

MHCC
Systems Subcommittee Meeting
Minutes
10-23-12 to 10-25-12

Contents

Actions and Highlights	3
Systems Subcommittee Meeting 10-23-12	3
Discussion	4
Systems Subcommittee Meeting 10-25-12	7
Discussion	7

Actions and Highlights

- **Motion Systems1:** Mr. Santana made a motion to reject Log 33 on the grounds that it's redundant with 30, 25, and 59. Mr. Poggione seconded.
 - **Vote: Motion Systems1 passes 7-0.**
- **Motion Systems 2:** Mr. Santana made a motion to reject Log 14, on the grounds that it is unnecessary. Ms. Desfosses seconded.
 - **Vote: Motion Systems 2 passed 5-0-2**
- **Motion Systems3:** Mr. Santana made a motion to accept Log 20 in principle with the modification that only the NFRC standard will be updated without updating the two AAMA standards. The other two standards would not be updated on the grounds that they would be cost prohibitive and provide no benefit. Mr. Poggione Seconded.
 - **Vote: Motion Systems 3 passes 5-0.**
- **Motion Systems3:** Mr. Lubliner made a motion to accept as modified. Mr. Rust seconded.
 - **Vote: Motion Systems 3 passes 6-0.**

Systems Subcommittee Meeting 10-23-12

The Systems Subcommittee was called to order at 11:25 a.m.

Systems Subcommittee Roll Date:10-23-12

Call

Member	Attendance
--------	------------

Mark Mazz	N
Michael Lubliner	Y
Terry Nelson	Y
Theresa Desfosses	Y
Leo Poggione	Y
Manuel Santana	Y
Mark Luttich – Chair	Y
Timothy King	Y
William Freeborne	Y
Adam Rust	Y

AO

Robert Solomon, NFPA	Y
Pat Toner, NFPA	Y
Joe Nebbia, Newport Partners	Y

HUD

Henry Czauski, DFO
Rick Mendlen

Guests

Steve Andersen	MHCC Member
Jim Demitrus	MHCC Member
Danny Ghorbani	MHARR
Jeff Legault	MHCC Member
Tim Sheahan	MHCC Member
Lois Starkey	MHI

David Tompos
Michael Wade
Frank Walter
Richard Weinert
Mark Weiss

MHCC Member
MHCC Member
MHCC Member
MHCC Member
MHARR

Discussion

The Subcommittee Chair reviewed recent action. There was discussion on the status of log 71. It was clarified that MHCC passed that log. The Subcommittee had two task groups. One was assigned to look at Log 20, on the window flashing issue, and log 14. The Chair asked for report on logs

It was determined that there was no official meeting on these logs by the task group.

A Subcommittee Member in the User category recommended that the group start by looking at site built recommendations. He further stated that there is a definition in NFPA 501 to look at as an example.

An MHCC member in the General Interest category asked for clarification on what was defined in NFPA 501?

Response – weather resistant barriers.

There was clarification that Log 20 updates an AAMA standard that does not contain additional requirements for weather resistant barriers. It was also clarified that, although Log 14 references window flashing, it is only as guidance linking to the manufacturer's installation instructions, and does not contain additional requirements for weather resistant barriers or flashing.

A Subcommittee Member in the Producer category mentioned an email discussing both logs that could be circulated for discussion.

There was a comment that Log 14, according to the docket, is part of Structure and Design, but it was moved to this Subcommittee. Log 14 and Log 20 need to be moved on the docket.

An MHCC member in the Producer Category asked about how a previous MHCC to adopt all new reference standards to the code impacted these logs. HUD had in place a committee to work on that.

It was clarified that the AO prepared a table, which can be distributed, on the standard updates. There were issues that there was a recommendation to adopt a particular edition but it had been superseded. Some of those standards were acquired by HUD this summer.

An MHCC member in the General Interest category asked about HUD listing programs and if any actually existed. It was clarified that this list does not exist.

The Subcommittee Chair began an update on the status of on Logs 25, 30, and 59. A Task Force met and developed a comparison between ASHRAE 62.2 and the HUD standard. In April, the Subcommittee passed a motion to accept in principle these logs with 3 provisions – adjust climate zones to match up with HUD zones; to clarify that jurisdiction with authority is HUD; and specify that performance of system is tested at plant at frequency manufacturer feels is appropriate. This recommendation will be brought before the MHCC.

