

**FLORIDA BUILDING COMMISSION
FENESTRATION WATER RESISTANCE WORKGROUP
Hilton University of Florida Conference Center
1714 SW 34th Street
Gainesville, Florida 32601**

[HTTPS://GLOBAL.GOTOMEETING.COM/JOIN/339205181](https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/339205181)

MEETING ID 339-205-181

April 16, 2019

WORKGROUP MEMBERS PRESENT:

Joe Belcher	Dan Lavrich
Warner Chang	Adam Locke
David Compton (Commissioner)	Lynn Miller
Jamie Gascon	Craig Parrino
Jeff Gross (Commissioner)	Jason Seals
Mike Guerasio	Jim Schock (Commissioner)
Gary Hartman	Steven Strawn

Brad Schiffer (Commissioner) (TBA)

WORKGROUP MEMBER NOT PRESENT:

John Holt

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Tom Campbell	Justin Vogel
Mo Madani	Chris Howell
Jim Hammers	

MEETING FACILITATION:

The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair from the FCRC Consensus Center at Florida State University. Information at: <http://consensus.fsu.edu/>

Welcome and Introduction:

Mr. Blair welcomed workgroup members, staff and the public to Gainesville and the meeting of the Fenestration Water Resistance Workgroup.

Roll Call:

Mr. Blair called the roll and a quorum was determined with 14 members present. He advised Commissioner Brad Schiffer was also present to participate and is awaiting appointment to the workgroup.

Agenda Review and Approval:

Mr. Blair covered the agenda and purpose of the meeting today including guidelines. He then asked for a motion to approve the agenda as posted.

Mr. Lavrich entered a motion to approve the agenda as posted. Commissioner Schock seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 14 to 0.

Mr. Blair then explained the process.

To Review And Accept Interim Draft Report For Research Project Titled “Study Of The Water Resistance Performance Of The Exterior Envelope Relating To Fenestrations During Minimal High Winds”:

Dr. Prevatt provided an interim report of the current project. He stated that the buildings used in the report were provided by a workgroup member.

Public Comment:

Dick Wilhelm, AAMA and Fenestration Manufacturers Association stated they participated in this study and advised they were not just looking at the performance of the product but also installation. He also spoke of the study documents provided by Mr. Madani.

Al Zichella, London Bay representing FHBA stated that his questions are date of building construction, type of windows, wind ratings, and are the buildings under positive pressure. He also spoke on the inspection and extent of inspection. Mr. Zichella then spoke about onsite testing.

Discussion followed regarding the need for additional data to complete a more detailed report to include specific data on water intrusion.

Mr. Blair stated the threshold issue is whether we have enough information to continue with the meeting for today and subsequent meetings to be able to make specific recommendations. He said of the 15 buildings only three were built to the building code, and asked to what extent this data is going to be helpful.

Dr. Prevatt stated yes in order to make a more robust study there needs to be more structures used that were built to the code.

Identification, Discussion and Evaluation of Options:

Mr. Blair provided the process that is used for evaluation of these projects and the information on the rating.

Mr. Blair asked that Mr. Strawn provide details regarding his option A under “General”.

Mr. Strawn provided detail on his options and noted that this was laid out with general guidelines.

Mr. Strawn stated there was no reason to rate this section as it was informational.

Mr. Belcher asked for clarification on high rises.

Mr. Seals stated his understanding was this research was limited to residential high rise buildings.

Mr. Madani stated the scope of work was on the high rise issues. He said he understood that we were to limit the scope to those buildings provided by the proponent and they were all high rise buildings.

Discussion followed on the restriction to only high rise occupancy and building types and requirements in same.

Public Comment:

Mr. Orłowski and Mr. Zichella provided their concerns.

Workgroup Comment:

Mr. Guerasio and Mr. Locke added their concerns and thoughts on this process.

Identification, Discussion and Evaluation of Options (cont.):

1.) A. Mr. Gascon provided detail on his options under design.

The rating by the workgroup is as follows:

Acceptable	5
Minor Reservations	4
Major Reservations	3
Not Acceptable	2
Support Level	64% which does not meet the 75% threshold

Mr. Miller expressed his concerns over the inclusion of the product approval process. Mr. Hartman also expressed his concerns as this process is clearly defined. Mr. Strawn included his reservation on the product approval inclusion.

Dr. Prevatt stated that there needs to be more properties identify buildings which were built under the code and which experienced the issues.

Mr. Madani stated that Mr. Lavrich needs to provide more data with specifics on what needs to be researched and with specific detail of forensic issues.

Mr. Belcher asked about the extent of damage of the leaky window. He said there needs to be a definition.

