

# INSULATION MATERIALS

Testing and Applications

3<sup>rd</sup> Volume



**ASTM** STP 1320

**Ronald S. Graves**  
**Robert R. Zarr**  
Editors

STP 1320

***Insulation Materials:  
Testing and Applications,  
Third Volume***

*Ronald S. Graves and Robert R. Zarr, editors*

ASTM Publication Code Number (PCN):  
04-013200-61



ASTM  
100 Barr Harbor Drive  
West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959

Printed in the U.S.A.

**ISBN:** 0-8031-2409-0  
**PCN:** 04-013200-61  
**ISSN:** 1058-1170

Copyright © 1997 AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TESTING AND MATERIALS, West Conshohocken, PA. All rights reserved. This material may not be reproduced or copied, in whole or in part, in any printed, mechanical, electronic, film, or other distribution and storage media, without the written consent of the publisher.

### **Photocopy Rights**

**Authorization to photocopy items for internal, personal, or educational classroom use, or the internal, personal, or educational classroom use of specific clients, is granted by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) provided that the appropriate fee is paid to the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923; Tel: (508) 750-8400; online: <http://www.copyright.com/>.**

### **Peer Review Policy**

Each paper published in this volume was evaluated by two peer reviewers and at least one editor. The authors addressed all of the reviewers' comments to the satisfaction of both the technical editor(s) and the ASTM Committee on Publications.

To make technical information available as quickly as possible, the peer-reviewed papers in this publication were prepared "camera-ready" as submitted by the authors.

The quality of the papers in this publication reflects not only the obvious efforts of the authors and the technical editor(s), but also the work of the peer reviewers. The ASTM Committee on Publications acknowledges with appreciation their dedication and contribution of time and effort on behalf of ASTM.

# Foreword

This publication, *Insulation Materials: Testing and Applications, Third Volume*, contains papers presented at The Third Symposium on Insulation Materials: Testing and Applications, held in Quebec City, Quebec, Canada on 15-17 May 1997. The sponsor of the event was ASTM Committee C-16 on Thermal Insulation.

The symposium co-chairmen were Ronald S. Graves, R & D Services, Inc., Lenoir City, TN, and Robert R. Zarr, NIST, Gaithersburg, MD. They also served as editors of this publication.

# Overview

---

After several decades of development, the testing and applications of thermal insulation materials may be considered, by some, a mature technology. Yet, new insulation materials, systems, and test methods for the measurement of thermal properties continue to emerge and evolve. In advancing the state of the art, ASTM Committee C-16 on Thermal Insulation has periodically published the latest up-to-date information on thermal insulation materials, systems, and measurement technology based on symposia sponsored by the committee. This Special Technical Publication continues this tradition of communicating state-of-the-art technology to those engaged in this field of endeavor.

In many ways, developments in the thermal insulation community reflect society's technological interests and needs. For example, during the 1960s the insulation community turned its attention to the space program. Later, in the 1970s and the 1980s, public awareness of rising energy costs focused attention on effective energy conservation programs using thermal insulation. More recently, the community has been involved with mitigation of the effects that the production and consumption of energy have on the environment. This publication presents the thermal insulation community with the latest information on developments in residential, commercial, and industrial applications.

Currently, there are several areas of interest and the papers in this volume have been organized in six categories. These categories are fenestration testing, system testing, materials testing and properties, models and materials, test methods, and performance. The papers and presentations for this publication were truly international in scope, with participation from 13 countries: Austria, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Israel, Italy, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the West Indies.

The editors of this Special Technical Publication gratefully acknowledge the contributions of the authors, technical reviewers, steering committee, and session chairpersons. The steering committee, session chairpersons, and technical reviewers are identified on the following page.

