VIA E-MAIL

TO: ALSC MEMBERS & ALTERNATES AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES

FROM: JOHN H. MCDANIEL

DATE: MARCH 28, 2012

SUBJ: FINAL MEETING MINUTES

Attached are the final minutes of the Enforcement Subcommittee meeting held by conference call on February 24, 2012.

JHM:tw

Attachments

cc: ALSC Officers
   Counsel
   Enforcement Subcommittee
MINUTES
ENFORCEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
February 24, 2012

A meeting of the Enforcement Subcommittee was held on February 24, 2012, by conference call. The members of the Enforcement Subcommittee in attendance were Messrs. Charlie Jourdain (Chairman)-RIS, Don DeVisser-WCLIB, Bob Browder-SPIB, Kevin Binam-WWPA, Ronnie Williams-TP, Jeff Fantozzi-PLIB, Jeff Easterling-NeLMA, Don Bender-ALSC Consumer Representative and Al Rozek-NLGA. Mr. Landry was present as Counsel. Messrs. Searles, Reck and McDaniel of the ALSC staff were present. Present for the meeting were:

- Mr. Randy Caron Chairman ALSC, Incorporated
- Mr. Furman Brodie Vice Chairman ALSC, Incorporated
- Mr. Hubert Sager Treasurer ALSC, Incorporated
- Ms. Linda Brown Southern Pine Inspection Bureau
- Mr. Jay Moore Timber Products Inspection
- Mr. David Conner Timber Products Inspection
- Mr. Joe Chin Timber Products Inspection
- Mr. Lon Sibert Renewal Resources Associates
- Dr. Kevin Cheung Western Wood Products Association
- Mr. David Kretschmann US Forest Products Laboratory
- Mr. Gilbert Travis Travis Lumber Company
- Mr. Mark Rey Travis Lumber Company
- Ms. Suz-Anne Kinney Forest2Market Newsletter
- Mr. Mark Hope Stafford Inspection & Consulting Services
- John Sebelius US Forest Service
- Cathy Kaake Southern Forest Products Association
- Mr. Rubin Shmulsky Mississippi State University
- Mr. Brad Douglas American Wood Council

Chairman Jourdain recognized those present and welcomed each person in attendance. He encouraged all present to participate in the meeting.

I. **Antitrust Statement**

Mr. Landry reviewed with the Subcommittee and those present their responsibilities under the antitrust laws.

II. **Minutes of the Last Meeting**

Chairman Jourdain stated the minutes of the last meetings on February 1, 2012 had been previously approved.
III. Further Consideration of the Timber Products Inspection (TP) Audited Stress Rating Proposal

Chairman Jourdain stated the Subcommittee met on February 1, 2012 to consider the Audited Stress Rating (ASR) proposal of TP. He noted that at that meeting the consensus of the Subcommittee was to seek written comments from all interested parties as to whether a process such as the Audited Stress Rating proposal would be appropriate procedurally under the ALS system. He stated that written comments had been received from SPIB, WWPA, NAHB, TP, RRA and NLGA.

Chairman Jourdain then opened the meeting for discussion on the proposal and asked that representatives in attendance for those submitting written comments summarize their points for those present. Mr. Williams stated that the original intent of the TP ASR proposal was to provide a procedure that could be used by a mill to validate existing design values of southern pine that would enable the mill to take advantage of a timber source that was considered to be higher in allowable properties than to those for the newly developed design values for southern pine.

It was suggested that the Subcommittee should determine if there was a consensus to move the proposal forward on its merits and then address the details necessary to move the proposal forward. The group discussions included but were not limited to the appropriateness of such a proposal under PS 20; would the proposal establish design values other than those published in a certified rule and if so, it would be necessary to develop an ASTM standard or similar document to address how those values should be developed; was it appropriate for a non-rules writing organization to develop a procedure to establish design values under PS 20 and if so how would those design values be handled under PS 20; suggestions were made that if proposal was used to solely validate existing design values published in the rules, would it be acceptable for a non-rules writer to develop such a proposal; and was the proposal limited to only design values for visual grading or would it also include design values for machine graded lumber.

