



APPROVED

ICC Evaluation Service, LLC
Western Regional Office
3060 Saturn Street, Suite 100
Brea, CA 92821
tel: 562.699.0543
fax: 562.695.4694
www.icc-es.org

FOLLOW-UP INSPECTION REPORT

Form Q-24

Date of Inspection: 6/13/16

ICC-ES Evaluation Report Number*: BOCA 93-36.02

*Please fill out a separate Q-24 for each master/follower report number as applicable.

Reissue Date of Evaluation Report*: 8/2003

*This date can be found on the upper right-hand corner of the first page of the evaluation report published on the ICC-ES website.

Revision or Correction Date of Evaluation Report*: n/a

*This date can be found on the upper right-hand corner or at the bottom of the first page of the evaluation report published on the ICC-ES website.

Name of Report Holder: PORTLAND STONE WARE COMPANY, INC.

Name of Manufacturing Facility: PORTLAND STONE WARE COMPANY, INC.

Manufacturer's Representative Name and Title: Ms. Donna Morgan, President

Manufacturer's Representative E-Mail Address: dmorgan@portlandstoneware.com
Phone Number: 978-450-7272

Address of Inspected Facility: 50 McGrath Road Dracut MA 16124
Street City State

Country and Province, if outside of the United States: n/a

Names of Products Inspected*: THE PORTLAND COLUMN

*Be sure to identify products using names provided in the evaluation report.

Signature of Manufacturer's Representative: Donna Morgan Date: 6/13/16

In lieu of a handwritten signature, you may type your name above.

Name of Agency Conducting Inspection: QAI

Name of Inspector: Jeff Judd

Inspector's E-Mail Address: jjudd@qai.org Phone Number: 540-352-0325

Inspector's Time of Arrival: 12:50 pm Inspector's Time of Departure: 2:30 pm

Was product being produced at the time of inspection? Yes No

Signature of Inspector: Jeff Judd Date: 6/13/16

In lieu of a handwritten signature, you may type your name above

Name of ICC-ES Staff Person Reviewing This Report: _____
(For ICC-ES Internal Use)

APPROVED Date: _____
By Jay Lee at 3:06 pm, Jun 16, 2016

Instructions

Introduction: The purposes of the follow-up plant inspection are to verify that the product being produced is consistent with the product used in the qualifying tests and recognized in the ICC-ES evaluation report or listing; that the documented quality system continues to meet ICC-ES requirements; and that the quality system is effectively implemented.

The Plant Inspection: The inspector should verify that documents and processes (including the current quality documentation) observed at the listee or report holder's facility during the inspection are consistent with the information provided by ICC-ES. A simple check in the Yes/No boxes may not suffice; if needed, use the comments sections or use an attached document for your remarks or explanations. The inspector should, to the extent possible, inspect the product recognized in the ICC-ES evaluation report or listing to assess conformance to specifications as described in the ICC-ES evaluation report or listing and ICC-ES supporting documents. Additionally, the inspector must use the ICC-ES supporting documents, the manufacturer's current quality documentation and operating procedures, and the manufacturing process records, to evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the facility's quality management system. **If there are questions regarding which documents to verify, please contact ICC-ES (inspections@icc-es.org).**

The Report: The inspector will complete this report during the inspection. If there is a nonconformity, the nonconformity will be detailed in the inspection report, and a Corrective Action Request (CAR) will be issued. CARs must clearly state what is required by the ICC-ES Acceptance Criteria for Quality Documentation (AC10) and by the manufacturer's documented quality system, and what the inspector actually found. This Follow-up Inspection Report must be signed by the manufacturer's representative and by the inspector. A copy of this report, and any CARs, must be given to the manufacturer's representative (and/or the report holder or listee, if the manufacturer and the report holder or listee are different) at the conclusion of the inspection, and a copy must be forwarded to ICC-ES.

Resolution of CARS: The manufacturer must respond to each CAR within 30 days of the inspection. CARs must be resolved by the manufacturer (or the report holder or listee, if the manufacturer and the report holder or listee are different) to the satisfaction of ICC-ES. ICC-ES reserves the right to require another follow-up inspection, to confirm corrective actions, when deemed necessary.

REVIEW OF NONCONFORMANCE(S) FROM PREVIOUS INSPECTION

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Reviewed effectiveness of correction plan for nonconformance(s) issued during previous inspection? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Is the implementation of the resolution(s) satisfactory? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Is additional follow-up required? (please provide a comment if additional follow-up is required) | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | |

PART A – PRODUCT VERIFICATION

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1. | Are the manufacturer’s quality manual and operating procedures consistent with the quality documentation submitted to ICC-ES? Note any discrepancies and provide applicable copies. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: Reviewed The Portland Column Quality Control Manual (QCM) dated 3/4/15 | | | |
| 2. | Are the manufacturer’s documented procedures, for inspection or testing of incoming materials, being carried out? Are the procedures consistent with the quality documents submitted to ICC-ES? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: reviewed section 2.2 QCM, reviewed mill certs for Type III cement & tubular steel | | | |
| 3. | Is this manufacturer conducting inspections and tests, as required in the quality documentation, for in-process quality control? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Are these inspections and tests sufficient to ensure consistency of product quality? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Are the procedures and tests consistent with what is described in the quality documents submitted to ICC-ES? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: reviewed section 2.3 QCM, reviewed core tests for project #20204 | | | |
| 4. | Is the manufacturer conducting final inspections and tests, prior to final approval and labeling of the finished product? Do these inspections or tests ensure that the product receiving the label complies with the applicable specifications and design values? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: reviewed section 2.4 QCM, reviewed visual check reports | | | |
| 5. | Using the identification that is applied to the finished product, conduct a traceability study by taking a finished product and tracing it back to the production and quality control records. Is the traceability adequate? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: reviewed section 2.1.5 QCM, date of manufacture included on labeling which provides for adequate traceability | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| 6a. | Does this facility presently label product for private label listees? If yes, please complete Section 6b. | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6b. | List the name of each private label listee for which there is labeling with the ICC-ES report number and/or mark. (A list of authorized listees appears below the report holder's name on the evaluation report) | | |
| Comments: | | | |
| 6c. | Is the product labeling consistent with what is described in the quality documentation | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Is the product labeling consistent with what is described in the "Identification" section of the evaluation report or listing? (Verify that these guidelines apply to all products labeled with the ICC-ES report number or mark.) | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: per section 2.1.4 QCM, labeling contained required information | | | |

PART B – QUALITY SYSTEM VERIFICATION

| AC10 Section | AC10 REQUIREMENTS | QUALITY SYSTEM IMPLEMENTED? | |
|--|--|--|---|
| 2.1.2 | Is the facility street address, telephone number and contact person, as noted in the documentation, correct? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: cover page and page 1 QCM | | | |
| 2.1.3 | Is the manufacturer reviewing the quality system documentation annually? Is there a revision log included in the quality documentation that is kept current and dated? (If the date of the quality documentation provided by ICC-ES for the follow-up inspection is different from the date of the quality documentation at the manufacturing plant, or if revisions have been made to the quality documentation, please provide to ICC-ES a copy of the revision record with an explanation of the changes that were made.) | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: last revision/review 3/4/15 | | | |
| 2.1.6 | Is the product flowchart or the description of production methods, as contained in the manufacturer's quality documentation, representative of the actual production flow and process? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: per 2.1.6 QCM | | | |
| 2.1.7 | ICC-ES must be notified of any significant product changes so that those changes may be evaluated and documented. Does the quality documentation have procedures to notify ICC-ES and other appropriate parties of any product changes? Has the product changed significantly since the last inspection? If yes, describe the change in the comments section below. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: per section 2.1.7 QCM | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 2.1.8 | Is the organizational chart up-to-date, and are the duties and responsibilities of key positions in the quality program identified? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: per section 2.1.8 QCM | | | |
| 2.1.9 | Are the products packaged and stored per the manufacturer's quality documentation and operating procedures? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: per section 2.1.9 QCM | | | |
| 2.1.10 | Are records of all significant complaints about the product being kept? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Is appropriate action being taken with respect to such complaints? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Are the actions being documented? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: reviewed section 2.1.10 QCM, no complaints | | | |
| 2.5 | Are nonconforming materials segregated from conforming materials as directed in this manufacturer's quality manual and operating procedures? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: reviewed section 2.5 QCM | | | |
| 2.6.1 | Does the manufacturer maintain a list that includes all the critical measuring and test equipment? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Does the equipment identified on this list have current calibration records? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: scales showed current calibrations traceable to NIST | | | |
| 2.7.1 | Is the manufacturer actually using the forms, checklists and reports identified in the manufacturer's quality documentation to record manufacturing and quality process metrics? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | |
| 2.7.2 | Are the quality records as noted in item 2.7.1, above (forms, checklists and reports), approved by responsible personnel as required by the manufacturer's quality documentation? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | |
| 2.7.3 | Are all manufacturing and quality records maintained for a minimum of two years? (Examples are reports resulting from the manufacturer's own tests and inspections.) | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: verified 2 year record retention | | | |

Summary of the Inspection

Inspector should note general observations on the manufacturer’s quality system, facility and product manufacturing process. (Include details as appropriate.)

Toured facility with plant personnel.
 Records were readily available upon arrival at plant.
 Personnel were very cooperative during today’s inspection.

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS (CARs)

Findings should be entered in the blocks provided below, and defined as falling into one of four categories:

- **Major CAR** – A major nonconformity (e.g., change of key raw materials, significantly different manufacturing process, different final product specifications) that must be resolved to the satisfaction of the ICC-ES technical staff.
- **Minor CAR** – A relatively minor nonconformity (e.g., equipment out of calibration, changes to forms, inadequately trained personnel) that can be resolved to the satisfaction of the inspector, in most cases, without much difficulty.
- **Concern** – A weakness in the quality system that needs to be corrected to head off the possibility of future CARs.
- **Comment** – A suggestion for improvement.

CARs must be addressed within 30 days of the inspection. The manufacturer or report holder should respond with a written report on the corrective actions taken, and objective evidence of the action. Objective evidence could be in the form of revised documents, new documents, photographs, etc.

Findings (check the category, and describe the details of the finding. Use a separate sheet if necessary):

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| CAR NO. | Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> | Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> | Concern <input type="checkbox"/> | Comment <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: no CARs | | | | |
| CAR NO. | Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> | Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> | Concern <input type="checkbox"/> | Comment <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | |
| CAR NO. | Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> | Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> | Concern <input type="checkbox"/> | Comment <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | |
| CAR NO. | Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> | Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> | Concern <input type="checkbox"/> | Comment <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | |
| CAR NO. | Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> | Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> | Concern <input type="checkbox"/> | Comment <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | |