Florida Building Commission
South Florida Integration Ad Hoc on Product Approval

Sunday, December 5, 1999
Orlando, Florida

Objectives

- To Agree on the Agenda and Guidelines for the Meeting
- To Hear a Proposal from Stakeholder's Group
- To Review the Commission's Ranked Product Approval Integration Options
- To Review, Refine, and Agree on a Product Approval Integration Option
- To Review, Refine, and Agree on Components of the Statewide Product Approval System
- To Hear Public Comment on the Proposed Option
- To Adopt a Product Approval Integration Option to Present to the Commission in December
- To Adopt the Components of the Product Approval System
- To Agree on Needed Next Steps

Agenda

1:00   Opening
Welcome and meeting objectives
Review and approval of guidelines and agenda

1:10   Report from Stakeholder's Workgroup on Proposed Refinements to Option D

1:30   Review Commission Ranked Product Approval Options

1:45   Review and Adopt Conceptual Starting Option

2:00   Review, Refine, and Agree on Product Approval Integration Option

3:00   Break

**3:15   Continue to Review, Refine, and Agree on Product
Approval Integration Option**

3:30   Review, Refine, and Agree on Components of the Statewide Product Approval System

4:00   Summary of Consensus on the Proposed Product Approval Integration and System Components Option

4:15   Public Comment on Consensus Option

4:40   Adoption of Option and Needed Next Steps
Instructions to staff for final presentation to Commission in December

4:50   Summary

5:00   Recess

Proposed Guidelines
South Florida Integration Ad Hoc on Product Approval
12/5/99

1. **Decision Rule.** Committee members will use the Commission consensus decision rule requiring 75% support for a proposal to be presented back to the Commission in December. (Requiring 6 of 8 members to agree on an option to make a committee decision)

2. **Committee Charge.** Committee members are charged by the Chair to develop consensus on an option for presentation to the Commission for consideration in December.

3. **Committee Members and Advisors.** Committee members, including the Commission Chair and Vice Chair, will be the only participants at the table but may, at the opening of the meeting identify advisors they have present at the meeting. The Chair, at his discretion, may permit an advisor to provide information to the Committee and any member may request a caucus to consult with them prior to a Committee decision.

4. **Problem Solving.** Members should acknowledge different views and perspectives and avoid stereotyping and personal attacks.

5. **Observers.** Observers are welcome to speak during the public comment sessions and provide input through written comments on post-its during the course of the meeting.

6. **Facilitation.** Facilitators will assist the Chair and members by facilitating an efficient consensus process to adopt an option for presentation to the full Commission in December. Facilitators may suggest use of consensus techniques such as ranking to achieve consensus on the option.

South Florida Code Integration
Statewide Product Approval System

Commission Ranked South Florida Integration Options:

1. (E.) Miami-Dade County Product Control is accredited by the Commission as one of the Approved Product Evaluation Agencies for all covered products (those requiring statewide approval). (Shaw Proposal) **Rank: 1**

2. (A.) Florida Building Commission contracts the operation of the state product approval system (but not the actual approvals) to Miami-Dade County Product Control. (Bassett Proposal) **Rank: 2**

3. (D.)Miami-Dade County Product Control is accredited by the Commission as one of the Approved Product Evaluation Agencies for all covered products (those requiring statewide approval). In addition, Miami-Dade is contracted to provide quality assurance auditing for the state product approval system. **Rank: 3**

4. (C.) Miami-Dade County Product Control approves all products covered by regional (high velocity hurricane zone standards which exceed the general statewide standards) standards but not statewide standards. **Rank: 4**

5. (F.) The Miami-Dade product approval system would be the system for the entire state. (Miami-Dade County Proposal) **Rank: 5**

6. (B.) Miami-Dade County Product Control is delegated the authority for state approval of all covered products (those identified by the Commission for statewide approval) in the high velocity hurricane zone. **Rank: 6**

Option	Rank	5	4	3	2	1	Score
A	2	3	3	2	3	3	42
B	6	0	0	2	5	7	23
C	4	1	1	3	6	3	33
D	3	2	1	5	5	1	40
E	1	2	9	3	0	0	55
F	5	1	0	1	4	8	24

Ranking Scale:
5   Wholehearted Support
4   Could be Better
3   Okay, Has +/-
2   Poor, Serious Concerns Must be Addressed
1   Oppose, (Over My dead Body)

Commission Comments on Proposed Options

Option A
Is Miami-Dade willing to do this?
Who would do the actual approval?
This limits the system to only one approval entity.
Strike the word "delegate" and this option would be legal.
Pros
This is a very good proposal.
Cons
The Commission cannot delegate but it can contract.
This reduces competition.

