

**FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION**  
**LOCAL PRODUCT APPROVAL WORK GROUP**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FLORIDA BUILDING**  
**COMMISSION**

**FACILITATOR'S REPORT OF THE AUGUST 11, 2004**  
**ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING**

*Orlando, Florida*

Meeting Design & Facilitation By



Report By Jeff A. Blair  
Florida State University



[jblair@fsu.edu](mailto:jblair@fsu.edu)  
[http:// consensus.fsu.edu](http://consensus.fsu.edu)

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

# **FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION**

## **REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE LOCAL PRODUCT APPROVAL WORK GROUP MEETING I**

### **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.

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

#### **Local Government**

George Wiggins

#### **Building Officials**

Dale Greiner  
Christ Sanidas  
Ronnie Spooner

#### **Product Manufacturers**

Dave Olmstead  
Craig Parrino

#### **Certification Agencies**

John Hill

#### **Residential Contractors**

Dick Browdy

#### **Engineers**

Steve Bassett

#### **Evaluation Entities**

Herminio Gonzalez

#### **General Contractors**

Ed Carson

## **OVERVIEW OF WORK GROUP'S KEY DECISIONS**

**WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 11, 2004**

### **Agenda Review and Work Group Plan Overview**

The Work Group voted unanimously, 11 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented. Following are the key agenda items approved for Meeting I:

- ✓ To Review and Adopt Work Group Procedures and Guidelines
- ✓ To Identify Issues Requiring Clarification and/or Revision Related to Existing Process
- ✓ To Propose Options for Identified Issues
- ✓ To Evaluate and Rank Proposed Options
- ✓ To Refine Options Enjoying a High Level of Acceptability
- ✓ To Agree on Preliminary Consensus Recommendations to Submit to the Commission
- ✓ To Consider Public Comment
- ✓ To Identify Needed Next Steps and Agenda Items For Next Meeting

### **Member Attendance**

The following members attended Meeting I:

Steve Bassett, Dick Browdy, Ed Carson, Herminio Gonzalez, Dale Geiner, John Hill, Dave Olmstead, Craig Parrino, Christ Sanidas, Ronnie Spooner, Pete Tagliarini, and George Wiggins.

### **DCA Staff Attendance**

Buster Case, Rick Dixon, Mo Madani, Jim Richmond, and Richard Shine.

### **Facilitation**

The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair.

### **Work Group's Decision-Making Procedures**

Jeff Blair, Work Group facilitator, reviewed proposed consensus-building and decision-making procedures for the Work Group. These recommendations emphasize the Work Group's commitment to work to achieve consensus on proposals, and only after thorough discussion will the Work Group vote, utilizing the 75% in support threshold requirement for favorable recommendations.

#### ***Work Group action:***

**Motion**—The Work Group voted 11 – 0 in support to approve the proposed procedures as presented.

**Overview of Meeting Process**

The facilitator prepared a worksheet for use during the meeting. The worksheet listed the issues as identified by BOAF and then listed BOAF’s preferred option for each of the issues. 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 (no additional issue were offered) 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:

<b>Acceptability Ranking Scale</b>	<i>4= acceptable I agree</i>	<i>3 = acceptable, I agree with minor reservations</i>	<i>2= not acceptable, I don’t agree unless major reservations addressed</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
------------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------

Following are the issues evaluated during the course of the meeting:

- A. Which products should be subject to local product approval.
- B. Responsibility of Local Jurisdictions
- C. Definition of Structural Components
- D. Exemptions for third party quality assurance for certain products.
- E. Allowances for Automatic Acceptance for Certain Product Approval Methods.
- F. Validation of Performance Evaluations at Local Approval.
- G. Acceptance of Products at the Local Level.
- H. Forms and Checklists.

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 decided that rather than agree to any specific recommendations for revisions to rule and or law, they would reach agreement on key concepts related to each of the issues and flesh out specifics at a future meeting. 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.

## Work Group’s Conceptual Recommendations

Following are the key conceptual recommendations for each issue and the acceptability rankings by Work Group members. In addition, member’s reservations are noted as comments.

### A. Which products should be subject to local 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 FBC as related to Rule 9B-72.*

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>		

**Minor Reservation:** Prefer this be mandatory for these products (building envelope and structural frame) and voluntary for all other products.

