

**SOFFIT SYSTEMS WORKGROUP MEETING II
REPORT TO THE FLORIDA BUILDING
COMMISSION**



February 4, 2009

Melbourne, Florida

Facilitation, Meeting and Process Design By



CONSENSUS SOLUTIONS

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



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

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

FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION

SOFFIT SYSTEMS WORKGROUP REPORT

OVERVIEW

Chairman Rodriguez announced that at the request of stakeholders the Commission is convening a Soffit Systems Workgroup. The Workgroup will work with affected stakeholder interests in a facilitated workgroup process to evaluate and build consensus on recommendations regarding labeling and performance requirements for soffit systems in the Florida Building Code.

labeling requirements for soffit systems in the Florida Building Code.

MEMBERS

Joe Belcher, Bob Boyer, Joe Breese, Jimmy Buckner, Rusty Carroll, Dave Johnston/Matthew Dobson (member/alternate), Jamie Gascon, Allen Hoying, Do Kim, C.W. Macomber, Lance Olsen, Paul Radauskus, Tim Reinhold, Neil Sexton, and Jim Schock.

REPORT OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2009 MEETING

Opening and Meeting Attendance

The meeting started at 8:30 AM, and the following Workgroup members were present: Joe Belcher, Bob Boyer, Youry Demosthenes for Jimmy Buckner, Rusty Carroll, Dave Johnston, Jamie Gascon, Allen Hoying, Do Kim, C.W. Macomber, Greg Yantorno for Paul Radauskus, Bill York for Tim Reinhold, Neil Sexton, and Jim Schock.

DCA Staff Present

Rick Dixon and Mo Madani.

Public Present

Mike Hammer, Greg Kopp, Forrest Masters, and Ralph Stas.

Meeting Facilitation

The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair from the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium at Florida State University. Information at: <http://consensus.fsu.edu/>



CONSENSUS SOLUTIONS

Project Webpage

Information on the project, including agenda packets, meeting reports, and related documents may be found in downloadable formats at the project webpage below:

<http://consensus.fsu.edu/FBC/soffit.html>

Agenda Review and Approval

The Workgroup voted unanimously, 13 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented including the following objectives:

- To Approve Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda)
- To Hear an Overview of the Workgroup's Scope and Charge
- To Review Workgroup Procedures, Guidelines, and Decision-Making Requirements
- To Identify Issues and Options Regarding Implementing Labeling Requirements for Soffit Systems
- To Discuss and Evaluate Level of Acceptability of Proposed Options
- To Consider Public Comment
- To Identify Needed Next Steps and Agenda Items for Next Meeting

Approval of November 12, 2008 Facilitator's Meeting Summary Report

The Workgroup voted unanimously, 13 - 0 in favor, to approve the November 12, 2008 Facilitator's Summary Report as presented.

Identification of Additional Issues and Options

Workgroup members were asked to identify key topical issues that should be evaluated for developing soffit systems labeling recommendations for the Florida Building Code. The Workgroup identified and agreed on the key issues for evaluation regarding soffit systems, as follows:

- **Format**
- **Content** (what should be provided on the label)
- **Inspection Needs** (providing on-site what the building inspector needs to ensure the product complies with the Code)
- **Performance Standards** (product/material types and prescriptive requirements)
- **Installation Instructions**
- **Site-Built Systems**

Discussion, Identification and Evaluation in Turn of Options Regarding Possible Labeling Requirements for Soffit Systems

Members were requested to identify, discuss and evaluate a range of options regarding possible labeling requirements for soffit systems in the Florida Building Code.

Overview and Summary of Discussion and Participant's Questions and Comments:

DJ: shouldn't it be decided whether label is needed first as a threshold issue.

JB: good idea, the first discussion is should there be a label requirement in the Code.

DJ: I have no position one way or other, but group should decide whether to make this recommendations, and if the answer is yes, then move on to details.

JS: the impetus for labeling is a result of the 2004 hurricanes, building inspectors' problem is guidance is needed on what should be allowed when looking at products on buildings.

MM: the Code already requires labeling of vinyl via the reference standard.

RC: does Miami-Dade allow labeling of just box packages, or the actual product as well.

JG: the marking on packaging does have to be linked to the actual product, but M-D does allow labeling of

just packaging (box), with a linking of a “lot number” that is on the product and ties it back to the package.
BY: once the product is installed one can’t see label on the soffit, so Workgroup approach similar to shingles and allow label to be on the package; the major problem is installation so inspection needs to be done before installation is complete.

RC/JG: an identifiable mark has to be on each soffit piece, at least every 4 feet in Miami-Dade.

GY: if inspection is done before project is complete then a mark on each piece could be viewed before the building is closed up.

JS: we need to hash out when the inspection is done so this marking issue can be resolved.

CWM: manufacturer’s say they can’t do a mark on each piece, some mfg’s don’t want to be the one that gets the Product Approval and the others’ use their data/approval without going through the process themselves; labeling has been solved for other components and there are ways of doing it the soffit components too.

