DCA legal will need to research whether a Florida registered architect or engineer is required for a manufacturer to provide typical installation details in the product’s approval, or whether they can be provided by their own design professionals, who may not be Florida registered.
  The second issue is to provide clarification that a Florida registered architect or engineer is allowed to make modifications to the installation instructions, and approval is allowed for alternate installation methods other than those provided in the product’s approval documentation.
WORK GROUP’S EVALUATION OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Following are the acceptability rankings by for each of the options evaluated by Work Group members. In addition, member’s reservations are noted as comments.

During the meeting, members were asked to develop and rank options, and following discussions and refinements, to do additional ranking of the options as refined. The following scale was utilized for the ranking exercises:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptability Ranking Scale</th>
<th>4 = acceptable, I agree</th>
<th>3 = acceptable, I agree with minor reservations</th>
<th>2 = not acceptable, I don’t agree unless major reservations addressed</th>
<th>1 = not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Issue IX. (E.) “The Dennis Brady Proposal”:
The Product Approval System for State approval should be limited to the approval of entities by the Commission.

The workgroup agreed to evaluate this option first since it was a threshold issue, because if approved the option would eliminate the need to evaluate many of the other issues and options under consideration.

The product approval system for state approval should be limited to the approval of entities only, and should also serve as a clearinghouse for all system documentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking</th>
<th>4 = acceptable</th>
<th>3 = minor reservations</th>
<th>2 = major reservations</th>
<th>1 = not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised/Amend</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Ranking 1/11/05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary;
The Workgroup extensively evaluated the option and heard considerable opinions from the public. An initial ranking was taken and indicated some level of support. Following additional public comment and an opportunity for members to express their reservations, a revised ranking was taken which indicated more support for the proposal. After a break, members requested another ranking to ensure they all understood what they were expressing support for by their ranking scores. The third and final ranking indicated less support than for the first ranking. Some members expressed that as they evaluated their concerns with the proposal, they were less comfortable then previously.
Member’s Comments:

- Is this an oversimplification of what Ralph Hughes presented (State approval for the 8 categories of products)?
- How would B.O.’s determine which products are state approved? There should be some data collection point, the BCIS should be able to do this in some modified form.
- This will not address the issue of inconsistent interpretations by locals for state approvals.
- Uncomfortable that there may be inconsistent requirements by different agencies without a central gate keeper for state approval.
- There should be a central point for review of product compliance documentation for state approval.
- What about the manufacturers that have already spent a lot of time and money to get their products approved under the current system.
- This proposal would be going back to what use to be in place before we started this process. What has evolved is a system where some jurisdictions are requiring proper documentation and others are not.
- There could be a central place where a building officials could go and verify the entities are approved and have access to the appropriate approval documents.
- The Commission would loose some degree of control by going to a system like this.

- How would this proposal affect the preemption of local building officials not accepting state approvals?
- Summary documents related to the approval could help.
- Is it legal for the Commission to delegate product approval to private entities?
- The process of figuring out how this option will work, will get us bogged down as we have in the past.
- There would be more scrutiny for the approval of the entities with this new proposal. It would also require a substantial statutory change. This is not a statewide product approval system, but a statewide entity approval system. This will also put a larger burden on the local jurisdictions.
- Will there be an increase in liability to the product approval administrator with this new system?
- This is a sideways move in that it will only be for the approval of entities. In addition, what will happen to the manufacturers who have already gone through the process to get their products approved statewide?
- The system of entity approval is already in place, and includes what they have to provide to the local jurisdictions to confirm product compliance.
- The state should be able to have some system for keeping track of approved products and officiating the system.
- There would no longer be individual product approval with this option, instead there will only be entity approval as it relates to the building envelop products.
Public Comment:

- I don’t see a maintenance process in the Florida system. What happens to the approval when the product changes? Where is the quality assurance? Commission control should be with the entities and not at the product level.
- The point of this proposal is to have something you can trust. We’ve tried the system of product approval and it hasn’t worked. Make the entities do their job. Put teeth into the system and build a system that all will have faith in.
- We’re having problems today with some jurisdictions only accepting Miami-Dade NOA’s. Need to define what the entities are required to do.
- We are a certification agency and cannot communicate with the BCIS. If we can establish a clearing house, then the B.O. can go there and find all the information he needs.
- It was determined that we were looking for building failures resulting from wind damage and this in turn determined which products have to be approved. We wanted to make it possible for manufacturers to have one place to go to get approval. The B.O. can continue to approval all other products as they have. Q.A. entities approve the Q.C. program of a manufacturer and follow up to make sure the manufacturer is producing the same product as approved. Approving entities only doesn’t make good common sense.
- Only allow certification agencies to enter information regarding a specific product. I speak in favor of the proposal, conceptually this is a very good idea.
- This proposal makes a lot of sense. There needs to be a level playing field for entities. The certification process in place now provides for testing, certification and labeling of approved products. The paper work submitted to the locals is enormous. Set minimum performance standards for these entities. The Commission approves entities, then the entities are responsible for determining compliance.
- For example using windows, AAMA has already gone through the process of approving my products. This proposal means that in the case of windows, the AAMA approval process determines product compliance and the Commission would then only approve the entities.
- We’ve been working on product approval for over a year now. This proposal is throwing the baby out with the bath water. Time would be better spent on working on the Rule and improving the current system, as planned.
- There are some holes in this proposal. Some of the entities certify that they comply with standards in the Code. They have stopped certifying compliance with the FBC and aren’t going to do this in the future, so this won’t work!
- We need a unified clearing house to convey information to the building departments. We do need uniformity. A clearing house is critical!
I. WHICH PRODUCTS ARE COVERED IN THE RULE

A. Define which products should be subject to product approval.

1. Limited to products and systems which comprise the building envelope and structural frame, for compliance with the structural wind load requirements of the Florida Building Code as related to Rule 9B-72.

   (Add scoping language to clarify that the Rule applies to wind related structural properties of the eight (8) product categories listed in law; and, amend subcategories of the covered products to eliminate products outside the defined scope.) Note:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Ranking 10/20/04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Ranking 1/11/05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minor Reservation:
Would prefer that State approval be mandatory for the 8 product categories.

Comment:
Once the system is in place, the Commission could consider expanding State approval beyond the 8 product categories.

2. Should exterior door components (not part of a door assembly) be a subcategory under exterior doors.
   (DCA04-DEC-157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Ranking 1/11/05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments and Minor Reservations:

- The intent is to have a subcategory under doors for individual door components.
- List the approved products under the subcategory.
- Clarify the subcategory of products that do not need State approval.
- If there is a substitution in components, a similar component with the same performance ratings should be acceptable.
B. Definition of Structural Components

Per current Rule:
1. Structural component means any part or assembly of a building or structure used or intended to support or shelter any use or occupancy, and which affects the safety of such building or structure or which supports any dead or designed live load and the removal of which part, material or assembly could cause, or be expected to cause, all or any portion to collapse or to fail, or both.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Ranking 1/11/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
The Workgroup unanimously agreed to eliminate this option.

POC’s proposed draft rule version:
2. Structural component means any part or assembly of buildings that comprise the envelope or structural frame.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Ranking 1/11/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Both definitions are too broad. There are certain structural parts of a building that are now not required to have product approval, for example a fence that is blocking the A/C equipment and braced with structural steel.

Summary:
The Workgroup unanimously agreed to eliminate this option.

Staff’s proposed version:
3. Structural component means any part or assembly of a building or structure that comprise the main wind force resisting system and components and cladding.

Add language to the scope section of the Rule indicating that there are some exemptions to this provision of the Rule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Ranking 1/11/05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Ranking 1/11/05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refinements:
Add “unless otherwise exempted by the rule” to the “scope” of proposed section 9B-72.005.
C. Non-conditioned Appurtenant Structures

1. Clarify whether non-conditioned appurtenant structures should be treated as canopies/structural components or roofs in the Code.

