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
April 20, 2005 (Product Approval Workgroup VI) Ocala
OVERVIEW OF WORKGROUP’S KEY DECISIONS

MONDAY, MARCH 28, 2005

Agenda Review and Work Group Plan Overview
The Work Group voted unanimously, 10 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented. Following are the key agenda items approved for Meeting V:
- 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 Adopt a Package of Recommendations for Inclusion in a Draft Rule
- To Identify Needed Next Steps, Assignments, and Agenda Items For Next Meeting

Review and Approval of the February 8 - 9, 2005 Report
The Work Group voted unanimously, 10 - 0 in favor, to approve the February 8 - 9, 2005 Report as presented.

Member Attendance
The following members attended Meeting V:

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

Facilitation
The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair.

Recess
The Work Group voted unanimously, 11 - 0 in favor, to recess at 5:15 PM.

TUESDAY, MARCH 29, 2005

Agenda Review
The Work Group voted unanimously, 10 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented.

Adoption of Package of Recommendations for Inclusion in Rule Draft (9B-72)
The Work Group voted unanimously, 10 - 0 in favor, to adopt the entire package of recommendations, those that achieved a supermajority of support, and to include the recommendations in a Draft of Rule 9B-72.

Adjourn
The Work Group voted unanimously, 10 - 0 in favor, to adjourn at 12:00 PM.
Overview of Meeting Process
The facilitator prepared a worksheet for use the 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 staff to draft rule language for review at the April 20, 2005 meeting. In addition to regular procedural actions, the Workgroup took a formal motion on their statutory recommendations to the Florida Building Commission, and for draft Rule language which will be reviewed by the Workgroup and then submitted as a recommendation to the Commission.

ASSIGNMENTS AND ITEMS NEEDED FOR THE NEXT MEETING:

- DCS staff will prepare a rule draft based on the PAWG’s proposals.
- The Workgroup agreed that DCA legal should 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.
- Staff will develop a list of proposed validation criteria for the Product Approval Administrator to use for each of the four compliance methods.
- The Product Approval POC will review the Administrator’s contract provisions and make recommendations regarding scope of services and possible changes to the contract based on the scope of services, including functioning as the validation entity.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATUTORY CHANGES/AUTHORIZATION RELATED TO THE PRODUCT APPROVAL SYSTEM

The following package of recommendations was unanimously adopted by the Workgroup.

1. SCOPE OF THE RULE

PRODUCTS THAT ARE SUBJECT TO PRODUCT APPROVAL

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.)

2. LOCAL PRODUCT APPROVAL

Clarify in the Rule that local approval may be accomplished by one of five ways, the four compliance methods (certification mark or listing, test report, evaluation report by evaluation entity and evaluation report by A or E) currently in the Rule, or by state approval using Commission approved entities, or may be validated by the local AHJ.

Products demonstrating compliance shall be manufactured under a Q.A. program audited by an approved Q.A. entity.

Determine and require the necessary criteria for the evaluation of the above documents be provided for review of the approval.

Products bearing a certification mark or listing or label by an approved certification agency require no further documentation to establish compliance.

Local building officials may accept modifications to products or their installations provided sufficient evidence is submitted to the local building official to demonstrate compliance with the Code or the intent of the Code, including such evidence as certifications from a Florida Registered Architect or Florida Professional Engineer.

Eliminate the mandatory checklist required for local product approval.

Eliminate the application form, and use the criteria currently in the form as list of minimum submittal criteria required for product approval application.
3. EVALUATION—INSTALLATION INSTRUCTIONS

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

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 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.

4. EVALUATION—PRODUCT/MATERIALS EXEMPTIONS

Seek statutory authority for the Commission to adopt by rule, an exemption from the (Method 1 and Method 2) evaluation requirements for products/materials that are subject to specification standards in the Florida Building Code.