*Ronald S. Graves*

R & D Services, Inc., Lenoir City, Tennessee 37771;  
symposium co-chairman and editor

*Robert R. Zarr*

National Institute of Standards and Technology,  
Gaithersburg, MD 20899; symposium co-chairman and editor

## Steering Committee for the 1997 Symposium on Insulation Materials

Dr. Mark T. Bomberg	Saskatchewan Research Council
Mr. John R. Mumaw	Owens Corning
Dr. Per I. Sandberg	Swedish National Testing and Research Institute
Dr. David W. Yarbrough	Tennessee Technological University

## Session Chairpersons for the 1997 Symposium on Insulation Materials

Mr. Mark A. Albers	Schuller International Inc.
Dr. Dragan Curcija	Carli, Inc.
Mr. André O. Desjarlais	Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Ms. Barbara A. Fabian	Owens Corning
Mr. Stephen N. Flanders	U.S. Army Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory
Dr. David J. McCaa	CertainTeed Corporation
Dr. David L. McElroy	Consultant
Dr. R. Gerry Miller	Center for Applied Engineering
Mr. John R. Mumaw	Owens Corning
Dr. Per I. Sandberg	Swedish National Testing and Research Institute
Mr. John A. Scott	Owens Corning
Mr. Thomas E. Whitaker	Fiberboard Corporation, Pabco Division
Dr. Kenneth E. Wilkes	Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Dr. David W. Yarbrough	Tennessee Technological University

## Technical Reviewers for the 1997 Symposium on Insulation Materials

Mark Albers	James Grimes	Carsten Rode
Mark Bomberg	Carl Hagentoft	Walter Rossiter
Richard Booth	Kielsgaard Hansen	Jeff Roux
André Brzezinski	Goran Hedenblad	Robert Rushforth
Duane Bukowski	George Hessler	Per Sandberg
Bret Clippinger	Martin Hofton	John Scott
Rick Curkeet	Francis Hutto	Bipen Shah
André Desjarlais	Dave Jones	Cliff Shirtliffe
Brian Dougherty	Bertil Jonsson	Iris Smalley
Kenneth Downs	John Kalis	Ivan Smith
William DuPont	Franz Kasper	James Sparrell
William Edmunds	Kurt Kiessl	Terese Stovall
Hakim Elmahdy	Jan Kosny	William Strzepek
Barbara Fabian	Mike Lacher	Raymond Taylor
Thomas Fellinger	Mark Leuthold	Domenic Tessari
William Fitch	David McCaa	Ronald Tye
Stephen Flanders	Barry McCrudden	Sivert Uvsløkk
Stanley Gatland	David McElroy	Thomas Whitaker
Peter Gaul	Gerry Miller	Kenneth Wilkes
Charles Gilbo	David Moyer	John Wright
William Goss	John Mumaw	David Yarbrough
Ronald Graves	Patrick Noonan	Robert Zarr
Brent Griffith	Thomas Petrie	

# Contents

Overview	ix
----------	----

## FENESTRATION TESTING

<b>Comparison of Methods to Standardize ASTM C 1199 Thermal Transmittance Results—</b> WILLIAM C. DUPONT	3
<b>Laboratory Procedures for Using Infrared Thermography to Validate Heat Transfer Models—</b> DANIEL TÜRLER, BRENT T. GRIFFITH, AND DARIUSH K. ARASTEH	23
<b>A Wall and Edge Guarded Hot Box for Thermal Transmittance Measurements—</b> STANLEY D. GATLAND II, WILLIAM P. GOSS, RON L. BAUMGARDNER, RAY G. WILLIAMS, AND R. GERRY MILLER	46
<b>Non-Destructive In-Situ Determination of the Rare Gas Content of Highly Insulating Glazing Units—</b> JOACHIM GROSS AND JOCHEN FRICKE	61
<b>The Design and Fabrication of a Calibrated Hot Box Apparatus—</b> STANLEY D. GATLAND II, WILLIAM P. GOSS, AND DRAGAN CURCIIA	73
<b>Expanded Polystyrene Board as a Standard Reference Material for Thermal Resistance Measurement Systems—</b> ROBERT R. ZARR	91

