Meeting Notes Recording Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Meeting: Door TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman: Steve Jasperson, (Therma-Tru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Secretary: J. Allardyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call to Order Tues. Feb 2, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll Call: S. Jasperson (Chair), S. Wendt (staff), J. Allardyce, D. Anderson, J. Baker, S. Coble, D. DeBlock, J. Ferris, J. Hayden, J. Krahn, D. Martin, D. McDonald, T. Reid, S. Strawn, S. Urich, T. Wix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Agenda: NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business of Meeting: (listed below)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. S. Jasperson (Chair) called the meeting to order 11:02 am EDT.
2. J. Allardyce took notes.
3. Anti-Trust Reminder
4. Items for Discussion:
   a) Door thickness and tolerance shown in Section 5.2.4.F of NFRC 100
      i. The dimension is currently shown as 44.5 +/- 0.8mm in Section 5.2.4.F, but is shown as 44 in Figure 5-10.
      ii. Jeff Baker mentioned a tolerance of +/- 0.8mm is needlessly tight. It will exclude doors that should be eligible for the SDR method: His calculations that used a dimension of 44 +/- 2mm resulted in a 4th-decimal-point variation between SDR and DDR methods. After considering other tolerances, the group agreed with a proposal to adopt a tolerance of +/- 2mm.
      iii. The group agreed with a proposal to change the text of Section 5.2.4.F from 44.5 to 44, such that 5.2.4.F would match the dimension shown in Figure 5-10.
      iv. Later in the meeting, the group concluded the amended NFRC 100 document is ready to go to ballot at the April 2016 NFRC meeting.
      v. Jeff agreed to provide evidence that increasing the tolerance range on door slab thickness would not cause a measurable difference in SDR U-values
   b) SDR Database Work Group (see NFRC Staff Associated Program Administrative Topics)
      i. Sherri, Mike T, and Una are working on developing the SDR Database, the SDR Business Rules including who will have access to the SDR data, and the costs to establish the SDR database.
ii. The first draft of this work is scheduled to be submitted to the Door Task Group for review in Q2 2016

c) Certified Door Simulator Training (see NFRC Staff Associated Program Administrative Topics)

i. How will we train the door simulators in the correct and consistent way to use the new SDR method

ii. Dennis Anderson reported he will develop the SDR Simulator Training Program once the SDR method has been fully approved for use by the full NFRC.

d) NFRC 200 Work Group

i. Dennis to update group on the NFRC 200 Work Group status of SDR revisions to NFRC 200

ii. Review proposed revisions to NFRC 200

(Thanks go out to the NFRC 200 Work Group – Dennis, M. Barclay, B. West and M. Zagotti for doing this work)

Dennis discussed his revisions to Sections 4.7.B & 5.2.2, and equations 5-2 through 5-10. The group agreed with his reasoning and amendments.

iii. Discuss default glazing (Dennis)

After discussing other options, the group agreed to use a 1” dual-glazed, air-filled IG as a default glazing.

iv. Determine if we have evidence to provide to the membership that will verify the SDR method will provide the same SHGC and VT results as product simulated using the current DDR method

Steve Coble of WESTLab will use Jeff Baker’s models from Jeff’s U-Factor investigation to confirm the minimal variation between the SDR and DDR methods for SHGC and VT.

v. Determine if the revised NFRC 200 is ready to go out for ballot

The group concluded the amended NFRC 200 document is ready to go to ballot at the April 2016 NFRC meeting.

e) NFRC 700

i. The Door TG determined that NFRC 700 will need to be revised to document the approval pathway for SDR data.

ii. The first draft of Mike’s proposed SDR data approval flowchart was not available for the group to review.

5. New Business Items

a) None

6. Meeting adjourned at 11:55 AM EDT.