### B. Responsibility of Local Jurisdictions

- 1. Remove building code requirements already in the rule and replace with specific requirements for local product approval (with the exception of equivalency of standards).*

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i>	<b>11</b>			

- 2. Local jurisdictions verify that products comply with the code through plan review, or inspection, or state approval number, or local approval in accordance with Rule 9B-72.*

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i>	<b>10</b>		<b>1</b>	

**Major Reservation:** This is confusing plans review and inspection with product approval.

### C. Definition of Structural Components

- 1. Revise the definition of structural components.*

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i>	<b>9</b>			

**D. Exemptions for third party quality assurance for certain products.**

- 1. Clarify how standardized products and products from foreign countries are dealt with in the rule, for example glue lam beams, dimensional lumber, nails, re-bar, CMU's, etc.*

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i>	<b>10</b>			

**E. Allow for Automatic Acceptance for Certain Product Approval Methods.**

- 1. Clarify how products bearing a certification mark or listing or label by an approved certification agency require no further documentation to establish compliance with Rule 9B-72.*

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i>	<b>10</b>			

**F. Validation of Performance Evaluations at Local Approval.**

- 1. Review language related to steps required to perform a validation of the performance evaluation at the local level and leave the method of determination of whether the manufacturer has demonstrated compliance with the Code completely at the discretion of the building department.*

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i>	<b>10</b>			

## G. Acceptance of Products at the Local Level.

Members agreed this issue is covered under issue B: responsibility of local jurisdictions.

## H. Forms and Checklists.

### 1. *Review requirements for use of application for local product approval form, and validation checklist for local approval form.*

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>		

**Minor Reservations:** Some felt some or all of the forms should be required to ensure uniformity, and others felt the forms should be available but voluntary.

## ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATION

*Expand the scope of the local product approval workgroup to incorporate Rule 9B-72 in its entirety.*

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>		

**Minor Reservations:** Two members expressed concern that this process may slow down the quick-fix phase of the rule development process, and/or the rule in general.

## FORMAL WORK GROUP ACTION

**Motion—The Work Group voted unanimously, 10 – 0 in favor to approve the entire package of recommendations and submit them for the Commission’s consideration at the August 31, 2004 Commission meeting.**

## PUBLIC COMMENT REQUEST

Consider expanding the workgroup’s representation to include additional stakeholder groups.

## **LPAWG PRELIMINANRY RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **A. Which products should be subject to local 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 FBC as related to Rule 9B-72.*

### **B. Responsibility of Local Jurisdictions**

- 1. Remove building code requirements already in the rule and replace with specific requirements for local product approval (with the exception of equivalency of standards).*
- 2. Local jurisdictions verify that products comply with the code through plan review, or inspection, or state approval number, or local approval in accordance with Rule 9B-72.*

### **C. Definition of Structural Components**

- 1. Revise the definition of structural components.*

### **D. Exemptions for third party quality assurance for certain products.**

- 1. Clarify how standardized products and products from foreign countries are dealt with in the rule, for example glue lam beams, dimensional lumber, nails, re-bar, CMU's, etc.*

### **E. Allow for Automatic Acceptance for Certain Product Approval Methods.**

- 1. Clarify how products bearing a certification mark or listing or label by an approved certification agency require no further documentation to establish compliance with Rule 9B-72.*



**F. Validation of Performance Evaluations at Local Approval.**

- 1. Review language related to steps required to perform a validation of the performance evaluation at the local level and leave the method of determination of whether the manufacturer has demonstrated compliance with the Code completely at the discretion of the building department.*

**G. Forms and Checklists.**

- 1. Review requirements for use of application for local product approval form, and validation checklist for local approval form.*

**H. Expand the Scope of Issues for the LPAWG**

- 1. Expand the scope of the local product approval workgroup to incorporate Rule 9B-72 in its entirety (local and state approval).*

# ATTACHMENT 1

## LOCAL PRODUCT APPROVAL WORKGROUP August 11, 2004—Orlando, Florida

### Meeting Evaluation Results

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

**1. Please assess the overall meeting.**

- 7.7 \_\_\_ The background information was very useful.
- 9.0 \_\_\_ The agenda packet was very useful.
- 9.1 \_\_\_ The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.
- 8.2 \_\_\_ Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.
- 9.4 \_\_\_ Adoption of Work Group Procedures and Guidelines.
- 8.6 \_\_\_ Identification of Issues Requiring Clarification and/or Revision.
- 8.0 \_\_\_ Proposing of Options for Identified Issues.
- 9.2 \_\_\_ Ranking and Discussion of Issues Enjoying A High Level of Acceptability.
- 9.3 \_\_\_ Agreement on Preliminary Consensus Recommendations to Submit to the Commission.
- 9.3 \_\_\_ Needed 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.
- 9.3 \_\_\_ The facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
- 9.6 \_\_\_ Participant input was documented accurately.

**3. What is your level of satisfaction with the meeting?**

- 8.9 \_\_\_ Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
- 9.3 \_\_\_ I was very satisfied with the services provided by the facilitator.
- 9.2 \_\_\_ I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

**2. What progress did you make?**

- 8.0 \_\_\_ I know what the next steps following this meeting will be.
- 8.3 \_\_\_ I know who is responsible for the next steps.

**5. Do you have any other comments that you would like to add? We are very interested in your comments. Please use the back of this page.**

- *Meeting was well organized and directed by the facilitator.*