## SYSTEM TESTING

<b>Thermal Imbalance in Hot Box Apparatus and <i>In-Situ</i> Measurements—</b> BRUNO BISIOL, MANUELA CAMPANALE, FRANCESCO DE PONTE, AND LORENZO MORO	109
<b>Comparison of Experimental and Analytical Methods to Evaluate Thermal Bridges in Wall Systems—</b> ANDRÉ O. DESJARLAIS AND ALEX G. MCGOWAN	128
<b>In Situ Measuring of Thermophysical Properties of Building Materials and Wall Configurations—</b> JÜRGEN W. DREYER	140
<b>Metal Stud Wall Systems—Thermal Disaster, or Modern Wall Systems with Highly Efficient Thermal Insulation?—</b> JAN KOŠNY, JEFFREY E. CHRISTAIN, AND ANDRÉ O. DESJARLAIS	153
<b>Thermal Behavior of Mixtures of Perlite and Phase Change Material in a Simulated Climate—</b> THOMAS W. PETRIE, KENNETH W. CHILDS, PHILIP W. CHILDS, JEFFREY E. CHRISTIAN, AND DANIEL J. SHRAMO	180

<b>A Variability Study on the ASTM Thin Slicing and Scaling Test Method for Evaluating the Long-Term Performance of an Extruded Polystyrene Foam Blown with HCFC-142b</b> —BARBARA A. FABIAN, RONALD S. GRAVES, MARTIN R. HOFTON, AND DAVID W. YARBROUGH	197
<b>Determination of the Optimum Settings of a Fibrous Loose-Fill Blowing Machine Using Design of Experiments</b> —ROBERT J. RUSHFORTH	216
<b>A Review of Expanded Polystyrene (EPS) Properties, Performance and New Applications</b> —THOMAS R. GREELEY	224

MODELS & MATERIALS

<b>Modeling and Experimental Evaluation of the Thermal Insulation Properties of Mineral Wool Products at High Temperature</b> — PHILIPPE DE DIANOUS, FRANÇOIS PINCEMIN, PASCAL BOULET, AND GÉRARD JEANDEL	243
<b>A Model for the Settling of Attic Loose-Fill Insulations</b> —BENGT SVENNERSTEDT	259
<b>Development of Vacuum Super Insulations with Glass Cover and Powder Filling</b> —R. CAPS, TH. RETTELBACH, M. EHREMANNTAUT, S. KORDER, AND J. FRICKE	270
<b>Use of Coconut Fiber as a Low-Cost Thermal Insulator</b> — GURMOHAN S. KOCHHAR AND KRISHPERSAD MANOHAR	283
<b>Thermal Conductivity Dependence of MgO Thermal Insulation on Porosity in Temperature Range 500-2000 K</b> —E. LITOVSKY, T. LITOVSKY, M. SHAPIRO, AND A. SHAVIT	292
<b>The Measurement of the Morphology of Closed Cell Foams Which Control the Overall Thermal Conductivity</b> —LEON R. GLICKMAN AND JEFFREY STEWART	307

TEST METHODS

<b>Thermal Design of a Miniature Guarded Hot Plate Apparatus</b> — DANIEL R. FLYNN AND RAVI GORTHALA	337
<b>Improved Temperature Oscillation Techniques for Measurements of Thermal Diffusivity and Conductivity of Insulation Materials</b> — WALTER CZARNETZKI AND WILFRIED ROETZEL	355
<b>Radiation Scattering Versus Radiation Absorption—Effects on Performance of Thermal Insulation Under Non-Steady-State Conditions</b> — DANIEL R. FLYNN AND RAVI GORTHALA	366



<b>Early-Time Estimation of the Thermal Resistance of Flat Specimens— Theoretical Analysis for Pure Conduction in a Homogeneous Material—</b>	
DANIEL R. FLYNN AND RAVI GORTHALA	381

