

CMAST Complex Products Task Group
Conference Call & GoToMeeting Session
Thursday, February 11, 2010
2:00 PM EST

1. Chair Sneh Kumar called the meeting to order at 2:04 PM EST.
2. In attendance: John Lewis (NFRC Staff), Catherine Best, Charlie Curcija, Gary Curtis, Greg McKenna, Joe Hayden, Joseph Holmes, Mike Nau, Sneh Kumar, Tom Mifflin.
3. Lewis volunteered to take notes for the TG.
4. Chair Kumar reviewed the agenda.
5. Chair Kumar reviewed the November ballot results and unfinished business. He mentioned that currently there are no guidelines in NFRC on rating/labeling of non-standard products. With majority of Commercial fenestration product falling under non-standard category – it is important to have guideline for such products.
6. Discussion ensued regarding rating of Spandrel products and Glazed wall with spandrel panel.
 - Gary Curtis stated the high insulating value of the spandrel unit would mask the performance of the portion of the unit with vision glass. It was decided not to have separate rating for Glazed wall with Spandrel panel.
 - Can the spandrel infill be modeled in CMAST? Yes. Spandrel infill will be treated as another glazing option.
 - What size should the Spandrel unit be? Greg McKenna suggested that the size should be the same as the base frame (i.e., use 2000 x 2000 mm for spandrel in curtain wall, treat it just like another glazing option). Catherine Best said the balloted size was more realistic 2000 x 900 mm. McKenna suggested that codes are driving the size of the vision area smaller, and spandrel sizes larger.
 - John Lewis suggested determining NFRC standard size was not as significant as it once was as CMAST can calculate the performance of actual size units. Curcija stated that NFRC does not certify actual sizes. Whole Task Groups felt that NFRC should adopting actual size certification for CMA.
 - Catherine suggested we have a stand-alone spandrel product for testing 2000 x 1200 mm, and remove glazed with spandrel panel. Group agreed with this size for rating Spandrel products.
 - McKenna stated codes currently do not require NFRC ratings on the spandrel areas.
 - Charlie Curcija asked about the status of his proposed method to model Spandrel; what was the result of the review by TIP? Curcija suggested that the location of the proposed methodology should be NFRC 100 instead of NFRC Simulation manual.

7. Regarding store front: consensus was to leave the storefront as requiring separate rating for Glazed wall and Door; so existing language should cover this.
8. Regarding corner products: Chair Kumar suggested to leave it out of the ballot; all agreed. Technical procedure for Corner product simulation does not exist at this time.
9. Combination products:
 - Chair Kumar reviewed the definitions of *combination products*; Joe Hayden stated that if definition changes, it needs to be initiated in NFRC 100 (or the controlling document) first, and then update the Glossary accordingly. Curcija agreed.
 - Combination assembly is term used by AAMA; does NFRC want to adopt this term? At one time, it was referred to by NFRC as Combination Assembly, but was changed to Combination Product. Chair Kumar and the group decided to leave definition alone.
 - 5.9.6.3.5 Language from previous ballot was reviewed; Sneha proposed to model individual products forming the combination units as separate units and ignore the reinforcing mullion.
 - Curcija stated this language was consistent with how residential products are handled (ignoring the reinforcement mullion). No additional simulations would then be required for CMAST.
 - TG agreed with the proposal to model and rate it this way.
 - Chair Kumar suggested that perhaps future work might include a method for modeling only the reinforcing mullion without frame components around it and CMAST would be able to calculate the performance for reinforcing mullion; the TG did not express much interest in this at this point.
10. Composite Product (Common frame):
 - The NFRC and AAMA definitions were reviewed. Chair Kumar suggested we adopt the AAMA definition; this was agreed upon.
 - For modeling Composite products - the issue here is modeling the numerous integral mullions that are possible.
 - McKenna suggested we just model the individual products as a stand-alone product and ignore the integral mullion. He said the size issue is a much larger issue than the accuracy gained from modeling the integral mullion. McKenna stated that California is in favor of actual size ratings with larger glass, which would provide better ratings as the frame is a lesser contributor.
 - Chair Kumar asked about determining the sizes of the individual units of a composite unit (actual size); Best suggested using the centerline of the mullion. McKenna suggested that the glass area should drive the size of the actual size unit that is input into CMAST. Curcija stated that glass area was used in CMAST, but not currently part of the available information. It was suggested this be added to the next release of CMAST.
 - Group agreed to use centerline of integral mullion for determining the actual sizes of individual units.

11. Curcija suggested that NFRC rating for actual sizes be included in this ballot. That was the unanimous consensus of the group. Actual sizes would supplement, and not replace the NFRC standard size.
12. Chair Kumar will modify prior ballot as per today's discussion; he will distribute to this group by Monday, February 15, 2010.
13. Lewis stated the ballots were due back from Chairs to liaisons by 02/18.
14. Discussion ensued regarding 'custom products;'
 - Current definition for custom product referred to residential products. Might need new term for custom commercial products.
 - Charlie said that custom products were intended to be those which did not fit into any other product type category. For modeling Custom products would be covered under composite/combination products.
 - McKenna suggested that for custom curtain walls, these be simulated only, and no validation test be conducted. Such products are designed and used only for a specific project and never used again.
 - Best and Kumar replied that NFRC has not accepted such a proposal in the past.
 - Best requested that 'custom products' be included as a separate ballot so that if contested, would not jeopardize the other ballot proposal from this TG.
 - Best agreed to work with McKenna and Curcija on drafting language for this separate ballot; Best stated she too would have this separate ballot to the TG by end of business (PST), Monday.
15. Next meeting date was not decided. Depending on the ballot response, next TG meeting will be called.
16. Meeting adjourned at 3:39 PM EST.