

## MINUTES



### Garage Door / Rolling Door U-Factor Task Group

Monday, November 16, 2009

Chair: *Joseph R. Hetzel, P.E., DASMA Technical Director*

---

1. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Hetzel at 10:05 AM.
2. The agenda was agreed to be as published, with some new business items added.
3. Unfinished Business
  - a. *DASMA Research Project.* Mr. Hetzel presented results of Phase 1 (affirming new NFRC 100/102 provisions) and Phase 3 (simulation of common garage door and rolling door sizes) of a DASMA research project recently completed. He noted there was good correlation between tested and simulated values. A summary of data from the project is attached. Mr. Hetzel noted that DASMA would discuss the prospect of funding Phase 2 (evaluating the need for inclusion of vertical jamb hardware).

*Simulation manual details.* Mr. Hetzel said that he had marked up relevant pages from the NFRC simulation manual, based on the successful balloting of November 2008 and the recent balloting as well. The markups would be passed on to NFRC staff for circulation to the TIPC for handling.
4. New Business
  - a. *Ballot results - changes to NFRC 100.* Results from the recent balloting of changes to NFRC 100 were presented and discussed. For discussion purposes at the meeting, one negative ballot was received, and two “approval with comment” ballots were received. Ballot results, and suggested action, is attached. The Task Group recommended that the negative ballot received be found non-persuasive, since the negative balloter did not supply supportive reasoning. The other comments received along with approval ballots would be studied to possibly result in changes for future balloting. It was suggested that the U-factor Subcommittee should approve the recent ballot content.
  - b. *Standard NFRC 101 insulation values vs. manufacturer-published values.* Mr. Hetzel said that he believed that some insulation materials used by garage door manufacturers

## MINUTES



have values other than contained in the NFRC library. He was directed to interact with the Thermophysical Properties of Materials subcommittee. Mr. Hetzel would contact NFRC staff (Mr. Ray McGowan) involved with this subcommittee.

- c. *NFRC 100 garage door section height.* It was discussed that garage door manufacturers, in most cases, wish to test and simulate specimens with other than 24" section heights. Language addressing this would be developed for a future ballot. The language would be in the form of a sentence in the main body of the Garage Door sections of NFRC 100 and NFRC 102, and in appropriate Figures, stating that if other than 24" heights, the manufacturer's drawing should be followed.
- d. *Ownership of simulation results, manufacturer or simulator.* The Task Group agreed, verified by NFRC staff, that in all cases the manufacturer owns simulation results.
- e. *Standardized spreadsheet.* As with other types of doors, Task Group members suggested that a standardized spreadsheet be developed for garage doors and rolling doors. NFRC staff would coordinate this request along with the efforts being made for other types of doors.

5. The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 AM.

**MINUTES**



**2009 DASMA Research Project Results**

Specimen	Rolling Door	Garage Door 1 3/8" EPS	Garage Door 1" Polyurethane
U <sub>s</sub>	.797	.254	.238
U <sub>st</sub> (AW)	.79	.26	.24
U <sub>sim</sub>	.82	.27	.24
U <sub>sim</sub> variance (7x7 to 20x10)	.82 - .83	.27 - .22	.24 - .19
9x7	-----	.26	.23
16x7	-----	.25	.23
10x10	-----	.23	.20

## MINUTES



NFRC 100 Ballot Results:

- Approve: 6
- Approve w/comments:2
- Do not approve: 1
- Abstain: 23
- **Total Votes: 32**

### **Do not approve:**

NewPro Mfg. No comment submitted.

TG Chair comment: Find negative non-persuasive. No supportive reasoning submitted.

### **Approve With Comment:**

#### **Carli, Charlie Curcija**

1. It is not clear why "edge of panel" area is included in these calculations. List of individual (2-D) U-factors includes "edge of glazing" only, as if there is no "edge of panel" areas.

TG Chair comment: This comment would be studied by the TG chair with help from TG members. If any changes were to be needed, they would be included in a future ballot.

2. Also, edge dimensions that are specified as greater of 2.5 in. and 1 in. is not clear and should be clarified. Greater of 2.5 in. and 1 in. is always 2.5 in., so it is not clear what the authors meant here.

TG Chair comment: The Task Group agreed that no action was needed. They believed that the language was clear enough.

#### **WESTLab, Jeff Baker**

While I understand that product size was not in this ballot, the size needs to be revisited and should be changed to 8' wide by 7' height.

TG Chair comment: 7x7 size was intended to capture the capabilities of all accredited NFRC laboratories for both U-factor and SHGC testing. Garage door manufacturers, almost without exception, can provide this size or provide specimens that can be successfully altered to this size. No action was recommended.