## PERFORMANCE I

<b>Field Experience and Dew Point Studies of a Retrofitted Roof—</b>	
AXEL R. CARLSON	403

<b>Innovative Self-Drying Concept for Thermal Insulation of Cold Piping—</b>	
VAGN KORSGAARD	416

<b>The Thermohygric Performance of Insulated Building Structures Under Conditions of Use—</b>	
PETER HAUPL, HEIKO FECHNER, JOHN GRUNEWALD, AND HORST STOPP	426

<b>Moisture Performance Analysis of EPS Frost Insulation—</b>	
TUOMO OJANEN AND ERKKI KOKKO	442

<b>A Logical Extension of the ASTM Standard E 96 to Determine the Dependence of Water Vapour Transmission on Relative Humidity—</b>	
JOHN C. LACKEY, ROGER G. MARCHAND, AND MAVINKAL K. KUMARAN	456

## PERFORMANCE II

<b>Preventing Environmentally-Caused Corrosion of Insulated Copper Lines—</b>	
PAUL A. HOUGH AND RONALD S. LENOX	473

<b>Effect of Halogens and Inhibitors on the External Stress Corrosion Cracking of Type 304 Austenitic Stainless Steel—</b>	
KENNETH WHORLOW, EDWARD WOOLRIDGE, AND FRANCIS HUTTO	485

<b>Evaluating High-Temperature Intumescent Insulation Materials Under Fire and Blast Conditions—</b>	
ARTHUR J. PARKER	498

<b>The Acoustical Testing of Thermally Insulated Exterior Building Elements—</b>	
RICHARD J. PEPPIN, GUY M. DUERSCH, MARTIN J. BEAM, AND KEVIN MILLER	510

<b>Measuring and Calculating the Thermal and Hygric Properties of Insulating Building Materials Over Wide Temperature and Moisture Ranges—</b>	
ROBERT ČERNÝ AND JAN TOMAN	524

<b>Indexes</b>	537
----------------	-----

## **Fenestration Testing**



## COMPARISON OF METHODS TO STANDARDIZE ASTM C 1199 THERMAL TRANSMITTANCE RESULTS.

---

**REFERENCE:** duPont, William C., “**Comparison of Methods to Standardize ASTM C 1199 Thermal Transmittance Results,**” Insulation Materials: Testing and Applications: Third Volume, ASTM STP 1320, R.S. Graves and R.R. Zarr, Eds., American Society for Testing and Materials, 1997.

**ABSTRACT:** ASTM C 1199-91 requires that the measured air-to-air U-factor,  $U_{sa}$ , is standardized to the U-factor that the test specimen would have if it was tested with standardized surface conductance coefficients on both sides. This produces the standardized thermal transmittance,  $U_{st}$ , which is typically a smaller value than the thermal transmittance (the air-to-air U-factor),  $U_s$ . ASTM C 1199-91 currently allows for two methods of determining standardized thermal transmittance, and this paper proposes a variation of one of those methods. In addition this paper compares the results from all three methods of standardization using actual test results from five NFRC accredited testing laboratories. By standardizing the measured thermal transmittance, the results from different laboratories that may have different wind machines and thermal chamber configurations can be directly compared. In addition, the test results can be directly compared with computer simulation results that have also been determined using standardized surface heat transfer coefficients. This latter point is critical to the National Fenestration Rating Council's certified product validation program. This paper recommends that the proposed method of determining the standardized thermal transmittance replace one of the existing methods, and that there be a criteria established that clearly identifies which of the two methods of calculating the standardized thermal transmittance is to be used when testing different fenestration products.

