**RESNET 1550 TG Meeting Agenda**

**August 6th, 2024**

**12-1pm ET**

[*MEETING RECORDING HERE*](https://zoom.us/rec/share/_i_D03TjZQDd5BjKbTd9LT5kvbze5PgBD_7pm6zeVXm9qC6xx6ORNhJzhdco0UIf.ZO-xpuWsvrcpQILH)

*Passcode: Q8#!XA#^*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Present:**Amanda HickmanMatthew CooperPhilip SquiresCorey SelfAlexis MinnitiDanuta DrozdowiczChris MagwoodTina WilliamsDavid EisenbergYatharth VaishnaniAndy BuccinoKarla ButterfieldTracy HuynhDavid ArkinAri RapportBrian ShanksNigel WattsBrett WelchMatthew BrownVictoria Muharskey (12:21 PM ET) | **Absent:**Asa FossErin BordelonGraham WrightHenrique MendoncaMegan CordesStacy SmedleyJeffrey BradleyJacob RacusinAnber RanaBennett DohertyMichael BrowneAriel BrennerAlex ReesDavid GoldsteinJoel Martell Charlie Haack | **Staff:**Noah Kibbe |

Meeting began at 12:03 PM ET.

**Roll Call**

**Review Responses from SDC Committee Members on Draft Standard**

A survey was distributed to SDC members to provide feedback on the draft Standard.

NOTE: *Italicized lines* below represent comments received; the Task Group

*There are too many assumptions within the Standard that the requisite information is on the plans or other construction documentation (e.g. the specific type of product being utilized).*

Brian suggested asking the respondent for specific instances.

***Scope****: Commercial buildings should not be included within the purview of the Standard. RESNET’s guiding principles and participants’ assumptions for participation always envisioned this being a residential standard leaving the assessment of commercial buildings to ASHRAE or other means.*

Chris commented that the scope does not include all commercial buildings, only commercial buildings with dwelling units as an attempt to be inclusive of housing typologies.

***Definitions*** *(generally): Some definitions are partially or inconsistently pulled from RESNET 301 and/or the IRC.*

Chris will ask the respondent to clarify which definitions appear to be inconsistent.

***Section 6.1****: The inverse is preferred. Imperial values should be used in calculations. Of course, a Canadian standard should utilize as drafted.*

The source data was reported in metric units.

Brian suggested adding that reporting will be done in both imperial and metric.

***Appendix 10.3****: This section is cumbersome and potentially impractical where only a projected assessment is being performed.*

Matthew disagreed with this sentiment via chat as it is a V1.0 process and is deliverable.

Andy agreed that there is enough justification in the workflow.

*Section \_\_5.3.2\_\_\_\_\_ Question/concern: The section does not address the scenario where a “generic product” is listed in the referenced plans and specifications…*

This comment likely stems from a misunderstanding as this concern is addressed in 7.2

*Section 1.1.1.1: Life Cycle Assessments…*

LCAs were limited to 2 years in this Standard.

Brian agreed with the proposed change of 5 years.

*Objection: Section 5.6: Only newly installed building products shall be included in assessments for retrofit projects…*

Karla noted that the Standard does not address penalties for construction waste or debris.

Brett said the challenge with retrofit is that there is no indication of what was already removed. Measurements are made based on what is present and do not account for what was removed.

*“Embodied Carbon” It is common practice to use carbon as a metric for benchmarking impact of all emission…*

Chris defended using “embodied carbon” because RESNET uses a carbon index which makes the term fitting.

*Section: 1. Purpose Comment: Language “using data and procedures commonly applied in energy modeling” is confusing and does not belong in the Purpose statement…*

This language was added to differentiate the Standard from ASHRAE 240p.

Matthew suggested changing modeling to rating and said that should not cause any issues.

*Section: 3.2 Definitions, Approved Software Rating Tool Comment: The standard includes a definition for an approved software rating tool but doesn’t include any information about requirements for that tool or how it will be verified*

Chris agreed with the comment and suggested either expanding the section or removing it until RESNET has a way to approve software.

Chris will refer this question to Rick Dixon and Gayathri Vijayakumar of SDC 301.

RESNET does not reference ASHRAE Standard 140. RESNET references 301.

*Section: 5.1 Spatial Boundary Comment: While stopping at the edge of the home does simplify the calculations, it is ignoring significant embodied carbon emissions that can be directly associated with the construction of the home…*

Chris noted that this is in conflict with the recommendations of the builders on the Technical Committee.

Matthew said the spatial boundary section should not change.

*Section 6.5.5 – Gross embodied carbon intensity per bedroom Comment: This metric is overly subjective and can be misleading. Recommend removing from the standard.*

Chris noted that there is an objective definition of a bedroom. The calculation can be done after using the Standard which makes removing it unnecessary.

*GENERAL COMMENT #1: For the record, NEHERS would like to be sure that this standard is positioned to implement an Embodied Carbon Index, which can be used alongside the HERS Index.*

That is outside the purview of the group as the group’s purpose covers only measuring and reporting.

*GENERAL COMMENT #4: Similarly, I would include something in the introduction section on why this standard is needed…*

Brian asked if an introduction is necessary.

David noted via chat that many Standards include introductions to provide an overview of the use of the Standard.

Matthew agreed but said that a rationalization for this particular comment is not necessary.

**Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 1:15 PM ET.