JB: there are field-built systems such as wood and stucco systems that need to be considered also.

Non-binding straw poll: Members were asked whether in concept they supported a labeling requirement in the Code, with the understanding they can decide later once the details are agreed on.

Vote: 14-0 unanimous.

RC: how about straw poll on labeling the packaging (with a tie-back to the product like Miami-Dade’s method) vs. piece labeling.

Straw poll on package with tie-back vs. each piece labeling: 12 support package, 2 support piece labeling.

JS: I’m flexible on the final decision, but for now like individual label approach better.

CWM: I agree with JS.

DK/JG: describe M-D system for soffits; lineals of vinyl goes to site in 12’ to 20’ pieces, and requires a mark on each piece every 4 feet; the mark must be linkable to the package and the package has link to the NOA.

LO: my group does both piece and package labeling, but wants the outcome to have sufficient flexibility to not require major revamping of the existing system with accompanying capital expenditures to implement.

JS: how difficult is it for inspectors to inspect using the M-D approach?

JG: the system works effectively.

JS: how does it link up to installation instructions?

JG: the info is in the NOA, which the inspector has to search back to determine compliance with the Code.

RC: has done inspections using M-D approved products and the tracking system worked well; he could find marks on products via the scrap even though installation may have been completed.

JG: the “lot number” used for other purposes, works fine for ensuring traceability to the packaging.

DK: if boxes are gone from site how does the linkability to the NOA work?

JG: it would require more effort to get the information from the manufacturer.

CWM/JG: the mark on pieces is not included in the NOA for direct linking.

JS: can the information be put on boxes?

LO: yes, the NOA or PA # could be put on boxes.

JG: the M-D approach has been worked out with manufacturer’s over time

RC: asked manufacturer’s how the mark on pieces is done.

LO: we roll stamp every 3’ to 3-1/2’ on the assembly line.

DK: is it ok to apply certification agency numbers on the label and not indicate the specific number; maybe the state PA number should be included in the NOA for instance.

DJ: is state approval required; answer no; so requiring the label to include State PA number may not work in all instances; if the label was required to have FL PA number on it then wouldn’t that precludes the current option for manufacturer’s to use local approval for specific products.

BY: will numbers currently used on pieces stay the same or change; how would people looking at pieces know who manufactured the product; the point is to link to certification or approval reports and thereby to relevant installation and performance documentation.

DJ: traceability of components after installation to a manufacturer is not generally required, so we should focus on improving the construction inspection process.

JS: local approval process: though it is allowed it is probably unusual and little used; most prefer the State approval option.

JB: the solution for the shutter label requirements was to have a number, not necessarily the FL PA number.

BB: I agree with JB, we do have cases where a job is cleaned up, so traceability is an issue.

RC: if a FL PA or NOA was required to be submitted for permitting, the linking of piece marking would work.

CWM: M-D & Broward permit document requirements do make this work but other areas need some way for the system to work for them too; traceability is key.

JG: small communities won't be able to do more elaborate inspection processes so keep it simple and traceable.

DK: does part of the lot number stay the same, also the NOA could have that part link pieces to the approval documents.

NS: some manufacturer's put their model name on pieces so product can be identified, its hidden after installation though, so inspectors have to be there during installation.

GY: won't be able to determine if installation is consistent with manufacturer's specifications unless inspection is done during the installation process.

JG: is there a problem with having manufacturer's name on the pieces together with lot numbers?

LO: siding standard requirements does not apply to soffits; it is not the same product.

AH: information including FL PA can be on the product packaging.

CWM: we need to brainstorm some way to provide traceability marking on the product.

NS: the product name on each piece is doable for a manufacturer.

RC: proposed: require manufacturer's name, FL #, NOA or some other number that can be referenced back to the NOA or FL# on each piece.

DJ: would this apply to all soffit systems?

RC: this proposal would apply only to all products which have an NOA or FL PA.

JS: we are referring to manufactured products, so I would also like to have manufacturer's model number too.

RC: clarification of the proposal: I am referring to a number that is included in the NOA in some way.

MM: the shutter label requirement for instance requires the manufacturer's name, product number, third party evaluator/certifier name or number, and the standard evaluated to.

LO: use manufacturer's name and product descriptors on the piece label/markings.

CWM: it should be the model number or name on each piece.

JB: we need to consider how much information is required to be on the label in terms of practicality.

RC: proposal modified to include the model number.

Proposal Ranking:

Piece labels shall include manufacturer's name and model number/name; FL #, NOA, or a number that can be referenced back to the NOA or FL# on each piece.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking 2/4/09</i>	9	5	0	0

Members Comments and Reservations (2/4/09):

CW: should follow approach of other products with labeling requirements regarding how entities are listed using proper code language.