5. VALIDATION ENTITY

Seek statutory authority to eliminate the third party validation entity in the validation process, and require the Product Approval System Administrator to conduct this function. The Commission will develop a set of criteria for reviewing each of the four compliance options.
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>

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>Initial Ranking 10/20/04</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 Ranking 1/11/05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Ranking 2/9/05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Ranking 3/9/05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 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>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minor Reservations:

• List the approved products under the subcategory.
• Clarify the subcategory of products that do not need State approval.
B. Definition of Structural Components

1. **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 (9B-72.005) 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><strong>Initial Ranking</strong> 1/11/05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revised Ranking with Exemption 1/11/05</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Non-conditioned Appurtenant Structures

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

Summary of PAWG Action:
No action was taken on this issue.

D. 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></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><strong>Ranking: Custom Exempt 1/11/05</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ranking: Standard-Replicated Remove Sheds from the Rule 1/11/05</strong></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.
E. 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>

F. 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>

G. Wind Breaker sub-category of windows.

1. Remove the wind breaker sub-category from the windows category of the Rule.

<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 2/9/05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
The Workgroup agreed to recommend removing this sub-category from the Rule.

Major Reservation:
Even if this is not part of the WFRS, this is still a life safety issue and should require product approval by the system.

H. Railing sub-category of structural components.

1. Remove the railing subcategory from the structural components category of the Rule.

<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 2/9/05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
The Workgroup unanimously agreed to recommend removing this sub-category from the Rule.
II. EVALUATION

A. Requiring Installation Instructions For All Compliance Options.

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

<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. (i) 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 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></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) 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.
C. What specific criteria should be required for identifying product limitations of use.

1. 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 1/12/05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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.


1. 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.)

Develop a method for recognizing equivalency of standards (9B-72.180).

<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 1/12/05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concern:
Should be allowed by the evaluating engineer.

E. Clarify in Rule the procedure for job specific approvals of products covered by the Rule (when the product is not to be used consistent with its approval).

1. Local building officials may accept modifications to products or their installations provided sufficient evidence is submitted to the local building official to demonstrate compliance with the Code or the intent of the Code, including such evidence as certifications from a Florida Registered Architect or Florida Professional Engineer.

<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 2/9/05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Clarify whether evaluation reports/certifications based on standardized tests adopted by the Code have to be tested by an approved test lab.

1. When the code requires a standardized test as a component of a product approval using the evaluation report or certification compliance method, the test lab must be accredited by an approved accreditation body. The entity issuing the evaluation report or certification is responsible to ensure that the test lab is accredited.

<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 2/9/05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minor Reservation:
We have product approvals currently for approved and non-approved test labs.

G. Clarify that rational engineering analysis can not be used in lieu of a standardized test required by the Code for approval of products within the scope of the standard. (Note: except for local project specific product approval in accordance with alternate methods and materials authorized in 103.7 of the FBC.)

<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 2/9/05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
Provide clarification in the Rule.

H. Clarify that a legacy evaluation report from an nationally recognized model code organization may be used if it shows compliance with the Florida Building Code.

<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 2/9/05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minor Reservation:
These reports should be backed up by the evaluation entity.
I. Exemptions for evaluation requirements for products subject to prescriptive specification standards found within the Code.

1. Seek statutory authority for the Commission to adopt by rule, an exemption from the evaluation requirements for products/materials that are subject to specification standards in the Florida Building Code.

(Staff will work with the Structural TAC to develop this list.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 2/8/05</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>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minor Reservation:
The test method can always be used and we already have a system that is working.

J. Evaluation by Architects and Engineers.

1. (4) Evaluation Report and Test Report Documentation Requirements. All reports and documentation required in subsections 9B-72.070(1) and (2), F.A.C., shall contain the information listed below. Design drawings submitted for permitting purposes are not to be construed to be an evaluation report and do not require this information.

