



Component Modeling Approach - Technical Task Group Conference Call Meeting Notes

Thursday, May 7, 2008

1:00 pm – 2:30 pm

1. Call to Order

Participants present: Mahabir Bhandari (Chair), Dennis Anderson (staff), Jeff Baker, Catherine Best, Charlie Curcija, Tom Culp, Tom Dangieri, Jessica Ferris (staff), Frank Fisher, Scott Hanlon (staff), Mike Manteghi, Marles McDonald, Patrick Muessig, Brad Schultz, Andy Solaris, Dan Wacek, Margaret Webb, Jim Westphal

2. Unfinished Business

a. Desiccant conductivity discussion – continued from April 17th Conference Call – Margaret Webb began discussions by restating her findings in the desiccant conductivity study she conducted: use a default value for desiccant. Jeff Baker went through his findings on the study with the group and recommended two options:

- i. Use one default value of 0.15 (W/m K) for all desiccant
- ii. Use two default values:
 1. “Desiccant – loose fill” – value of 0.03 (W/m K)
 2. “Desiccant – desiccated matrix” – value of 0.29 (W/m K)

Action Items:

- 1) After some group discussion it was agreed to go with Option ii. Chair of the task group requested that this option recommendation be forwarded to Thermo Physical Properties SC for inclusion into the NFRC 101. The names and values of the desiccants in NFRC 100 will be replaced by the names and values provided in Option ii. Charlie Curcija will initiate this for the task group.
- 2) The group also agreed that the revised Spacer Grouping language for the NFRC 100 was acceptable as amended and should be balloted for the July meeting.

Label certificate discussion – continued from April 17th Conference Call – The sense from the group after the last conference call in subsequent e-mail discussions was that the task group would not pursue developing NFRC guidelines of any kind regarding any appropriate percentage of fenestration that should be rated on a building project; rather, it would be up to the code official of that particular jurisdiction to make that determination. It was recommended then that the Label Certificate be clear in its disclaimer that that this is NOT NFRC certification for the fenestration of the whole building project, but only for products listed on the certificate.

Action Item: The task group agreed that this recommendation should be forwarded to the CMA Label Certificate TG and incorporated into the latest revision of the draft Label Certificate for ballot in July.

There was additional discussion about actual size ratings vs. standard size ratings for CMA. It was the consensus of the group that NFRC's mission currently reflects comparative ratings at standard sizes, so to consider actual size certified ratings for non-comparative purposes would require a modification to NFRC's mission, so that would have to be a Board decision.

Catherine Best suggested then that perhaps NFRC consider changing the standard 80" by 80" curtain wall size since that's not a "real world" size in the commercial fenestration. The group thought that it was beyond the scope of this task group and it may require a separate ballot.

3. New Business

- a. Muntins, composite and combination windows** – How should NFRC address these product types? What the standard size that should be used for these sorts of products?

Discussion: Tom Culp recommended that NFRC look to using real world sizes for these products. Perhaps herein is reason for the need for actual size ratings. Maybe Catherine Best can offer actual size ratings for non-residential to the membership as a ballot in July and see what happens.

Charlie gave several examples of product types prevalent in "commercial world", e.g. a fixed window with operable on top and a spandrel panel on the bottom. Currently there is no provision of rating such a combination.

Marles McDonald recommended that the task group defer to the NFRC Board as to whether NFRC should rate these product types in the first place.

Next Steps: The group resolved to discuss this issue further at the July NFRC meeting in Chicago. The task group will schedule a 2 hour block for its meeting. Any recommendations from this meeting can then be forwarded to the CMA Technical SC.

4. Meeting adjourned at 2:40 PM.