Meeting Notes – Interior and Exterior Attachments Task Group
NFRC 2009 Spring Membership Meeting
Tucson Marriott- University Park; Tucson Arizona
March 2, 2009

Interior Attachments Task Group Chair Mike Cienian called meeting to order.
Mike reviewed anti-trust reminder, routed the Task Group Interest sheet, and reviewed agenda.

Mike noted that Fred Higgins was no longer serving as Exterior Attachments Task Group Chair, and that Tom Zaremba had stepped forward to fill this role. Mike and Tom will work to advance the Interior and Exterior Attachments Task Group work together.

NFRC Board Direction - Attachments

The agenda was modified from what had been published in the Program Booklet as the NFRC Board had provided six detailed steps to provide direction to the groups advancing work on Attachments. To share and clarify these new steps, Jim Benney and Joe Hayden were in attendance. Here is the note that was sent from the Board:

Dear Attachment Subcommittee chair; Technical Committee chair and Ratings Committee chair:

The NFRC Board of Directors has approved the following direction related to attachments:

1. 1. Rate all attachment products (on a case by case basis) per New Product Rating Guidelines
2. 2. Use the existing NFRC committee structure/system; i.e., require that all attachments come up through the Attachments Subcommittee that reports to existing Technical and Rating Committees.
3. 3. NFRC is to create a new trademark representing NFRC ATTACHMENTS (to differentiate from whole window product ratings).
4. 4. Allow attachments to have different ratings depending upon their business need.
5. 5. That a separate NFRC Technical document covering NFRC 100, 200, etc., be developed with separate sections pertaining to individual attachment types (Storm Windows, Awnings, Blinds, etc).
6. 6. That a separate Attachments PCP document will also be developed, with sections related to various attachment types as appropriate.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.
Please do not hesitate to contact me if you should have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,
Jim Benney, CAE
NFRC Executive Director

Jim B went through the document for the group point by point, taking questions to clarify the direction. Some questions and comments included:

- Joe H. explained that the Board had considered a request to move Attachments to a separate committee or organization under the NFRC banner, but the Board of Directors decided to keep Attachments within the current NFRC organizational and committee structure.
- Jim B. advised that Attachment companies should now get their marketing groups involved in creating concepts for the Attachments ratings logo and label
- Questions were voiced as to the need for new technical procedures as well as tech documents. Jim B. explained that attachment documents for NFRC 100 and NFRC 200 could be based on current existing documents, but were not limited to that.
- Joe H. added that the existing documents are becoming cumbersome and this contributed to the Board direction of separate NFRC 100, NFRC 200 and other documents for Attachments.
- Willie DuPont asked if the Task Group should start creating the complete new attachments document now
    - Joe H. – yes by either copying the verbiage from existing NFRC documents or by extended references
- Darrell Smith shared some comments in regards to the appearance of the label and the differences between a Windows label and the existing Interior and Exterior attachments label in use for Films. Jim B – commented that a new version of NFRC labels for other Attachment products would not dilute the current NFRC marketing efforts – the stand alone status would let attachments differentiate themselves and focus on their industry,

Mike Cienian thanked the Board for its direction, and specifically to Jim Benney and Joe Hayden for their support, attendance and comments in the meeting.

<u>Mike Rubin Presentation</u>

The next Agenda item was a presentation by Mike Rubin of LBNL. Mike has been helping to share information with the Attachments Optical Properties Task Group and other Task Group members in regards to current equipment and testing methods at LBNL. Some of the topics covered included:

- Normal incidence vs light scattering
- BSDF definitions
- Use of the LBNL Goniophotometer for scanning numerous angles of BSDF
- Alternative and simpler means measure transmittance, such as use of

standard spectrophotometers available in industry today

Daylighting Discussion

The group had questions and discussion in regard to Daylighting and the importance of other than normal incidence analysis on incoming lights striking a shading device, and whether NFRC should be taking a more definitive role in measuring and rating performance due to the impact of daylighting.

After discussion, it was determined that this issue did not belong as an Attachment Task Group action item at this time. Joe Hayden offered to bring the topic to the NFRC Board for review and possible direction. Joe requested some information in writing for submission to the board from Lisa Heschong and others.

Ballot Review

After a time check-in with Darrell Smith (Films Task Group), the Film TG yielded its scheduled time to allow a review of ballot negatives and comments for the Attachments NFRC 100 and NFRC 200 ballots that are in consideration during this conference.

NFRC 100 Ballot Task Group discussion

Bipin Shah noted that in NFRC ballot resolution, all negative comments need to be specific as what areas were lacking in detail and specific suggestion as to what needs to be worked on. Tom Culp and others commented that the ballots were intended to show the direction and intent of the Task Groups. The point was made that to improve document we need to address negatives and determine what areas need work.

MM negative – CPD attachment upload sheet needs to be updated – Marles explained that only the aluminum window base case is needed to match current NFRC practices. This could alleviate issues in simulation and reduce overall base windows for attachments. Currently there are 8 referenced base case windows in the Attachments documents.

Joe H/Pella negative – advises to reduce the number of base case windows – too many for effective label, risk of confusing the consumer/buying public. It was suggested to have:

- One for each area (residential and commercial)

Also, it was noted that some of the definitions are material specific and should be more material neutral.

Tom C. – cited specific language changes needed – use more generic language – stay away from specific references. Some procedures appeared to be written as guidelines and not procedure. Tom advised he would be willing to help as next generation language is developed.

NFRC 200 Ballot Task Group discussion

Many of the comments/negatives had already been addressed in the NFRC 100 ballot discussion.

Mike thanked the group for their comments, and noted that with the new NFRC Board direction, many of the negatives might now be moot and possibly withdrawn in subcommittee.

Recognition was given to many of the people who helped advance the ballots for this meeting.

Meeting was adjourned
Submitted by Mike Cienian from notes by Rob Simons