LO: concern about how this is scoped: specificity of manufacturer's model number/product name and not applying the same requirements to site-built systems such as plywood; we need a method to ensure site-built systems meet the same requirements for performance and installation; inspection verifies installation requirements are met.

LO: should focus on product ID/markings versus all information being placed on a label.

JS: we should use 1714.8.2 as the template.

DJ: we have agreed on some information that can be attached to the soffit pieces; recognize that this can only be seen by accessing the back of the piece; need to address how the information will be conveyed to the inspector for an "in-process" inspection.

MM: also need to address installation instructions.

DJ: need to address what information is provided on the packaging.

JB: let's talk about packaging labeling.

Issue to evaluate: what information should be required on the packaging.

1714.8.2 The following information shall be included on the labels on impact-resistant coverings:

1.) Product approval holder/ manufacturer's name and city and state of facility where the product was manufactured. (14 – 0 in favor)

Discussion:

A vote was taken regarding requiring the manufacturer's corporate address on the package label.

(11 – 3 in favor, with manufacturer's voting against)

Manufacturer's expressed concern with street specific address on packaging and felt this should be found info through the PA/NOA; also the ID is included in the code put on each piece already. After discussion members agreed unanimously to requiring the manufacturer's name and city and state of the facility where the product was manufactured.

JG: traceability for QA is the reason for the M-D requirement for address: city and state of origin

2.) Product model number or name. (14 – 0 in favor)

3.) Method of approval and approval numbers as applicable. Methods of approval include, but are not limited to Miami-Dade NOA, Florida Building Commission, TDI Product Evaluation. ICC-ES. (14 – 0 in favor)

4. The test standard or standards specified in Chapter 14 to demonstrate code compliance. (14 – 0 in favor)

Issue to evaluate: what information should be required on the product (soffit pieces).

Require mark to be not more than 4 feet on center. (14 – 0 in favor)

Overview of Consensus Labeling Recommendations

Conceptual support for a soffit system labeling requirement in the Florida Building Code. (14 – 0 in favor)

Label should be on the packaging with some tie-back method to the installed product. (12 members preferred this methodology, and 2 preferred requiring each soffit piece to be fully labeled, but could support the former)

Members agreed that for manufactured products with State approval the following is required on the label: Manufacturer's name; model number or name; FL number, NOA, or some reference number that correlates the product to its product approval number providing traceability. (14 – 0 in favor)

Manufacturing facility's city and state should be on the packaging label. (14 – 0 in favor)

The Workgroup agreed unanimously, 14 -0 in favor, to the following regarding soffit system product/piece labeling requirements for manufactured products in the Florida Building Code, as follows:

Individual soffit pieces shall be marked at not more than four foot on center with a number/marking that ties the product back to the manufacturer. (14 – 0 in favor)

The Workgroup agreed unanimously, 14 -0 in favor, to the following regarding soffit system packaging labeling requirements for manufactured products in the Florida Building Code, as follows:

1714.8.2 The following information shall be included on the labels on impact-resistant coverings:

1. Product approval holder/manufacturer name and city and state of manufacturing plant.
2. Product model number or name.
3. Method of approval and approval numbers as applicable. Methods of approval include, but are not limited to: Miami-Dade NOA, Florida Building Commission FL #, TDI Product Evaluation, and/or ICC-ES.
4. The test standard or standards specified in Chapter 14 used to demonstrate Code compliance.

General Public Comment

Members of the public were invited to provide the Workgroup with comments.

There were no general public comments provided. Members of the public spoke on each of the substantive discussion issues before the Workgroup.

Review of Workgroup Delivery and Meeting Schedule

The next meeting is planned to be held after the Florida Building Commission's April 2009 meeting.

The meeting is scheduled for April 9, 2009 in Gainesville, Florida.

Next Steps

Compile and distribute the following information:

- Labeling requirements for other products.
- Standard soffit system installation examples for different product types.
- List of the different types of materials and construction types.
- Overview of Product Approval System and what submittals are required for approval.
- Matrix or reporting system summarizing the different soffit system types, materials, applications, and installation specifications.

Adjournment

The Workgroup voted unanimously, 14 – 0 in favor, to adjourn at 11:30 AM.

ATTACHMENT 1
MEETING ATTENDANCE

November 12, 2008—Gainesville, Florida

Name	Representation
Rusty Carroll	Broward County BORA
Alan Hoying	Ply Gem Siding Group
Neil Sexton	Certainteed CORP.
David Johnston	Vinyl Siding Institute
Jaime Gascon	Miami Dade BCCO
James Schock	City of Jacksonville and BOAF
Bob Boyer	Palm Beach County
C.W. Macomber	APA
Greg Yantorno	Sarasota County
Bill York	IBHS
Youry Demosthenes	CBUCK
Lance Olson	Louisiana Pacific
Do Kim	Do Kim and Associates, LLC
Jack Glenn	FHBA
Robert Lutz	USP Connectors
Joe Belcher	AAF