**KEYWORDS:** thermal transmittance measurements, fenestration U-factor testing, laboratory hot box, surface heat transfer coefficients, standardized surface heat transfer coefficients, surface temperature measurements.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sunergy Company, P.O. Box 4642, Annapolis, MD 21403

## INTRODUCTION:

Before the development of ASTM Standard Test Method for Measuring the Steady State Thermal Transmittance of Fenestration Systems Using Hot Box Methods (C 1199) in 1990, the thermal transmittance (U-value or U-factor) of fenestration products in North America was typically measured using the procedures outlined in ASTM Standard Test Method for Steady-State Thermal Performance of Building Assemblies by Means of a Guarded Hot Box (C 236: Annex A1), ASTM Standard Test Method for Thermal Performance of Building Assemblies by Means of a Calibrated Hot Box (C 976: Annex A2) or AAMA Voluntary Test Method for Thermal Transmittance and Condensation Resistance of Windows, Doors and Glazed Wall Sections (1503.1-88). All three of these procedures require that the “air-to-air” thermal transmittance (U-factor) be reported. Although ASTM C 236 and ASTM C 976 were originally developed with the intent of testing test flat, homogeneous wall sections, this “air-to-air” U-factor,  $U_s$ , has been used for years to rate the thermal performance of fenestration products that are not flat or homogeneous. The thermal transmittance is described by the following simple equation [1, 2]:

$$U_s = \frac{Q_s}{A_s \cdot (t_i - t_o)} \quad (1)$$

where:

- $U_s$  = thermal transmittance,  $W/(m^2 \cdot K)$
- $Q_s$  = heat flow through the test specimen, W
- $A_s$  = the projected area of the test specimen (the area of the aperture in the surround panel),  $m^2$
- $t_i$  = warm side air temperature, K
- $t_o$  = cold side air temperature, K.

This thermal transmittance is considered to be a primary measurement because all the variables on the right side of the equation can be directly measured by the test laboratory, and the uncertainty of each measurement can be determined. Basically, the measured heat flow through the test specimen is divided by the product of the area of the test specimen times the air temperature difference on both sides of the test specimen.

The development of ASTM C 1199 not only introduced the necessary modifications and extra calibrations associated with testing fenestration products smaller than the metering area of a typical ASTM C 236 thermal chamber, but it also presented two methods of standardizing the warm side and cold side surface conductance (heat transfer) coefficients on each side of the test specimen to produce a new final result called the standardized thermal transmittance,  $U_{ST}$ . This standardized thermal transmittance is represented by the following equation in ASTM C 1199-91 [3].

$$U_{ST} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{h_{STI}} + \frac{1}{C_S} + \frac{1}{h_{STM}}} \quad (2)$$

where:  $U_{ST}$  = standardized thermal transmittance,  $W/(m^2 \cdot K)$   
 $h_{STI}$  = warm side standardized surface heat transfer coefficient,  $W/(m^2 \cdot K)$   
 $C_S$  = thermal conductance of the test specimen (surface-to-surface),  $W/(m^2 \cdot K)$   
 $h_{STM}$  = cold side standardized surface heat transfer coefficient,  $W/(m^2 \cdot K)$ .

Although the standardized thermal transmittance is not considered to be a primary measurement due to the uncertainties in measuring the surface heat transfer coefficients,  $h_i$  and  $h_o$ , and the "surface-to-surface" conductance,  $C_S$ , it provides many advantages over not standardizing the results.

The primary benefit is that results from different laboratories, with significantly different air flow delivery systems, and thermal chamber configurations can be directly compared with confidence. Results from the 1994 NFRC Test Laboratory Accreditation Program<sup>(2)</sup> round robin [4] on identical test specimens show that there is greater agreement between the standardized thermal transmittance,  $U_{ST}$ , as compared to the thermal transmittance,  $U_S$ . Two of the laboratories in that round robin had cold side air flow delivery systems that delivered the air parallel to the plane of the test specimen, and the remainder of the laboratories had cold side air flow systems that directed the air directly at the test specimen normal to its plane of installation. This method of blowing the cold side air perpendicular to the test specimen seems to be unique to North America because the International fenestration thermal transmittance test procedures [5] only reference parallel air flow on the cold side. The large number of perpendicular cold side air flow thermal chambers in the United States and Canada is historically due to the AAMA 1503 test procedure which requires perpendicular air flow on the cold side of the test specimen.

