

---

**To:** Cindy Walden  
**Subject:** 9/20/11 draft of 1802 form

---

**From:** Kenneth Woehrer [<mailto:tauruskw@hotmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 28, 2011 2:04 PM  
**To:** Cindy Walden  
**Cc:** Charles Kelley; Jesse Carr; Kenneth Woehrer; Tasha Carter  
**Subject:** FW: 9/20/11 draft of 1802 form

---

To: Cindy Walden  
From: Kenneth Woehrer

Near the top of the draft there is a "note" which states that the insurer may ask additional questions regarding the wind mitigation features(s) on this form. Why would this be necessary if the OIR 1802 form has been submitted with all the required data on it?

Why doesn't the #3 Roof Deck Attachment have the verbiage that was included under option C, which is on the current 1802 form. The omitted verbiage is ( or any system of screws, nails, adhesive, other deck fastening system or truss/rafter spacing that has an equivalent mean uplift resistance of 182 psf.) I had my interior roof deck attachment done under the MY Safe Florida Home grant program. That program suggested the use of ITW foam seal adhesive, which has more uplift capability than the nailing process, for both the interior roof deck attachment as well as the interior secondary water barrier. I have all the My Safe Florida Home paper work for the ITW foam seal adhesive that I paid to have applied as an interior roof deck attachment. I believe the ITW foam seal adhesive is currently still being used for the interior roof deck attachment and secondary water barrier. Is the new 1802 draft saying I no longer can receive a wind mitigation discount for the ITW foam seal adhesive which was applied and paid for? All the consumers who applied and paid for the application of the ITW foam seal adhesive would be adversely affected.

The new draft regarding #6, Secondary water barrier, under option A., mentions a foam adhesive SRD barrier. I believe the SRD should be SWR.

The new draft has omitted (Gable END Bracing ), which is #6 on the current 1802 form. The MY Safe Florida Home Grant program advised this feature be done because it would provide wind mitigation protection. Why would an important feature like this not be included on the new 1802 draft?

Why doesn't the new draft require all wind mitigation inspectors to attend standardized wind mitigation inspection classes? Tasha Carter, Director of Division of Consumer services under the Department of Financial Services, also has recommended this requirement.

Why isn't the new draft directly tied into the appropriate rate discount chart? Mr. Charles Kelley, P & C Market Investigations Manager in the Florida Office of Insurance Regulation also recommends this requirement.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Woehrer  
941-794-0730