   (a) Name and address of the manufacturer, evaluation entity, engineer or architect or testing laboratory.
   (b) Statement of compliance with the appropriate section or standard of the Code.
   (c) Complete description of the product, construction method or building system including, all drawings, manufacturers product designation, and materials, except materials specifics identified as proprietary.
   (d) Technical documentation, including all substantiating data, supporting the compliance statement. Substantiating data shall include all test reports and calculations which may be referenced within the report.
   (e) Installation requirements.
   (f) Limitations and conditions of use.
   (g) Certification of independence in conformance with Rule 9B-72.110, F.A.C.
   (h) Name, title and signature of person authorized to sign on behalf of entity or signature, registration number and seal in the case of architects and engineers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 3/28/05</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>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments/Discussion:
1. Certain manufacturers have objected to having certain documentation included because proprietary information would be included.
2. We should know what materials products are made out of.
3. Tests results would have to be disclosed by referencing the test document and not attached to the application.
4. Currently, evaluation reports only reference test reports and don’t give specifics.

Public Comment:
1. The way “d” is written it may require the report to be included.
2. Limited to in “c” should be specific and not leave it open ended. Drawings and materials would be a better way to state “c”.
3. On “d”, substantiating data would include a list of reports and don’t have to submit the tests reports.
4. Support the language in “d”. It should be clear that references to test reports be listed.
5. I have concerns of how these documents will be made available at a later date.

K. Resolve Discrepancies Between the Rule and Code for Product Labeling.

Summary of PAWG Action:
This issue is the subject of a complaint action and will have to be resolved at the POC level.

III. QUALITY ASSURANCE

A. Exemptions for third party quality assurance for certain products for both local and state approval.

1. Products that have prescriptive specification standards and Q.A. procedures as specified in the Code will be deemed approved. The Commission will seek statutory authority to exempt these products, and the product list will be developed on a case-by-case basis. (No list will be created at this time).

<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>10/20/04</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Discussion:
1. The Commission approved the recommendations of the Structural TAC.
B. Third party Quality Assurance is not Required for Site Specific Shop Fabricated Curtain-Wall Systems, provided that system components have Q.A. as provided by the Rule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 3/28/05</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>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Reservation:**
Field installations should require third party quality assurance.

**Comments/Discussion:**
1. If it is site specific, it is exempt from the product approval rule.
2. Do not require system to have Q.A., but the components would.

**Public Comment:**
1. AAMA would work with these fabricators to develop a voluntary Q.A. program.
2. I would recommend requiring Q.A. for these systems.
3. The system is exempt from the rule and should not be required Q.A.
4. All curtain walls in our area are site specific.

C. Quality Assurance Entities.

1. **Clarify in the Rule that Commission approved Certification Agencies are also approved as Quality Assurance Entities for the products covered by their certification program.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 3/28/05</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>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments/Discussion:**
1. Q.A. is included as the process for certification agencies.

D. Clarify in Rule that Q.A. agencies that are ISO rated do require additional approval by the Commission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 3/28/05</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>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments/Discussion:**
1. This is clear in the Rule.
E. Clarify the role of the quality assurance agency and the criteria manufacturer must meet.

1. Define the follow requirements for quality assurance entities and their program participant manufacturers:

Manufacturers shall provide the quality assurance entity named on the product approval application with all test and/or evaluation reports that are used to qualify products for Florida state or local product approval.

Quality assurance entities shall verify that program participants operate as defined in a documented quality management system that is sufficient to ensure products are manufactured as described by the test and/or evaluation reports used to qualify the product for state or local approval.

Quality assurance entities shall require program participants maintain records to indicate the components or raw materials used in the manufacture of approved products meet the component specifications identified in the test and/or evaluation reports used to qualify the product for state approval.

Quality assurance entities shall require manufacturers clearly differentiate approved from non-approved products as part of the manufacturer’s documented quality management system.

Quality assurance entities shall require manufacturers maintain records of approved products shipped, for a time period defined by the quality assurance entity.

Quality assurance entities shall maintain a publicly-accessible listing of program participants.

Quality assurance entities shall provide documented requirements for initial and ongoing program participation, to include limited time periods for the participant to demonstrate compliance with the program requirements.