Another advantage of standardizing the surface heat transfer coefficients on each side of the test specimen is that the test results can be directly compared with computer simulation results that use the same standardized surface heat transfer coefficients. This capability has been a cornerstone to the success of the NFRC Procedure for Determining Fenestration Product Thermal Properties (100-91) U-factor rating system because it allows manufacturers to inexpensively derive accurate U-factor ratings for a vast variety

---

<sup>2</sup> References to the NFRC accredited test and simulation laboratories and the procedures that those laboratories use are frequently relied on throughout this paper because the NFRC is the most active user of ASTM C 1199.

of different product configurations with computer modeling, and directly verify those computer generated results with a relatively small number of thermal tests. Currently, NFRC 100-91 [6] specifies that the U-factor of a fenestration product can be determined by the WINDOW 4.1 [7] and FRAME 4.0 [8] computer programs for certified rating purposes, and tests from ASTM C 1199 are used to validate those results<sup>(3)</sup>.

One disadvantage of the standardization process, as it is currently described in ASTM C 1199, is that it allows two methods of calculating the standardized thermal transmittance, and the test laboratory is permitted to choose which result they want to report. Although each of these two methods have advantages and disadvantages that will be discussed later in this report, the fact that the test laboratory has the opportunity to choose which result they want to report is problematic. Currently there is no criteria in ASTM C 1199 to guide laboratories in making that decision.

## DESCRIPTION OF STANDARDIZATION METHODS

ASTM C 1199 currently allows for the following two methods of determining the standardized thermal transmittance, and the third method presented has been proposed as a modification to the first method. This modified method has been used by NFRC accredited testing laboratories since June, 1993.

### Projected Area Weighting Method

One of these methods, which is often called the "area weighting method," (Section 7.1.7 and 7.1.8 of ASTM C 1199) relies on measuring 20 surface temperatures on each side of the test specimen with temperature sensors (such as thermocouples), and using those surface temperatures to determine the surface heat transfer coefficients on both sides of the test specimen during the test using the following equations:

$$h_i = \frac{Q_s}{A_s \cdot (t_i - t_1)} \quad (3)$$

---

<sup>3</sup> NFRC has its own version of ASTM C 1199 called NFRC 100-91 Attachment A: Interim Standard Test Method for Measuring the Steady-State Thermal Transmittance of Fenestration Systems Using Hot Box Methods. NFRC 100-91 Attachment A was published before ASTM C 1199. Although the NFRC Technical Committee voted to replace NFRC 100-91 Attachment A with ASTM C 1199 in January, 1992 (Anaheim, CA), the fact that Draft 10 of ASTM C 1199 was published instead of Draft 11 caused NFRC accredited test laboratories to continue to use NFRC 100-91 Attachment A. Also see footnote (5).

where:  $h_I$  = warm side surface heat transfer coefficient,  $W/(m^2 \cdot K)$   
 $t_I$  = warm side test specimen surface temperature, K

and,

$$h_{II} = \frac{Q_s}{A_s \cdot (t_2 - t_{II})} \quad (4)$$

where:  $h_{II}$  = cold side surface heat transfer coefficient,  $W/(m^2 \cdot K)$   
 $t_{II}$  = cold side air temperature, K

The calculated warm and cold side surface heat transfer coefficients are used to determine the test specimen thermal conductance,  $C_s$ , using the following equation:

$$C_s = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{U_s} - \frac{1}{h_I} - \frac{1}{h_{II}}} \quad (5)$$

The thermal transmittance of the test specimen is determined from Equation 1, and the surface heat transfer coefficients are determined from Equations 3 and 4. The thermal conductance of the test specimen calculated using Equation 5 is then combined with the standardized surface heat transfer coefficients to determine the standardized thermal transmittance using Equation 2. The cold side standardized surface heat transfer coefficient is considered to be a constant,  $28.98 W/m^2 \cdot K^{(4)}$ . The warm side standardized surface heat transfer coefficient is also considered to be a constant,  $8.3 W/m^2 \cdot K^{(5)}$ , in ASTM C 1199-91, but is calculated using Equation 37 of NFRC 100-91 Attachment A [9] by the NFRC accredited test laboratories, by the computer program WINDOW 4.1, and in the analysis performed in this paper.

