



Component Modeling Approach -Technical Task Group Conference Call

Thursday, January 22, 2009

2:30 pm –4:00 pm

Chair: Mahabir Bhandari, Carli, Inc.

Call Participants: Mahabir Bhandari, Catherine Best, Tom Culp, Charlie Curcija, Jason Davis, David Duly, John Lewis, Peter Lyons, Marles McDonald, Nils Petermann, Roland Temple, Margaret Webb, Rick Wright, Jessica Ferris (staff)

1. Meeting was called to order at 2:35 PM EST
2. Recording secretary appointed (Jessica Ferris)
3. Unfinished Business
 - a. **Mullions** - Should mullions be included in the model? .. contd

Discussion: Answer - Yes. We currently rate the system and not the whole assembly for certification purposes. We need to look at a short term as well as long term solution for this issue.

Action Item: The task group agreed that we will handle mullions as they are currently handled in the Site-Built program, rule-wise, and will recommend at the March meeting that a task group be formed to address how we can handle complex assemblies in the certification program. The Ratings Committee will first need to decide if NFRC should rate complex assemblies and then direct that to an appropriate task group. Mahabir will make a report on this issue during the CMA Technical SC meeting in March.

- b. **Spandrel panels** – do we model a portion of the product or the whole product? Will insulation behind panel also be modeled as part of whole assembly?.contd

Discussion: Catherine Best recommended that when rating a spandrel panel, one needs to consider the insulation behind the panel as well; that's what, in her experience, code officials want. Peter Lyons agrees.

Action Item: Catherine will provide Mahabir with an example of a spandrel panel to be modeled so that Charlie Curcija can prepare a procedure for this. This will be brought up for further discussion at the next task group meeting schedule for March 2nd in Tucson. This will more than likely be a new product for Table 4-3 so we will need to come up with an NFRC standard size. Catherine will research sizes and come up with an average size for the task group's consideration at the next meeting.

- c. Spacer Height Simplification rules in Path II –Do we keep spacer height requirement at ½”? .. contd

Discussion: It was noted that the ½” reference was removed from the Path II language in the NFRC 100. This is good – we don’t need to address this issue then in the 100. However, in the simulation manual we will need to identify the minimum sealant to be used.

Action Item: Margaret Webb will provide minimum dimensions of the primary and secondary sealants to Mahabir so that this can be incorporated into the simulation manual and the logic incorporated into CMAST.

4. New Business

- a. Composite and combination windows - wait to see what is decided at Ratings in March on whether we allow for rating complex assemblies.
- b.
- c. Complex modeling issues - wait to see what is decided at Ratings in March on whether we allow for rating complex assemblies.
- d.
- e. CMA Validation Testing Ballot – Tom Culp will be submitting a ballot proposing revisions to validation testing requirements in the NFRC 100, Section 5.6. The current CMA frame validation test procedure limits the test specimen to only the standard configuration size given in Table 4-3. To increase flexibility and cost efficiency, the proposed ballot allows other configurations to be tested.

5. Meeting adjourned at 3:45 PM EST