Quality assurance entities shall suspend program participation in the event the participant does not demonstrate compliance within stated time periods, and shall provide documented notice of suspension of participation to the participant and to the Product Approval Administrator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 3/28/05</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>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of PAWG Action:
This proposal did not achieve consensus.
Comments/Discussion:
1. Are we going to add unnecessary requirements that are not currently in place? This may create a whole new level that has not been considered. This may create an enforcement issue for the POC.
2. Jon is explicitly stating the requirements for Q.A. entities. Our Q.A. manual already addresses all of these. This is no additional burden for manufacturers.
3. Is there anything on this list that they are not currently doing?
4. This is trying to level the playing field.
5. This is more normal for manufacturers and Q.A. entities, but we can put this in the Rule and make it more explicit.
6. Clarify that suspension would be from the Q.A. function and the Administrator would take it to the Commission for action.
7. Enforcement issues may contaminate the Rule process. Q.A. entity could sign a statement of understanding of the quality assurance process.
8. The Rule references ISO 17020 which we rely on for approving Q.A. entities. This is a business function between the Q.A. entity and the manufacturer.
9. ISO 17020 spells out how a Q.A. agency operates and says very little about how the manufacturer operates.
10. If this doesn’t cure anything, I’m against putting it in the Rule.

Public Comment:
1. What will this add in additional costs beyond the ISO standard?
2. Most Q.A. entities use all of the items listed here.
3. I don’t think any of this is needed.
4. Q.A. has not been a problem with this system. Some of the requirements are onerous.

F. Add a third method of quality assurance for products at local level that are of limited use and have met all of the product approval requirements except for third party quality assurance.

Summary of PAWG Action:
The PAWG voted unanimously, 9 – 0 in favor, that this issue is already addressed by the Commission’s decision on local product approval.

G. Clarify how QA is accomplished at the local level for standard products when the QA entity is not an approved entity.

Summary of PAWG Action:
The PAWG voted unanimously, 9 – 0 in favor, that this issue is already addressed by the Commission’s decision on local product approval.
IV. VALIDATION

A. Clarify in the Rule what Level of Review is Required for Validation.

1. Seek statutory authority to eliminate the third party validation entity in the validation process, and require the Product Approval System Administrator to conduct this function. The Commission will develop a set of criteria for reviewing each of the four compliance options.

<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>2/8/05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of PAWG Action:
Note this option was adopted by the Commission.
The PAWG voted unanimously, 9 – 0 in favor, that this issue has been decided by the Commission, and that the development of a list of criteria should be done by the POC collaboratively with the system administrator.

Comments/Discussion/Reservations:

1. This should be looked at in two parts. Eliminate the third party validation entity and rely on the product approval administrator’s validation of applications. Provide what guidance is required for the administrator’s validation of applications.
2. Eliminating the validation process is not going down the right path. Whatever validation process you choose is not a good method. Validation is essential for third party independence to look at the applications. There are too many options and this makes it difficult. Options should be streamlined to the different category of products. Train the validators.
3. It will be detrimental to the process to get rid of the validation process.
4. Validation could be done better if it were done by only one entity.
5. Definition of validation entity, the validator functions are administrative.
6. This distributive system of validators with no oversight is a bad system.
7. This will eliminate some redundancy.
8. It took many meetings to come up with the Rule and this takes a big chunk away from the Rule and is wrong.

V. QUALIFICATION OF ENTITIES (no proposed revisions)

VI. FEES

The Commission voted to charge a $300.00 fee for revisions to already approved products.
VII. LOCAL PRODUCT APPROVAL

A. How local product approval is accomplished.

1. Clarify in the Rule that local approval may be accomplished by one of five ways, the four compliance methods (certification mark or listing, test report, evaluation report by evaluation entity and evaluation report by A or E) currently in the Rule, or by state approval using Commission approved entities, or may be validated by the local AHJ.

Products demonstrating compliance shall be manufactured under a Q.A. program audited by an approved Q.A. entity.

Determine and require the necessary criteria for the evaluation of the above documents be provided for review of the approval.