---

<sup>4</sup> Actually, ASTM C 1199-91 (and ASTM E 1423-91) lists the cold side standardized surface heat transfer coefficient as "30.0  $W/(m^2 \cdot K)$  (5.1  $Btu/(h \cdot ft^2 \cdot ^\circ F)$ )". If one converts 5.1  $Btu/(h \cdot ft^2 \cdot ^\circ F)$  into metric units the result is 28.89  $W/(m^2 \cdot K)$ . The results in this paper were calculated using a cold side standardized surface heat transfer coefficient of 28.89  $W/(m^2 \cdot K)$  because that is the value that the NFRC accredited test laboratories and the computer programs WINDOW 4.1 and FRAME 3.1 were using.

<sup>5</sup> The differences between ASTM C 1199-91 and NFRC 100-91: Attachment A can be summarized by the differences between Draft 10 and Draft 11 of the original submission for ASTM C 1199. Somehow Draft 10 of ASTM C 1199 was printed as the final document, when Draft 11 was considered to be the final draft. NFRC printed Draft 11 as NFRC 100-91 Attachment A, which has been used since by the NFRC accredited test laboratories.



### Calibration Transfer Standard Method

The other method of standardizing the thermal transmittance which is called the "CTS method," relies on first measuring the surface temperatures on both sides of a unique Calibration Transfer Standard(CTS) [10] in one set of tests, and using those temperatures to calculate the heat transfer coefficients (Section 5.2 of ASTM C 1199) on the CTS. The test on the actual test specimen is performed in a separate test using the same thermal chamber without changing the wind velocities, wind directions, and thermal chamber configuration. The test specimen surface temperatures are then calculated by iteratively solving the heat balance equation assuming that the heat transfer coefficients on each side of the test specimen are the same as was measured on the CTS, but based on the measured heat flow,  $Q$ , through the test specimen. The CTS method does not require that the surface temperatures of the test specimen be measured (no need for surface temperature thermocouples) because the "equivalent" surface temperature is calculated using this method.

Actually, on the cold side, the combined radiative and convective surface heat transfer coefficient from the CTS,  $h_{II}$ , is used to determine the "equivalent" cold side surface temperature of the test specimen, whereas on the warm side, only a convective surface heat transfer coefficient,  $K$ , is used. For this purpose, the cold side surface heat transfer coefficient can be expressed in an equation much like Equation 4, but separating the radiative and convective components<sup>(6)</sup>:

$$h_{II} = \frac{(q_{r2} + q_{c2})}{(t_{II} - t_2)} \quad (6)$$

where:  $q_{r2}$  = net radiative heat flux from the cold side, W/m<sup>2</sup>  
 $q_{c2}$  = net convective heat flux from the cold side, W/m<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Measuring the average surface temperature of the baffle next to the cold side of the test specimen in a parallel air flow cold chamber is not too difficult of a task, but in a perpendicular air flow cold chamber, such as those used by most of the NFRC accredited test laboratories, this measurement is much more problematic. In a perpendicular air flow cold chamber the test specimen usually faces the fan, the fan exit plenum, and the air flow deflection louvers or screens placed in the exit plenum. Measuring the surface temperatures and view factors of all those surfaces (including the spinning fan blades and fan motor) is not practical for most commercial laboratories, and is therefore not always performed by the perpendicular air flow laboratories that participated in this study. Instead, most of them used Equation 4 to determine the cold side surface heat transfer coefficient,  $h_{II}$ , on the CTS.