**RESNET SDC 1550 Technical Task Group Draft Agenda**

April 1st, 2025

12:30 PM – 1:45 PM ET

[MEETING RECORDING](https://zoom.us/rec/share/bcW96TxD4WxFNpHU6Eqqw0Ajjwe_BMAg39iRFoBPmO546ImckqCgRwZ-vxZBRLYc.1H1ishEZtRr4asoM)

Passcode: E0fCi6&C

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Present | RESNET Staff |
| Chris Magwood  Ari Rapport  Andy Buccino  Brian Shanks  Alexis Minniti  Nigel Watts  Jeff Bradley  Karla Butterfield  Megan Cordes  Philip Squires  Yatharth Vaishnani  Graham Wright  Matthew Cooper  Amanda Hickman  Ariel Brenner  Charlie Haack  Erin Bordelon  Jacob Racusin  Mike Browne | Noah Kibbe  Katie Stewart |

[Link to Comments](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/q3hav075rr9lqavu8v7zt/250306_1550-Comments_PDS01.xlsx?rlkey=qsse0tkxemk66xzfqyqlpixze&e=2&st=0he7g79s&dl=0)

[Link to Draft Standard PDS-01](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/4ine3cvrj4hs91lh8v8t2/250306_PDS02-RESNET-C1550.docx?rlkey=ldaow0956tyw1qiflzc69ewco&e=2&st=bldtfv8p&dl=0)

Review of Public Comments

**Row 38**

Jeff Bradley asked if a free-standing roof structure over a wheelchair ramp would be included, to which Chris confirmed that it would not unless the roofline was extended from the main building.

**Row 39**

Jeff Bradley asked whether there should be a distinction between loose-fill insulation and rigid insulation or materials that come in vats/baths. Chris Magwood agreed but was unsure about the specifics. Blowing insulation into attics makes it hard to determine the waste rate, but for rigid products, a higher waste rate might be reasonable.

Brian Shanks expressed uncertainty about where the 7% or 8% cut-off rates came from and whether they accurately reflect true waste. Brian proposed starting with a 5% waste rate for insulation as a first iteration of the standard, which could be adjusted later based on feedback.

Chris Magwood explained that their current data source is RICS (in the UK), which sets the waste rates used by the ASHRAE group. It was noted that additional data to support different numbers had not been explored, but further exploration would continue.

Chris also suggested they could look at insulation EPDs (Environmental Product Declarations) for more information on this topic. Ultimately, Chris proposed that they mark this issue as unresolved for now and revisit it at the next meeting when more data can be gathered.

**Row 40**

Chris Magwood concluded that the section would be revised for consistency with other sections.

**Row 41**

Brian Shanks suggested adding an informative note for insulation and sought clarification on the extent of basement walls in calculations, stressing the need for specificity. Chris Magwood questioned whether assumptions should be made when comparing the model to on-site conditions.

Matthew Cooper emphasized the importance of modelers including accurate dimensions for windows, doors, and openings, and recommended not specifically addressing roofs or walls in the current text. It was also mentioned that there was no opposition to calling out roof insulation distinctions, though it might not be necessary.

Brian Shanks noted that both cavity insulation is used in the wall and roof sections and suggested either removing the roof reference or adding it for consistency in the document.

Concern was raised about whether the embodied carbon, if product-specific, would be accurately captured.

**Row 42**

The discussion focused on whether to add rule-of-thumb quantities or default values for materials like rebar and footings in Table 10.1.1of the dimension takeoff guidance. The consensus was against providing default values, as there is too much variation in materials and construction practices, and defaults could lead to inaccurate results.

**Row 43**

Brian Shanks raised a concern that tub surrounds could be a separate three-piece unit, and if combined into one, it might exclude important components and emphasized that calling it all one unit could be problematic.

Jacob Racusin clarified tubs should be assessed separately from shower surrounds, keeping them distinct.

**Row 44**

Brian Shanks supported allowing flexibility but emphasized the need to avoid controversy. He referenced ASHRAE 240, which accepts waste documentation such as receipts or weights from waste removal companies. Custom waste rates would need to specify the exact amount of each material (e.g., drywall) sent off-site.

Chris Magwood proposed revisiting this discussion at the next meeting after reviewing ASHRAE 240’s language and custom waste rate documentation.

**Row 45**

Brian Shanks sought clarification on A5.3; it was confirmed that A5.3 specifically relates to on-site waste activities, excluding machinery and other activities. The consensus was to incorporate A5.3 into the LCA language to meet LCA requirements and maintain consistency.

Meeting adjourned at 1:45 pm ET