Workgroup agreed this issue should be referred to the Structural TAC for consideration. C.W. Macomber will work with Commissioner Kim to bring a proposal back to the Workgroup.

D. Prefabricated Building Components

Add the components of prefabricated buildings to the appropriate product categories (consistent with the FBC’s declaratory statement decision).

Summary:
The Workgroup agreed that this issue will be covered under “E” below (by clarifying how pre-engineered buildings are to be treated in the Rule).

E. Clarify how pre-engineered buildings should be treated by Rule 9B-72 for standard (replicated) and custom (one-of-a-kind) buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking: Custom Exempt 1/11/05</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking: Standard-Replicated Remove Sheds from the Rule 1/11/05</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
The Workgroup unanimously agreed that custom (one-of-a-kind) pre-engineered buildings are exempt from the Rule since they already require engineering for the approval process. The Workgroup unanimously agreed that the “Sheds” subcategory should be removed from the Rule.

Comments:
• This really deals with site specific engineered buildings that we’ll be discussing later. The rule should address this to help the building official determine if the building is covered or not.
• Sheds should be deleted as a subcategory in the rule, as noted in the draft rule. Staff should compare the recommendations from this workgroup and revise the draft rule accordingly.
• Eliminate this option.
F. Pre-engineered AC Stands

1. Add pre-engineered AC stands as a subcategory under the structural components category (consistent with the FBC’s declaratory statement decision).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Ranking 1/11/05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Pre-engineered roof access hatches

1. Add pre-engineered roof access hatches as a subcategory under the exterior doors category (consistent with the FBC’s declaratory statement decision). (DCA04-DEC-161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Ranking 1/11/05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. EVALUATION

A. Should Installation Instructions be Required for All Compliance Options.

1. Require minimum installation instructions for all compliance options, including attachments requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Ranking 1/12/05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minor Reservation:
- The word minimum should not be included in the language and is not needed.

Comments:
- Limiting this to a fastener is a manageable way of handling installation.
- This is more critical for residential construction than for commercial, since installation instructions are already required and provided in the commercial approval process.
- Have a process to address case by case installation requirements. Site specific design for installation is mostly in commercial construction.
- What type of details are required for Miami-Dade product approval? Miami-Dade does require detailed installation instructions to help the BO to determine proper installation.
• Why not require the minimum attachment instructions for all product approvals? Use the term “attachment instructions” instead of “installation instructions”.
• Should be required to follow the manufacturer’s installation instructions as tested and approved by the evaluation entity.
• We’re providing a mechanism for the BO to inspect the installation of the product.
• The Code states that the installation shall be per the manufacturer’s instructions or by a prescriptive method spelled out in the Code.
• The instructions posted on the BCIS should be verified by the evaluation entity.
• Make sure we’re talking about all products, and not only windows and doors. Attachment details should address each model listed on the product approval.
• There could be an installation that’s not an attachment.
• We should keep using the word “installation” because this is the term in the Code.
• Use “installation/attachment”.
• Another term to consider would be “structural anchorage”.
• Installation of the product should be part of the evaluation process to determine what is critical to be included in the instructions.
• Installation from the manufacturer deals with attachment, but other factors like flashing and weather proofing are provided by the designer.
• Require minimum installation instructions so the BO can determine compliance with the evaluation of the product.
• Require manufacturer’s installation instructions including minimum requirements for anchorage.
• This is dealing with structural performance for wind resistance. Stating just the minimum will confuse the BO. Specific anchorage for the application is needed.
• Concerning roofing products, what is the definition of “minimum” for these type of products? Is this by windzone or design pressure?

1a. How should installation instructions be tied back to the inspection process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking: to Delete</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/12/05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
The Workgroup unanimously agreed, 12 – 0, to delete this option. Installation instructions should not be tied back to the inspection process.
2. Require installation instructions for load bearing fastener components only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking to Delete</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/12/05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
The Workgroup unanimously agreed, 12 – 0, to delete this option.

B. (a) How are installation instructions reviewed and approved through the product approval process and put on the BCIS?

Manufacturer installation instructions shall be generated by an evaluation entity, test lab or by a manufacturer’s licensed design professional.

Prior to the manufacturer posting installation instructions (including anchorage requirements) on the BCIS, they shall be reviewed or verified by the one of the following: certification agency, evaluation entity, test lab or by a manufacturer’s licensed design professional. Alteration of installations may be allowed by a Florida architect or engineer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised/Amend</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• Prior to the manufacturer posting installation instructions on the BCIS, the instructions shall be reviewed, and verified by the certification agency, evaluation entity, and/or test lab or by a manufacturer’s licensed design professional. Alteration of installations may be allowed by a Florida architect or engineer.
• The manufacturer has to be able to have their designer put this on the BCIS.
• If the instructions on the BCIS, then the manufacturer would have to have an engineer’s raised signed and sealed. These would need to be by the evaluation entity to make sure they comply.
• Is the Commission is going to accept the manufacturer’s engineer evaluation or is a third party evaluation needed?
• Some entities have a problem with making available confidential documents. Reference the documents instead of providing the entire document.
• Certification agencies do not certify the installation, Miami-Dade is the only one that does this. There is some conflict regarding what’s allowed by the rule and the engineer’s board.
• If a product is tested, the compliance option should be the test. If the product is to be used on a substrate different that that tested, then the compliance option should be different.
• I’m in support of option two with regard to roofing products.
• The BO has the ability to accept instructions from the manufacturer. What installation details are put on the BCIS? If the evaluation document has them included, its done. For those that are not included, why not let the manufacturer add their engineer’s evaluation to the BCIS?
• Need to state somewhere, that the approved installation instructions can be modified by an engineer.

(b) How does this (installation instructions) affect signed and sealed for permitting purposes?

Summary:
The Workgroup agreed that DCA legal will need to research whether a Florida registered architect or engineer is required for a manufacturer to provide typical installation details in the product’s approval, or whether they can be provided by their own design professionals, who may not be Florida registered.
The second issue is to provide clarification that a Florida registered architect or engineer is allowed to make modifications to the installation instructions, and approval is allowed for alternate installation methods other than those provided in the product’s approval documentation.

2. Limit the scope of installation instructions to “fastener requirements”, the type, size, number and placement for the various anticipated surrounding construction shall be:
   • Determined by testing and/or evaluation and documented in the qualifying reports,
   • Communicated by the manufacturer to the installer and building official by label and/or BCIS listing,
   • The manufacturer’s label and listing details are verified by the certification or QA entity to match those documented in the test and/or evaluation reports, as part of the inspection process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/12/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
The Workgroup unanimously agreed, 12 – 0, to delete this option. This option was eliminated.
C. What specific criteria should be required for identifying product limitations of use.

1. Identify and require specific criteria for limitations of use by category of product.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised/Amend</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
This option did not enjoy a reasonable level of consensus after re-evaluation.

Member’s Reservations:
• This option is too complicated.
• The limitations should mirror what the manufacturer has on the evaluation document.

Comments:
• There should be a summary column that details the limitations, so all of the documents don’t have to be reviewed in order to determine the product’s limitations of use.
• This option is not acceptable.
• This option is not needed.

2. Identify and require specific criteria for limitations of use by wind zones/HVHZ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised/Amend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
A product should be required to list as one of its limitations whether it is intended for use in the HVHZ.

Comments:
• I don’t see the need for listing by wind zones.
• The main issue is whether the product is for use in the HVHZ or not.
• The BCIS should list a summary of the limitations of use found in the evaluation document.
• It would be helpful for manufacturers to know exactly what limits of use information should be include on the BCIS.
D. Testing Products to Correct Standards Related to the Code.

1. Develop a list of standards specific to each category of products and adopt by Rule 9B-72.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Ranking
1/12/05

Comments:
- It would be impossible to keep an up to date list, however staff should keep an advisory list.
- The standards are already in the Code and are not needed in the Rule.
- Use the list of standards in the Code as a drop down on the BCIS to allow manufacturers to select from only the appropriate standards.

