

**MINUTES**  
**CONNECTICUT AUTOMOTIVE GLASS WORK AND**  
**FLAT GLASS WORK BOARD**  
165 CAPITOL AVENUE  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106

**FEBRUARY 27, 2004**

The Connecticut Automotive Glass Work and Flat Glass Work Examining Board held a regular Board Meeting on Friday, February 27, 2004 commencing at 9:32 a.m. in Room 126 of the State Office Building, 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, CT 06106.

Board Members Present: Edward J. Fusco (Flat Glass Work Journeyperson)  
Mary E. Grabowski (Public Member)  
Kurt L. Muller (Auto Glass Work Contractor)  
Robert Steben (Auto Flat Glass Work Contractor)  
Carl Von Dassel (Auto Flat Glass Work Contractor)  
John A. Wisniewski (Auto Glass Work Contractor)

Board Members not present: Douglas Howard (Public member)

Board Vacancies: Unlimited Auto Glass Work Journeyperson  
Public Member

Board Counsel: Not Present

DCP Staff Present: Richard M. Hurlburt, Director of the Occupational and Professional Licensing Division  
Robert M. Kuzmich, License and Applications Specialist  
Gregory Carver, Investigator

Others Present: John Smith, Safelite Auto Glass  
Paul Syfko, Glass Medic  
Frankie Burgos, JN Phillips Auto Glass  
Ray DiMeglio, Glass Weld of New Jersey  
Charlie Eisenhof, Glass Repair Specialist  
Valerie Stolfi, Connecticut Glass Dealers Association  
Kevin McMahan, Connecticut Glass Dealers Association  
Glenn Moses, Safelite Auto Glass  
Mike Boyle, National Windshield Repair Association/  
Glas-Weld Systems, Inc.  
Robert Simoni, Dr. Bob's MWRS, Inc.  
Bill Abounader, Globe Amerada Glass  
Michael McCarthy, Pilkington, North America  
Jay Pitchell, Hartford Connecticut Auto Dealers

Note: The administrative functions of this Board are carried out by the Department of Consumer Protection, Occupational and Professional Licensing Division. For information, call Director Richard M. Hurlburt, Director at (860) 713-6135.

**Minutes:**

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

1. The Automotive Glass Work and Flat Glass Work Examining Board Meeting was called to order at 9:32 a.m. by Chairman Edward Fusco.

**2. REVIEW OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:**

After a review of the minutes of the December 19, 2003 regular Board meeting by all members, *the Board voted, unanimously, to approve the draft of the minutes as submitted.*  
(Wisniewski/Grabowski)

**3. COMMENTS OR CONCERNS OF ANY PERSON PRESENT TODAY:**

Mr. Jay Pitchell addressed the Board regarding windshield repair relative to a personal experience with a car he recently sold to a customer. The windshield of the car was replaced incorrectly with critical moldings not reinstalled. He noted that if this car had been in an accident with the windshield installed as it was, very serious injury might have occurred to the passengers. Mr. Pitchell spoke very passionately in favor of windshield repair and the Glas-Weld System and their installers. He noted that windshield repair provides automobile dealers, like him, significant cost savings and helps preserve their profit margin.

At the request of the Board at their last meeting, Mr. Mike Boyle provided the Board a set of the Australian and New Zealand Windshield repair standards covering both the process and the system. Mr. Boyle stated, in response to questions from Mr. Muller, that it will be up to the Board to determine how these standards and other material they have received will be implemented. He commended the Board on their effort to clean up the windshield repair and replacement industry through the implementation of licensing.

Mr. Boyle demonstrated an actual windshield repair for all present on a sample section of an automobile windshield and fielded questions from Board members and others present. Mr. Moses commented that the break area of the repair must be filled with resin and all air must be removed otherwise the repair will be visible. He noted that this is the main criteria to be satisfied for a good repair job. Mr. Moses also stated that the issue of drilling the repair area is at the discretion of the technician and agreed that most repairs should not have to be drilled due to the quality of the equipment used.

Mr. Moses asked Ms. Gabowski's opinion on the repair demonstration. She noted that that based upon what she has seen, she was impressed and would certainly consider windshield repair option on her windshield if given the choice. Mr. Muller suggested the possibility that perhaps the Board does not have the technical expertise to properly evaluate the information before them on windshield repair. To this point, he offered the possibility that outside, private sector,

independent experts be used to evaluate this material. This led to considerable discussion especially concerning the cost for this evaluation and who pays for the same.

Mr. Boyle again spoke for the safety record of windshield repair and noted the environmental impact of discarded windshields in landfills across the country. Mr. Simoni questioned the Board regarding what they are looking for in order to accept windshield repair. Mr. Fusco advised that the Board is trying to make every effort to ensure that all aspects of windshield repair have been considered and realizes that it has been a time consuming process but stressed that this time is absolutely necessary. Consumer safety is paramount and will not be compromised.

Mr. Moses asked the Board if there is anything negative to be presented on windshield repair. He believes that the only negative issues that have been discussed were in theoretical circumstances only and something that has not actually happened.

The Board opened discussion with members of the public concerning the definition of the acute area relative to windshield repair. All participants agreed that this is a difficult area to define and varies depending on the driver of the vehicle. Mr. Moses noted that the definition of critical area began with the State Farm Insurance Company and has since become obsolete. This raised the question and considerable discussion of whether this "critical area" is really needed and why would repair not be done in this area in light of the safety record of windshield repair work.

Mr. Boyle noted that the Board's need for more and more information creates the appearance of unnecessary delays which in his opinion "really stinks". He also noted that the State of Connecticut is being observed nationally relative to their actions on windshield repair. It was noted by Mr. Moses that the *NGA* and the *NWRA* are working together with *ANSI* to develop a new standard for windshield repair which may redefine the landscape of repair work.

Mr. Fusco asked the public of their opinion as to how many repairs should be allowed in the lifetime of a windshield. Mr. Moses noted that there are diminishing financial returns the more repairs are made to the point where the insurance company would direct that the windshield be replaced. Mr. Hurlburt noted determining this number perhaps in lieu of having a critical or acute area. Mr. Moses suggested that a maximum of three or four repairs per service call be considered.

After considerable discussion by all present, it decided to hold a special meeting of the Board scheduled for March 18, 2004 at 9:30 a.m. tentatively in Room No. 117. Mr. Moses volunteered to draft new language for both the *Limited Repair Contractor (AG-3)* and *Limited Repair Journeyperson (AG-4)* specifically focusing on the number of repairs permitted per the life of the windshield, the proximity of the repairs to one another, and the size of the individual repairs.

#### **4. OLD BUSINESS:**

A.) Report from subcommittee concerning:

1. Proposed draft of letter regarding an *Open Request for ARG Industry Input on Windshield Repair*.

**5. REVIEW OF CORRESPONDENCE:**

A. Draft of Proposed language for *Limited Repair Contractor (AG-3) and Limited Repair Journeyman (AG-4)*.

B. State of Massachusetts *Standards For The Repair of Damaged Motor Vehicles*.

C. E-Mail from Lee Telke, dated January 28, 2004, concerning Windshield Repair and the *NGA* and *NWRA*.

This correspondence was distributed to the Board for their review.

**6. NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Any correspondence and/or business received in the interim.

No items were discussed.

**7. OTHER BUSINESS:**

No items discussed.

There being no further business, *the meeting adjourned at 11:57 a.m. (Von Dassel/Steben)*

**The next regular meeting of the Board is scheduled for April 23, 2004, 9:30 a.m., Room No. 126, State Office Building, 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert M. Kuzmich, R.A.  
License and Applications Specialist