1. **Call to Order**

2. **Appointed Recording Secretary- J. Allardyce**

3. **Anti-Trust reminder.**

4. **Meeting Agenda reviewed and approved.**

5. **New Business**
   A. **Continue review of the proposed ballot to revise NFRC 100 to add the “Simplified Door Rating Method”**.
   
   1. **Simplified Ballot Cover Letter – J.Ferris:**
      a. Jessica, Steve, and Dennis provided a 17-item list of changes to NFRC 100 as a ballot letter. Item #3 was wordsmithed, then the group approved this improved ballot letter.
   
   2. **Questions not resolved at last meeting:**
      a. **Section 5.2.1.2:** Should the middle paragraph be deleted? We discussed this, then decided the middle paragraph should remain in place.
      b. **Section 5.2.4.C.b:** This paragraph is redundant, so it was deleted. The remaining paragraph “a)” was incorporated into 5.2.4.C.
      c. **Section 5.2.4.E.c:** Hardwood: We kept this text as-is.
      d. **Section 5.2.5 for Deco Glass:** The two previously-deleted paragraphs were added back to the document, but inserted into Section 5.2.4 instead of 5.2.5.
      e. **Section 5.2.5.2:** Caming and decorative glass layer simplifications text was removed in a previous edit. Was that correct? Yes, it was. It remains deleted.
   
   3. **Questions raised after our last meeting:**
      a. **The addition of doors with wood core – T.Reid.** Refer to Section 5.2.1.1.A: Tank’s concerns were resolved without any resistance from the group. We amended “A” to overtly include wood cores, and wordsmithed the rest of “A”.
      b. **Proposed revisions – Steve Urich**
         i. **Sections 5.2.4 – “representative intermediate”** was edited to be “representative intermediate vertical member, as determined and reported by the simulator.”
Section 5.2.5.1.A.ii – “per Equation 5.2, for the 6-panel opaque”: We dropped “6-panel” in order to include both 6-panel and opaque versions.

c. Should we be using the methodology for SHGC and VT – J.Hayden: This answer is included in “d”.

d. “In order for this to work we will need NFRC 200 updated as well – J.Baker. This answers both “c” and “d”. We will ballot the amendments to NFRC 100, then start amending NFRC 200. The revised NFRC 100 cannot be implemented until the revised NFRC 200 is successfully balloted.

e. Can we use the “Windows” Method for other than full lites – J.Hayden: No, per Marles’ explanation, and agreed to by Jeff Baker.

4 Questions raised at the end of this meeting: General discussion

a. What parties are the primary beneficiaries of these NFRC 100 amendments? The primary beneficiaries are door jobbers and prehangers. Note: Companies that make both doorglass and doors will benefit, as well, because new door slabs will be quickly simulated with pre-existing doorglass. It will become a “cut and paste” operation rather than a re-simulation operation.

b. Will the doorglass simulation data be generic or specific to the manufacturer? It will be specific to the manufacturer. Permission will be granted to combine door glass from a specific door glass provider with a specific door provider. Each manufacturer will be responsible for uploading their simulation files to the CPD.

c. What types of door glass is included in the SDR methodology? Are blinds or non-default plastic frames included? Yes, they are included. Any doormlight construction, frame, frame material, and glass can go into the doorglass collection. If a proprietary plastic frame that performs better than the default frame can be simulated, so as to maximize the benefit of the improved frame.

5 The group approved the proposed ballot and agreed to send it to the U-Factor Subcommittee chair (Steve Urich). Near the close of this meeting, Steve Urich agreed with these changes. Therefore, the proposed ballot has been forwarded to NFRC Staff for balloting at Annapolis in March.

6 The meeting adjourned at 11:47am EST.

7 Next meeting: NFRC Spring Conference in Annapolis, MD. Agenda will be to discuss any negative comments of this ballot and to start discussion of NFRC 200 SHGC amendments.