Mr. Zichella agrees this is a design issue and should be placed with the design official. He also spoke on maintenance issues.

Mr. Lavrich spoke on the damages he witnessed and stated most of the windows in the older buildings had been replaced. He stated we need to do better on these issues.

Mr. Blair stated that the group needs to review if there is enough information available to make decisions within the group. He stated that he would take the remaining comments as the group would need to continue with the ratings.

Mr. Lavrich stated there was no forensic information gathered, however, he does feel that more information is needed and will work with Dr. Prevatt.

It was agreed among the group that additional information is needed to allow the group to make a decision on the need for any code changes.

Identification, Discussion and Evaluation of Options (cont.):

1.) B. Commissioner Schock provided detail on his options under design.

The rating by the workgroup is a follows:

Acceptable	13
Minor Reservations	1
Major Reservations	
Not Acceptable	
Support Level	100 %

Additional discussion was held regarding shop drawings and the facts of whether design professionals should be charged with this issue. Include language for shop drawings if not in the design professional's drawings.

1.) C and D. Commissioner Schiffer provided detail on his options under design

The rating by the workgroup is a follows:

Acceptable	2
Minor Reservations	12
Major Reservations	
Not Acceptable	
Support Level	100 % which does meet the 75% threshold

1.) E. Steve Strawn provided detail on his options, stating this should take place with the design professionals.

There was no rating as it was incorporated with Commissioner Schock and Commissioner Schiffer's options.

Mr. Buck stated there needs to be a definition of the failure. He said we have identified the symptom but now need a resolution or fix.

Mr. Guerasio asked Mr. Madani for guidance on the missing data.

Mr. Madani stated when the request was proposed there seemed to be a problem with the fenestration and building envelope on high rise buildings. He stated the Commission included it in the project scope to define the problem. Mr. Madani provided examples of information that would be needed to be able to make a determination and not having this information there is no definition of the problem.

Identification, Discussion and Evaluation of Options (cont.):

Mr. Madani advised that Dr. Prevatt made it clear without the data defining the problem the project cannot be completed.

Mr. Campbell stated the workgroup could formulate what further information is needed to complete the evaluation to pose to the Commission and they would make the determination of the next phase of the workgroup.

Jason Seals provided a review summary on the evaluation on #6 (E) expanding on his recommendations stating what it would take to look at other buildings nearby and determine whether they leaked.

BREAK 15 minutes - Reconvene 1:50 p.m.

Mr. Blair covered the next steps for the workgroup, as the evaluation process is not necessary or beneficial at this time.

Mr. Lavrich recommended additional product testing in a lab system, and also testing some older products using the same procedures would be needed to make the comparison. He felt this would give a better idea of water penetration.

Mr. Strawn and Commissioner Compton discussed design pressures for wind and water testing.

Mr. Blair stated the group needed to identify what steps need to be taken to make a recommendation to the Commission.

Mr. Blair received a recommendation to add insurance data to the list provided by Mr. Seals.

Mr. Gascon requested to add existing projects that have testing ongoing and allowing those to go to higher pressure.

Mr. Madani asked about prior recalls and how frequent they are in high rises in Miami-Dade.

Mr. Gascon responded to Mr. Madani with the requirements and the process used in Miami-Dade.

Testing was discussed among the workgroup.

Mr. Chang advised the group that the insurance industry data on specific claims would be very limited due to reporting, no identification of how the water penetrated are listed on their reports, also antitrust law limits the information that can be discussed and received. He stated he agrees with the testing that was discussed.

Identification, Discussion and Evaluation of Options (cont.):

Mr. Blair asked for specific information that is needed.

Mr. Hartman addressed the 15 pounds of pressure testing for evaluation and suggested, we should look at the history of where these figures came from.

Mr. Blair stated staff will use the list provided by Mr. Seals combined with suggestions from the workgroup to evaluate and determine what additions would be feasible, provide that to UF and see if this information will work for them to be able to complete the project.

Discussion followed among the workgroup for any additional issues that could be identified to be added to the plan.

Commissioner Compton entered a motion to charge staff with taking a list of issues for evaluation and the issues added today and come back to the workgroup with the compiled list of those issues that are reasonable to accomplish. Mr. Strawn seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 14 to 0.

Public Comment:

Dick Wilhelm, AAMA and Fenestration Manufactures Association stated that the industry has looked at better practices and listed those for the group. He stated that they are willing to provide additional information to assist the group.

Workgroup Comment:

Mr. Seals asked if the meeting in June will still be scheduled.

Mr. Campbell stated to keep the date on the calendar until advised otherwise.

Adjournment:

There being no further business before the workgroup the meeting was adjourned at 2:34 p.m.