Options 2 and 3 below were combined and considered together.

2. Upon submittal of the application, the manufacturer shall provide certification of equivalency by the evaluator, standards writing organization, testing lab accredited to tests both standards or for a Florida architect or engineer for review by the Commission. (Staff will maintain a list of Commission approved equivalent standards.)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3= minor reservations</th>
<th>2= major reservations</th>
<th>1= not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Ranking</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised/Amend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Once approved as equivalent by the Commission, it should be deemed equivalent for all future submittals.
- Standards writing organizations should be able to provide a letter of equivalence for newer editions of standards.
- Product approvals using equivalent standards should be listed for the POC to use as a tool to determine those standards they have previously approved as equivalent.
- The evaluating engineer should be able to determine equivalency of standards.
- Equivalency should be determined per application by the engineer, then adopted by the Rule as equivalent.
Develop a Process for reviewing product approval renewals for compliance with the standards in new Florida Building Code editions:

4. Prior to a Code change, the BCIS shall send an e-mail notifying the manufacturer that they are responsible for certifying that the product still complies with the new Code, and/or they are responsible for revising their application in a timely fashion, or the product’s approval will be revoked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3=minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1=not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/12/05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- If the Code change affects the performance of an approved product, the manufacturer would have to get the approval renewed.
- This could be handled by an affidavit by the manufacturer that the product still complies with the Code.
- What does Miami-Dade do relative to this issue? Answer: Miami-Dade notifies manufacturers of Code changes and if manufacturer does not respond, the approval is revoked.
- The state should have a similar process to Miami-Dade’s process.
- Make BCIS field searchable for standards.
- Six months prior to a Code change, have the BCIS sent an email notifying the manufacturer that they are responsible for revising their application in a timely fashion or the approval will be revoked.
- Develop a process for the Commission to revoke product approvals related to Code changes.
- How are we to deal with section number changes when the Code changes? (This is related to numbering changes only.)
- Change the Statute and the Rule to reflect that product approvals are to be revised only when there are substantive changes (increased performance change only).
- There should be a staggered approach for manufacturers to comply with this issue.
ATTACHMENT 1

PRODUCT APPROVAL WORKGROUP—JANUARY 11 - 12, 2005
Meeting Evaluation Results

0 TO 10 RATING SCALE WHERE A 0 MEANS TOTALLY DISAGREE AND A 10 MEANS TOTALLY AGREE.

1. Please assess the overall meeting.
   9.3 The background information was very useful.
   9.6 The agenda packet was very useful.
   9.4 The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.
   8.8 Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.
   9.5 Consideration of Issues in Turn and Identification of Additional Options.
   9.5 Proposal of Options for Identified Issues.
   9.3 Evaluation and Ranking of Proposed Options.
   9.5 Refining of Options Enjoying a High Level of Acceptability.
   9.4 Next Steps and Agenda Items for Next Meeting.

2. Please tell us how well the facilitator helped the participants engage in the meeting.
   9.2 The participants followed the direction of the facilitator.
   9.7 The facilitator made sure the concerns of all participants were heard.
   9.1 The facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
   9.5 Participant input was documented accurately.

3. What is your level of satisfaction with the meeting?
   8.4 Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
   9.3 I was very satisfied with the services provided by the facilitator.
   8.4 I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

4. What progress did you make?
   9.3 I know what the next steps following this meeting will be.
   9.2 I know who is responsible for the next steps.

5. Comments.
   • We have to have microphones so everyone can hear what is being said!
   • We need to stay on point. Cannot write the Rule to cover everything. Too much reaction to “what happens ifs”.
   • We need microphones for workshops too!!
   • Wordsmithing during the meeting (unfortunately, a necessary evil) is a progress killer!!
   • Without microphones hearing was difficult.
   • Provide a mechanism to “call the question” for the consensus vote to expedite the process. This would still require a vote to indicate whether a supermajority of the Workgroup wants to end the discussion and vote on the item.