There was a clarification that Logs 63 and 64 were tabled had not been fully completed, but that they were tabled by the MHCC.

There was a comment from the public that no public notice was made of the April Subcommittee call. There was a further question on whether cost information was submitted.

It was clarified that cost implications were discussed during the Subcommittee call.

There was further comment from the public that cost issues go beyond materials costs.

Motion Systems1: Mr. Santana made a motion to reject Log 33 on the grounds that it's redundant with 30, 25, and 59. Mr. Poggione seconded.

Vote: Motion Systems1 passes 7-0.

The Systems Subcommittee took a break for lunch at 12:00.

Systems Subcommittee reconvened at 1:00.

The Subcommittee returned discussion to Logs 14 and 20. Email discussion with a window manufacturer was shown via projector.

A Subcommittee Member in the Producer category stated that the problem with one of the standards is it would not allow removal of the sash. If the standard is updated, many current products would not be usable.

The Subcommittee Chair commented that the IRC no longer permits the sash to be removed. There was a question about whether the current standard permits too small of an opening.

There was further discussion on the size of the window.

A Subcommittee Member in the Producer category stated that this would add cost and impact smaller windows.

An MHCC member in the General Interest category stated that there was no benefit. The windows would not actually change; there would just be added cost for re-testing without removing the sash.

HUD staff mentioned that the current standard also requires greater force instead of lesser force to be used in the test. This is why HUD had not used the later standard.

A Subcommittee Member in the General Interest category asked about using a grandfather clause on testing.

An MHCC Member in the General Interest category stated that with a window size change, there would be a cost for re-submitting designs.

A Subcommittee Member in the Producer category stated that there would also be a cost in the fact that manufacturers could no longer sell windows already in stock.

Motion Systems 2: Mr. Santana made a motion to reject Log 14, on the grounds that it is unnecessary. Ms. Desfosses seconded.

Vote: Motion Systems 2 passed 5-0-2

Discussion continued on Log 20, which deals with 3 standards – the standard dealt with in Log 14, and AAMA 1704 and NFRC 100.

Motion Systems3: Mr. Santana made a motion to accept Log 20 in principle with the modification that only the NFRC standard will be updated without updating the two AAMA standards. The other two standards would not be updated on the grounds that they would be cost prohibitive and provide no benefit. Mr. Poggione Seconded.

Discussion:

A Subcommittee Member in the General Interest category asked if the egress benefits outweighed the cos. There was a response from a Subcommittee Member in the Producer category that egress was not brought up as an issue in the proposal.

A Subcommittee Member in the Producer category stated that these standards deal with more than egress. It's also use of force to open the window.

HUD staff commented that there is also a standing proposal in the second group of standards to prohibit the removal of the sash.

There was a question from a Subcommittee member in the User category on how this would impact the use of interior storm windows?

A Subcommittee Member in the Producer category stated that they hadn't seen an inside storm window in over 15 years.

HUD staff clarified that, using the NFRC standard, interior storm would not be permitted, but in the AAMA standard it is.

An MHCC Member in the General Interest category stated that the AAMA standard is most commonly used, and sometimes windows are certified under both AAMA and NFRC.

Vote: Motion Systems3 passes 5-0.

There was a motion to adjourn and a second unanimously approved.

The Systems Subcommittee Adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Change in Agenda – The General Subcommittee postponed meeting due to lack of Chair.

Systems Subcommittee Meeting 10-25-12

Discussion

The Minutes of April 16 were discussed.

Edits:

- Flow rate testing on behalf of the state of Washington. Insert “SAA”.
- Make it clear that the first paragraph on page 5, flow rates are out of MHCSS compliance.
- Typo on Page 6, provisions should be 1, 2, 3 instead of 4, 5, 6

Motion Systems3: Mr. Lubliner made a motion to accept as modified. Mr. Rust seconded.

Vote: Motion Systems 3 passes 6-0.

Systems Subcommittee Adjourned.