Products bearing a certification mark or listing or label by an approved certification agency require no further documentation to establish compliance.

Local building officials may accept modifications to products or their installations provided sufficient evidence is submitted to the local building official to demonstrate compliance with the Code or the intent of the Code, including such evidence as certifications from a Florida Registered Architect or Florida Professional Engineer.

Eliminate the mandatory checklist required for local product approval.

Eliminate the application form, and use the criteria currently in the form as list of minimum submittal criteria required for product approval application.

<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>10/20/04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>2/8/05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. BCIS (BUILDING CODE INFORMATION SYSTEM)

A. Enhancements to the BCIS Related to Revising Data on the System.

1. Authorize revisions to all data on an approved product. Adding a new product to an approved application should not be allowed in the revision process. Product revisions will apply to the same sub-category, and a revision history (tracking method) will be maintained.

<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 3/29/05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 3/29/05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Discussion:
1. Most revisions are adding limits of use and including HVHZ.
2. Put a field in the BCIS identifying the reason for the revision.
3. There should be a field for revision history.
4. Review of a revision should not be limited to the revision only, but should include a review for all data.

Minor reservations on first ranking:
1. Can you add a different size?

A.1.1 Revision: A revision is a material change to the performance of the product. The BCIS should have fields that can be changed without a fee. Provide a revision number for all changes. Minor changes such as section number changes with no substantive changes may be made without a fee; however, the manufacture will be required to certify that the revision does not have a material or substantive change.

<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 3/29/05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Discussion:
1. We need a list of what is a editorial or material change.
2. Changes to a document should be tracked with a number change or some distinction.
3. There should be a revision number for whatever is changed.
4. Change in code section should not be charged a revision fee. This should not be an issue.
5. Couldn’t the code section changes be handled at the time of renewal.
6. The code section issue is irrelevant now. It will correct itself in the two year renewal process.
7. Develop a cross reference list available to building departments of code section changes that did not affect performance.
8. A user friendly process is needed as soon as possible. Certification from the manufacturer that the product is still in compliance.

Public Comment:
1. There is a lag between the time of product approval and the time of permitting, installation and inspection.

A.1.2. A form should be developed to allow the manufacturer to certify compliance with the 2004 Code. The certification will be posted to the BCIS and there will be a random auditing process to verify claimed compliance with sanctions including revocation. There is no fee if there is no change. All changes will require a revision number. Update code sections is not a revision. There will be a revision history. Minor changes such as section number changes with no substantive changes may be made without a fee; however, the manufacturer will be required to certify that the revision does not have a material or substantive change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 3/29/05</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>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reservations:
Opening the BCIS to manufacturers if a mistake. What about products are found in an audit not to be in compliance with the 2004 Code? One entity should look at these products to determine code compliance.

Comments/Discussion:
1. Manufacturer self certification should be by adding to the BCIS a statement that the product does comply with the 2004 Code, old sections and new sections listed.
2. Add a new field showing new code section compliance.
3. There should be an audit system for checking claimed compliance with a stick for those that don’t.
4. Opening the BCIS to manufacturers if a mistake. What about products are found in an audit not to be in compliance with the 2004 Code? One entity should look at these products to determine code compliance.
5. This is an urgent timing issue.
6. What does M/D do with code section changes?
7. Performance based to a specific standard.

Public Comment:
1. Section reference changes must be reflected in the BCIS.
Use the 8th product category language and insert it into each of the other sub-categories. Eliminate the “other” sub-category and provide language within each sub-category that recognizes new technology.

<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>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Discussion:
1. Add screened areas as a subcategory.
2. These could fall under the category of panel walls.
3. We would have to have subcategories that would capture everything.
4. Leave in a sub-category for shutters, other storm barrier protection.

2. Add additional fields in the BCIS to standardize the formatting of the limits of use field.

<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>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Add help button to the system.

<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>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. How Should the Rule Link Approved Certification entity labels with the State Approval.

