NFRC 2010 Spring Membership Meeting
April 12-15, 2010, New Orleans, LA
MINUTES

Garage Door / Rolling Door U-Factor Task Group

Monday, April 12, 2010

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

1. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Hetzel at 8:25 AM.
2. The agenda was agreed to be as published.
3. Old Business
   a. *DASMA Research Project.* Mr. Hetzel reiterated that 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 begun in 2009 were completed. He again noted there was good correlation between tested and simulated values. Regarding Phase 2 (evaluating the need for inclusion of vertical jamb hardware), Mr. Hetzel said that DASMA was in the process of balloting the sponsoring of NFRC 100 simulating and NFRC 102 testing of a rolling door curtain without vertical jamb hardware. The rolling door curtain used in the 2009 DASMA U-factor research would be used for the testing. Should testing show that U-factor values were comparable with vs. without vertical jamb hardware, it was anticipated that DASMA would revise the rolling door details in NFRC 100 and NFRC 102 to eliminate the vertical jamb hardware, and such changes would be balloted.
   b. *Standardized NFRC 101 insulation values vs. manufacturer-published values.* Mr. Hetzel reported that DASMA was balloting the sponsoring of ASTM C518 research testing on EPS and polyurethane panel samples to be obtained from the specimens used in the 2009 DASMA U-factor research project. Once DASMA conducted the research and analyzed the results, Mr. Hetzel would contact NFRC staff (Mr. Ray McGowan) and the Thermophysical Properties of Materials subcommittee chair about the potential formation of a Task Group within that subcommittee, to discuss and possibly act on results obtained from the ASTM C518 testing.

c. *Simulation manual details.* Mr. Hetzel said that garage door and rolling door details were now included in the NFRC simulation manual. No further action was needed on the part of the Task Group.

d. *Standardized simulation spreadsheet.* Mr. Hetzel said that NFRC staff would coordinate the inclusion of garage doors and rolling doors in a future standardized simulation spreadsheet. No action was needed on the part of the Task Group.

4. New Business

a. *Ballot results - changes to NFRC 100.* Results from the recent balloting of changes to NFRC 100 were presented and discussed. One negative ballot was received, and one "approval with comment" ballot was received. Ballot results, and suggested actions, are attached. The Task Group found the negative persuasive, where further changes to the paragraph on "variations from standard simulation and test conditions" would be needed. NFRC 102 would be studied to see if such changes to NFRC 100 would need to be coordinated accordingly. They took no action on the one approval with comment. Therefore, based on the persuasive negative ballot, the Task Group recommended sending the ballot back to them for further work. If a manufacturer was interested in simulating and validation testing a size or configuration other than what is currently in NFRC 100, they could seek an interpretation from the NFRC Technical Interpretation Panel Committee and that Committee would likely allow the variation.

b. *Scope of products in NFRC 100 and NFRC 102.* It was pointed out that language in NFRC 100 and NFRC 102 indicated that the scope of products was limited to residential. The Task Group would investigate changing the language to remove this limitation, and would likely ballot such change. (Note: Subsequent to the Task Group meeting, the U-factor subcommittee, Technical Committee and Board voted to delete the last sentence of the definition of Vehicular Access Doors in NFRC 101, to allow garage doors in any application. The sentence to be deleted reads, "Currently ratings in this procedure are for

residential vehicular access doors only, ratings for commercial doors are under development.")

5. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 AM.

MINUTES

NFRC 100 Ballot Results:

- Approve: 18
- Approve w/comments:1
- Do not approve: 1
- Abstain: 16
- **Total Votes: 36**

Approve With Comments

Jeld-Wen, Steve Strawn

Waiting on comments from (our R&D department).

Task Group recommendation: No action needed. No specific comments submitted.

Negative

Sunergy, Willie duPont

1. What variation in size is permitted if the manufacturer's panel configuration will not fit in the NFRC sized aperture?
   Task Group recommendation: Covered by Section 4.6.1 in NFRC 100. However, 7x7 is the established size.

2. How does the manufacturer determine this size?
   Task Group recommendation: Size variations covered in Section 4.6.1 in NFRC 100.

3. Should this language be placed in NFRC 200?
   Task Group recommendation: No action. Comment not germane to this ballot.

Recommended Action on Ballot: Because discussion focused on allowing manufacturers to simulate and test specimens with alternate configurations to what is currently shown in NFRC 100 (4 – 21" panel heights), the Task Group recommended that the ballot be returned to Task Group for further work. Provisions regarding number of, and height of, panels would be removed. The work would include the following:

1. Keeping only the first sentence of the garage/rolling door provisions in NFRC 100 addressing variations from standard simulation and test conditions.
2. Adding a sentence in those NFRC provisions stating that if a manufacturer is not capable of manufacturing a door to fit into a 7x7 opening, the provisions of Section 4.6.1 would govern.