



Via Electronic Submission

February 8, 2013

Doug Anderson  
ENERGY STAR Home Improvement Program  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20460-0001

Subject: ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for Residential Windows, Doors, and Skylights – Version 6.0 Draft 2 Eligibility Criteria

Dear Mr. Anderson:

Comments from Cardinal Glass Industries on the solar heat gain trade-offs proposed in draft 2:

Modify Table 4 as shown:

Table 4. Equivalent Energy Performance for Windows		
Climate Zone	U-Factor <sup>1</sup>	SHGC <sup>2</sup>
Northern	= 0.28	≥ 0.32 <b>0.40</b>
	= 0.29	≥ 0.37
	= 0.30	≥ 0.42

1. Btu/h ft<sup>2</sup>·°F

2. Solar Heat Gain Coefficient

#### Reason Statement

Draft 2 expands the U-Factor “trade-up” to new precedent: it’s now possible to qualify a higher U-Factor for the Northern zone than what’s needed in the North Central region. This seems inappropriate in a region with inherently colder weather when the logic behind the U:SHGC trade ratio does NOT account for seasonal comfort and is based upon building operational assumptions that do NOT follow the 2012 IECC. See the detailed explanations to follow.

1. The Northern region covers 4 zones from the model energy code (CZ5, 6, 7, and 8) while North Central comprises only climate zone 4. With each zone further north the hours of cold weather get larger and the winter design temperature gets colder.

ENERGY STAR Zone	Climate Zone	Winter Design Temperature*	Hours Below Freezing*
Northern	8	-30°F	4000
	7	-20°F	3500
	6	-10°F	3000
	5	0°F	2300
North Central	4	+10°F	1500

\*weather data approximates an average across each climate zone

An average roomside window surface temperature can be calculated using interior film coefficients exported from the Window6 program. In the table below, this average surface temperature at the outdoor design condition is labeled as “Feels Like”; this gives an approximation of what the night time comfort conditions will be for each zone.

ENERGY STAR Zone	Climate Zone	Maximum U-Factor	“Feels Like” Temperature
Northern	8	0.30	43°F
	7		45°F
	6		48°F
	5		51°F
North Central	4	0.29	54°F

As the latitude increases with the more northerly zones the hours of winter sunlight decrease about 15 minutes per climate zone. Within the lower 48 states there’s almost 1 hour less of daylight in climate zone 7 than in the North Central (CZ5) region. Regardless of what the energy balances might suggest, when night hours are over 50% of the day the proposed reduction in ENERGY STAR window comfort needs to be acknowledged and addressed in setting the trade-off limits.

2. Modeling the trade-off house with equal distribution on all 4 sides is the opposite of how the performance path in the code works. Yes, the standard reference house for performance trade-offs uses equal windows on all sides, but this is used to establish the budget for the actual building. The budget house sees some “good” winter sun on its south façade and some “bad” summer sun on east and west. Real houses tend to be heavily glazed on one side (typically the backside) or at best on the front and back. In the typical backside distribution only 1 in 4 homes has any exposure that can benefit from a passive solar benefit while the east and west houses (2 of 4 exposures) will backslide on total energy due to the summer solar penalty.
3. Window SHGC is rated without grids, with grids <1” wide, and with grids > 1” wide. In this process the same window is rated three times. Grids < 1” would reduce the base window SHGC on the order of 0.04 - 0.05 and grids > 1” will be an offset around 0.06 - 0.07. Cardinal’s IG production data suggest that about 1/3 of the operable windows have grid bars (of any size) so averaging the NFRC database to determine a “market” SHGC will be artificially too low with respect to sales.





8. Window SHGC can be binned in ranges of about 0.50 for high solar gain low-E, 0.30 for medium solar gain low-E, and less than 0.25 for low solar gain low-E. Gaming the trade-offs in bins as narrow as 0.05 is playing with variations due to window size, frame widths, grid bars, etc., and likely to miss the intent of moving from lower gain products into full-on high solar gain windows.

Summarizing our concerns with the “equivalent energy” path, we suggest adding these guidelines to the criteria:

- Make sure the paths are equal (energy) and that they’re nearly the same (comfort). Simulation programs are dumb - there’s no feedback as to what the occupant might do in regards to a loss of comfort. In the 1980’s homeowners in the Northern zone routinely criticized low-E as the only products available at the time were high solar gain variants and they didn’t validate manufacturer’s claims towards saving energy year-round.
- Make the trade-off a “go big or go home” moment by raising the SHGC trade-off to a meaningful level. Questions about the carry over modeling routines cast doubt on the validity of applying the 5:1 trade-off ratio universally. This small ratio will be gamed in much the same manner that tax credit values from ARRA were tweaked.

Regards,



Jim Larsen  
Director, Technology Marketing