1. Require the FL # to be cross-linked to the product in the BCIS.

<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>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Modify the rule to require certification labels include a unique identification number that corresponds to the product / rating authorized for certification.** (This is currently done by the certification agencies internally, assigning a unique single letter code to each certifier would prevent duplication of these ID number between agencies.)

**Summary of PAWG Action:**
The PAWG voted unanimously, 10 – in favor, to delete this option from consideration.

**Comments/Discussion:**
1. Florida specific label and it won’t work.
2. Not Florida specific, but each certification agency could share one unique identifier code.
3. Require a field in BCIS that includes the unique identifier found on the label.
4. Two different agencies may have the same code.
5. Input certification agency first.
6. FL number in plan review, the inspector sees the same number in the field.
7. Not all products are required to be labeled. The Code defines what is on the label.

**Public Comment:**
1. Certification agencies require the identifier be put on the label/sheet. There’s no way of knowing the number in the field during inspection. No requirement for FL number on the product.

3. **Add the capability to the BCIS to allow building officials (and others) to search for product approvals based on this unique certification authorization ID number found on the label and certification documents.**

**Summary of PAWG Action:**
The PAWG voted unanimously, 10 – in favor, to delete this option from consideration.

**IX. MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS**

A. **Terminology for State Approval.**

1. **Replace statewide with state in 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</td>
<td>3/29/05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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B. Certification Numbers Applying to More than One Product (BO Review).

1. Clarify in the Rule how certification numbers apply to more than one product.

Summary of PAWG Action:
The PAWG voted unanimously, 10 – in favor, to delete this option from consideration.

Public Comment:
1. There is no provision for lumping these together.
2. This is not a rule issue, but an issue of how to use the BCIS.
NOTE: Delete this issue.

C. Define what constitutes adding a new product.

Summary of PAWG Action:
The PAWG determined this issue was handled by the decision on revisions.

D. Should there be a conditional or deferred application status on the BCIS?

Summary of PAWG Action:
This issue was referred to the Product Approval Program Oversight Committee (POC).

Comments/Discussion:
1. The POC can assign a deferral. The administrator would like to have a conditional status.
2. Conditionals are more editorial in nature.
3. This is a POC issue.
NOTE: Defer the POC.

E. Coordinate and correlate terms used in the HVHZ sections (Code) with the Product Approval System/Rule.

Summary of PAWG Action:
The PAWG voted unanimously, 10 – in favor, that no action was needed on this issue, since it will be resolved by the implementation of the 2004 Florida Building Code.

Comments/Discussion:
1. M/D uses the term NOA and no one else does. It appears that an NOA would be needed to get HVHZ approval. The Code says you have to have an NOA.
2. Let code officials know of this change.
3. This is a concern because it is possible to get an HVHZ approval outside M/D.

NOTE: This goes away with the 2004 code and no longer an issue. No action: 10/0.
F. Define technical documentation.

Summary of PAWG Action:
This issue was referred to the Product Approval Program Oversight Committee (POC).

Comments/Discussion:
1. This is a POC issue
2. This is already handled by the discussion of evaluation reports.

G. Define limitations of use.

For each of the product subcategories the minimum limitations of use must include whether the product is or is not for use in the HVHZ, wind speed, design pressure, and impact vs. non-impact.

<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>3/29/05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Discussion:
1. Staff has developed a list of limits of use by sub-category being used now on the BCIS.
2. It will be difficult to create an all inclusive list. POC should determine if limits of use are applicable for each product application.
3. Three criteria for limits of use should be HVHZ, wind speed, and design pressures.
4. Provide minimum criteria for these three items.
5. For windows, wind zone is more complicated than just the wind speed.
6. Add impact vs. non-impact.
7. Turn this over to staff to develop a very short list of limits of use.
8. Have the administrator fill in the limits of use.
9. Include a limit of “strength capacity”.

