

## NFRC Meeting Minute Sheet



Name of Meeting: CMA Road Mapping Technical TG

Chairman: Mahabir Bhandari

Recording Secretary:

Call to Order: Date - 7/24/06 Time - 10:30

Roll Call:

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes:

Business of Meeting: (MINUTES recorded on the following attached pages)

W61

C. Curcija reported on progress of workgroup 1 (Resolution of glazing and spacer effects).

- Status: work complete and report prepared and on website.

- All effects were well correlated. Generally small effect on overall U-factor, but recommend to include correlations into model. (glazing bite, spacer position, glass thickness, spacer height)

- Some discussion on importance of individual factors.

- Workgroup will develop recommendations on specific correlations and how to include.

W62

D. Wacek reported on progress of workgroup 2 (Implementation of single glazing and double sash configurations)

- Status: work still ongoing. Double sash configuration may be difficult to include.

- J. Hogan asked about ability to include double facades.

Generally not covered by NFRC software now. Needed for compliance, but several questioned whether it should be a priority now.



Page 2 -

- W63 Workgroup 3 - (Sloped + structural glazing)  
 No current chair, no progress.  
 Important, but need new chairperson.  
 Possibly handle through research project?
- W64 Workgroup 4 (~~Desiccant~~ Desiccant and glass conductivity effects)  
 report from M. Webb
- Consider whether use one conductivity value for all desiccants or two values for ~~the~~ molecular sieve vs. desiccated matrix
  - Within each type, conductivity variability has only very small effect on  $K_{eff}$ , <sup>even</sup> compared to no desiccant
  - Recommend using ~~the~~ <sup>generic</sup> conductivity value for ~~the~~ desiccants, but no recommendation on one value for all, or one value for molecular sieve and one value for desiccated matrix.
  - ~~Group felt only have 1 desiccant value for simplicity.~~
  - Group felt one generic value for each category (molec. sieve and desiccated matrix).
  - J. Baker will recommend numbers to be used, and propose to change 101.
  - ~~Group~~ Have not looked into glazing conductivity effects yet (glass vs. polycarbonate vs. other glazing materi.



Page 3 -

Presentation from J. Baker on Spacer Grouping

- Several possible ~~app~~ levels for grouping:

1. simple default <sup>coeff</sup> values for aluminum vs. all other
2. model spacer bar with generic sealant system
3. detailed model of both spacer bar and sealant system

- Workgroup will work on details of #1 and #2.

Spacer calculation tool for CMA being developed for #3.

- Discussion on these category-type approaches for spacer entry vs. traditional grouping of different spacers in use of whole product.

Group will make recommendations on this, which may also apply to current residential program.

- Question whether this should be balloted for inclusion in NFRC 100 for review by California after November, or do it later. Same for other issues - ballot if possible.

Other new business:

- Discussed other areas in technical procedure that may need to be clarified or amended prior to California review after November

- test validation

- grouping

- "one-offs" or custom products

- Discussion about need to address custom products in general and keeping timing short. Question whether it is more a rating process issue or technical.