Option B
Is this referring to just high velocity hurricane zone?
Does this option meet the intent of the legislation?
Is this legal?
Cons
Apparently this is not legal.
This separates Dade County from the rest of the state.

Option C
Is this legal?
Is the high hurricane zone just in Miami-Dade and Broward Counties?
Can any other county elect to be a high velocity hurricane zone?
Is Palm Beach County part of this option?
Pros
This option provides sharing between Broward and Dade Counties.

Option D
What services will be provided and how will they be provided?
Is there no trust in the current system? Does another entity need to be involved?
Does Miami-Dade have any input on these options?
Pros
This option supports quality assurance.
Cons
There is no need for the middle step.

Option E
This is option D with the exclusion of the last sentence.
Why are we doing this exercise without the input of Miami-Dade?
Pros
Miami-Dade is one of several alternatives and they would be equal to nationally
recognized agencies.

Option F
This is the Dade County proposal – The Dade County approval would be the approval
for the state. (This is similar to Option A.)
Cons
This is not legal.

Review and Discussion of Ranking Exercise Results of South Florida Code Integration Issues Related to Product Approval
The Commission reviewed the ranks and agreed that the South Florida Integration Ad Hoc Committee would consider the results of the ranking exercise and develop a consensus option to present to the Commission at the December meeting. The Ad Hoc will meet Saturday, November 20, 1999 in Miami. The Ad Hoc members appointed were Chairman Raul Rodriguez, Vice Chair Doug Murdock, and Commission members Nick D'Andrea, Dick Browdy, Med Kopczynski, Jim Mehltretter, George Wiggins, and Craig Parrino.

Ranking Exercise Discussion:

Miami-Dade has said that they will provide input on all of the options.
Option F was the original Dade County option.

Option E was the "Shaw" option. It was the position of the TAC.
Option E is supported by contractors in South Florida.

Miami-Dade has an excellent system and it should be considered for the whole state.

It is not a good idea to assign responsibilities to someone until all the details of the system are understood.

Miami-Dade could conduct this process without any learning curve because they are already doing it. (Option A)
The Florida Building Commission would provide ratification instead of the Miami-Dade Council under Option A.

COMMISSION'S RANKING OF COMPONENTS OF THE PROPOSED FLORIDA PRODUCT EVALUATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS

Ranking Scale
3= Whole hearted support
2= Heartburn-could support with the following changes…
1= coronary- can't support unless serious concerns addressed as follows…

Ranking Scale	3	2	1	
Overall Rank	1	11	4	
1. Introduction	4	8	4	
2. Part A- Product Evaluation	1	12	3	
3. Approved Product Evaluation Entity	1	11	4	
4. Evaluation Rpt/Rational Analysis	1	9	6	
5. Part B- Validation & Approval- Statewide Ap.	1	7	8	
6. Approval Based on Rpt. From App. PE entity	1	7	7	
7. Approval Based on Rpt. Or Rational Analy.PE/Ar.	1	6	9	
8. Product Approval by Local Juris.	4	4	8	
9. Grandfathering	5	8	3	
10. FBC Procedures for Approving Test Org.	3	10	3	
11. Acceptance Criteria for Qual. Assur. Agency Accreditation	1	12	3	
12. Revocation/ Notification	6	6	4	

Florida Building Commission
South Florida Integration Ad Hoc on Product Approval

Saturday November 20, 1999
Miami, Florida

Meeting Evaluation Form

How well did the Commission achieve the meeting objectives?

Circle One

	Good				Poor

- To Agree on the Agenda and Guidelines for the Meeting   5 4 3 2 1
- To Hear a Proposal from Stakeholder's Group   5 4 3 2 1
- To Review the Commission's Ranked Product Approval   5 4 3 2 1
  Integration Options
- To Refine a Consensus Option   5 4 3 2 1
- To Agree on Components of the Statewide Product   5 4 3 2 1
  Approval System
- To Hear Public Comment on the Proposed Option   5 4 3 2 1
- To Adopt a Product Approval Integration Option   5 4 3 2 1
  to Present to the Commission in November
  To Adopt the Components of the Product Approval System   5 4 3 2 1
- To Agree on Needed Next Steps   5 4 3 2 1

Rate the following aspects of the meeting?

Clarity of the meeting purpose and plan   5 4 3 2 1

Balance of structure and flexibility   5 4 3 2 1

Group involvement and productivity   5 4 3 2 1

Facilitation   5 4 3 2 1

Facility   5 4 3 2 1

Comments:

What did you like best about the meeting?

How could the meeting have been improved?