After considerable discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Bender, to moved the TP ASR proposal forward and form a task group to explore how this proposal could be developed. After some further discussion it was suggested the motion be split into two motions to determine if there was a consensus to move the proposal forward. Mr. Williams and Mr. Bender agreed and a motion to move the proposal forward was considered. A roll call vote was taken with Mr. Williams voting affirmative; Messrs. Browder, Rozek, Binam and Bender voting negative; and Messrs. DeVisser, Fantozzi and Easterling abstaining. The motion failed. The motion to form a task group was not considered.

V. Consideration of Editorial Changes to Enforcement Regulations

Chairman Jourdain stated that an inconsistency with language in the various enforcement regulations was noted. He noted the inconsistency pertained to Sections 14.2.2.1 of the Lumber Enforcement Regulations, 4.13.2 of the Treated Wood Enforcement Regulations,
5.1.3.2 of the Wood Packaging Material Enforcement Regulations and 4.13.2 of the Densified Fuel Enforcement Regulations. He referred to the information in the meeting book that gave the summarized details and the suggested editorial changes to each section that could be made to make the various sections consistent. Mr. McDaniel reviewed the proposed editorial changes for the group. A motion was made by Mr. DeVisser, seconded by Mr. Browder, that the Subcommittee accept the proposed editorial changes as presented. (Attachment 1) The motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John H. McDaniel
Vice President of Operations
Attachment 1:
Approved Editorial Changes to the Following Sections of the Various
Enforcement Regulations

Lumber Enforcement Regulations

14.2.2.1 Upon finding grademarked and/or certified lumber at the point of origin that is seriously misgraded, the Board inspector shall immediately advise the Board office. It shall in turn immediately so notify the grading agency whose mark appears on the lumber. The grading agency shall then immediately notify the mill or facility management to hold such lumber in inventory at the mill for prompt regrading. The agency shall either regrade or supervise the regrading of such misgraded lumber in inventory at the mill or facility. Any mill or facility failing to have hold such lumber regraded shall be subject to having the use of its grademarks or grademarking devices suspended immediately.

Treated Wood Enforcement Regulations:

4.13.2 (b) Origin: Upon finding quality marked and/or certified material at the point of origin which contains serious infractions, the Board of Review inspector shall request the plant to hold the material for review by the agency and notify his office immediately of the infraction giving full details. The office of the Board of Review shall immediately notify the agency whose quality mark appears on the material. The agency shall immediately notify the plant management and confirm that the material is to be held for review by the agency. The agency shall review the material being held and determine the appropriate action and shall promptly report the actions taken to the Board of Review. Any plant failing to hold such material shall be subject to having the use of its quality marking devices suspended immediately. Any plant failing to hold the material for corrective action shall be suspended immediately by the agency.

Wood Packaging Enforcement Regulations:

5.13.2 (b) Origin: Upon finding quality marked and/or certified material at the point of origin which contains serious infractions, the Board of Review inspector shall request the facility to hold the material for review by the agency and notify the Board of Review office immediately of the infraction giving full details. The office of the Board of Review shall immediately notify the agency whose quality mark appears on the material. The agency shall immediately notify the facility management and confirm that the material is to be held for review by the agency. The agency shall review the material being held and determine the appropriate action and shall promptly report the actions taken to the Board of Review. Any facility failing to hold such material shall be subject to having the use of its quality marking devices suspended immediately. Any facility failing to hold the material for corrective action shall be suspended immediately by the agency.

Densified Fuel Enforcement Regulations:

4.13.2 (b) Origin: Upon finding quality marked and/or certified material at the point of origin which contains serious infractions, the Board of Review inspector shall request the manufacturer to hold the material for review by the agency and notify his office immediately of the infraction giving full details. The office of the Board of Review shall immediately notify the agency whose quality mark appears on the material. The agency shall immediately notify the manufacturer management and confirm that the material is to be held for review by the agency. The agency shall review the material being held and determine the appropriate action and shall promptly report the actions taken to the Board of Review. Any manufacturer failing to hold such material shall be subject to having the use of its quality marking devices suspended immediately. Any manufacturer failing to hold the material for corrective action shall be suspended immediately by the agency.