Public Comment:
1. There have been no instructions for manufacturers to use. Having criteria is important. A definition is needed. I have major problems with this list.
2. Maximum design pressure and impact rating would be beneficial.
3. This is not a problem and no action should be needed. If the product meets the requirements of the code, this should be sufficient.
4. HVHZ should be included and would cut down on meeting time at the POC meetings.
5. We don’t make any products that do not fit in these limits of use like structural products. Add “not applicable” for these types of products.
6. This would help to clarify what needs to be put on the application.
H. Define the term “custom”

Summary of PAWG Action:
The PAWG agreed no rule action is needed and this issue is dealt with in the Code.

Comments/Discussion:
1. The dictionary defines it as “made to order”.
2. The code doesn’t exempt them, they just don’t have to comply with the rule.
3. Custom is more unique than site specific.
4. Inform building departments that custom deals with code compliance and not compliance with the rule.

Public Comment:
1. P. B. County has had a problem with this term.
2. M/D County has a similar issue including products coming in from other countries.
3. This could be a local product approval issue.

NOTE: This is handled by the Code and not a rule issue.

I. Should the product approval application number remain the same as the product approval number once the product has achieved product approval under the system?

Summary of PAWG Action:
The PAWG voted unanimously, 9 – in favor, to delete this issue from consideration. No action is needed.

Comments/Discussion:
1. Some manufacturers are taking the FL application number and using it as an FL approval number.
2. This is an education problem.

J. Require that an e-mail notification be sent to the selected Test Lab, whenever an applicant uses a test report as a part of their product approval submittal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking 3/29/05</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>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
K. Require that all test reports have a valid company name and address on them.

<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 3/29/05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments/Discussion:
1. There should be a valid company name and address listed.
2. There have been unauthorized use of test reports.

L. Local Approval of Products Denied by the Florida Building Commission.

1. Do not allow local jurisdictions to approve products that have been denied for technical insufficiency by the Florida Building Commission without providing additional clarifying technical data showing compliance with the code.

<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 3/29/05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of PAWG Action:
This option did achieve consensus and should be included in the Rule draft.

Minor reservations:
1. We are setting up a system that is not in place. Locals have the responsibility to check this anyway.
2. There is no way currently to verify this.
3. We’re dictating to the local jurisdiction conduct.

Comments/Discussion:
1. The intent is that applications coming to the Commission and are denied, that the local jurisdiction can not override the Commission’s action by granting a local approval. Locals should be able to approve using different documentation.
2. This is not workable.
3. Some Commission denials have been because the product is outside the scope of the Rule, or alternate materials and methods. Reason for denial not posted.
4. Include statement that the denial was because of technical insufficiency.
5. Should all denials be listed on the BCIS?
6. Denials can be archived on the BCIS and not seen by the building official.

Public comment:
1. State approval is optional. If denied by Commission, they have to seek local approval. This is not needed.
2. Homeowners deserve the same protection with local approvals as they would get with state approval. This doesn’t make sense.
3. I support this in concept, but I would need to look at the technical documentation related to the denial.

_The explanation for denial should be posted on the BCIS._

<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>3/29/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Add new sub-category for structural to cover concrete and masonry anchors._

**Summary of PAWG Action:**
The PAWG voted unanimously, 10 – in favor, to approve this recommendation.
0 TO 10 RATING SCALE WHERE A 0 MEANS TOTALLY DISAGREE AND A 10 MEANS TOTALLY AGREE.

1. Please assess the overall meeting.
   - 9.64 The background information was very useful.
   - 9.79 The agenda packet was very useful.
   - 9.79 The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.
   - 9.59 Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.
   - 9.43 Consideration of Issues in Turn and Identification of Additional Options.
   - 9.43 Adoption of Package of Recommendations for Rule Draft Proposal.
   - 9.66 Next Steps and Agenda Items for Next Meeting.

2. Please tell us how well the facilitator helped the participants engage in the meeting.
   - 9.43 The participants followed the direction of the facilitator.
   - 9.86 The facilitator made sure the concerns of all participants were heard.
   - 9.64 The facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
   - 9.58 Participant input was documented accurately.

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

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

5. Do you have any other comments that you would like to add?
   - Good progress on the issues
   - Thanks for the audio system