

NFRC 101-Thermophysical Properties [\(click here to access the original proposed ballot\)](#)



Legend:

AC :Approve with Comment

NEG: Negative response with Comments

NFRC Ballot Comments through November 2, 2009

Research and Technology Committee- Thermophysical Properties SC

Company Name, Rep Initials	AC/ NEG	Section and/or Page #	Comment/Alternate Language
Marvin	NEG	general	I cannot approve due to the following. Timing of implementation and enforcement. Products that have been rated using the existing rules cannot be decertified due to inspections. Second inspectors cannot be expected to examine products to the details required to comply with the proposed rules. Finger joint is one issue but how about edge glued and veneered products? No way can an inspector determine the wood specie/s that may have been used internally and hidden by veneer. A manufacturer will have to submit what they are using but do not add it to the inspections as it will be a waste of time.
Andersen	NEG	general	Support the concept, but language as written is flawed; particularly with finger jointed wood example. Not clear if we are able to use table A values for finger-jointed wood. Also- if it is desired to use table B data for a finger-jointed component, it should be allowed to use the average value of the wood species allowed- not be penalized with the highest conductivity.
Cardinal	AC	format	For readability include grouping title at top of each page. For example: top of page 13 should read Polymers (cont.)