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

April 8th, 2025

12:30 PM – 1:45 PM ET

Present: Chris Magwood, Mike Browne, Ari Rapport, Ariel Brenner, Charlie Haack, Erin Bordelon, Mike Browne, Andy Buccino, Nigel Watts, Phillip Squires, Karla Butterfield, Jacob Racusin

Staff: 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)

**Meeting started at 12:30 PM (EST)**

The meeting began with a brief reference to the unresolved sections from the previous meeting. Specifically, three comments on waste rates and waste rates related to home building in the U.S. were highlighted as needing further discussion. Brian Shanks and Chris Magwood have been working offline to identify better resources, tables, or more accurate numbers that may be more applicable to U.S. home building.

**Row 41**

The committee revisited comments on dimension takeoff guidance and incorporated feedback from the previous meeting. It was agreed to remove redundant mentions of "roof" and "exterior wall" in certain sections for clarity.

The language around insulation was adjusted to consolidate various insulation types into a single line, with specific changes made for continuous insulation and framing fraction to maintain simplicity and clarity.

A new line for floor insulation in raised deck and wooden floor systems was added, and a copy-paste error in the interior wall insulation section was corrected. Additionally, it was decided to specify the number of glazing panes for skylights to account for their impact on embodied carbon. The committee also agreed to remove references to framing fraction in interior wall insulation for consistency across the document.

The suggestion to specify excluding window and door openings in foundation walls was deemed unnecessary and was struck. No objections were raised to the suite of changes, and the updated table will reflect these revisions.

**Row 43**

The committee decided to exclude shower surrounds from embodied carbon calculations due to the lack of Environmental Product Declaration (EPD) values. Only the bathtub will be rated for now, though items like shower surrounds and stone tops may be added to a future consideration list. Tile in shower floors or walls will be included as part of general flooring or wall materials. Ari Rapport inquired about other materials lacking EPDs, and Chris Magwood noted that including them now wouldn't significantly affect the overall embodied carbon. Stone tops were also excluded for the time being.

**Row 46**

A commenter suggested including "approved inspectors" alongside certified raters for verification tasks, but Matthew Cooper opposed this, emphasizing that only raters should handle these tasks to maintain HERS quality assurance. While some agreed, it was noted that as the standard evolves into an ANSI standard, it might include other professionals. "Approved inspector" is already defined in other ResNet standards as someone competent in inspections, trained, examined, and approved by a rating provider.

Questions arose about potential overlaps with other credentials like BPI, but no clear examples were found. Erin Bordelon sought clarification on whether approved inspectors were jurisdiction-approved, which Chris Magwood clarified as those trained, examined, and approved by a rating provider. Karla Butterfield stressed the importance of ResNet's quality assurance process, with Erin Bordelon agreeing. Andy Buccino mentioned challenges in modular construction, where companies conduct their own inspections, potentially accrediting these bodies in the future, but this issue wasn’t resolved in the current standard.

The committee ultimately rejected the proposal to include approved inspectors at this stage.

**Row 47**

Chris Magwood reviewed a prior comment regarding the verification requirements for insulation. The previous revisions included changes to the R-value language, where the committee decided to remove the comparison to plans and instead focus on recording the R-value observed in the building. Additionally, the product name was added to the list of items that must be verified. The commenter had requested the inclusion of a minimum R-value of 0.25, but with the recent changes made to the verification process, this concern was addressed by eliminating the comparison to the plans.

As a result, the committee felt that the commenter's main points were effectively captured. It was decided that the proposal for the 0.25 R-value would not be adopted. No further concerns were raised regarding this approach.

**Row 48**

As the commenter noted, we have a building components exclusion table that was originally titled "informative." The commenter correctly pointed out that it should be "normative." It was also noted that it had mistakenly been placed in the "accept in principle" section. However, the committee agreed that this was simply a correction, and they decided to move on.

**Row 49**

Another commenter raised the same point, requesting that the table be labeled as "normative." The committee acknowledged the consistency of this feedback and agreed to update the labeling accordingly.

**Row 50**

The next comment addressed the exclusion table and requested more specific language about the types of fasteners included and excluded. The commenter highlighted concerns that major fastening systems, specifically Z-Gerts (metal strips used for holding exterior insulation), might not be captured. It was noted that Z-Gerts and similar systems are covered under the strapping and furring section for walls.

The committee discussed expanding on the fastener exclusions to clarify that nails, screws, staples, and washers are included as fasteners. There was also a mention of insulation around window and door units, clarifying that spray foam or other insulation used around these units is not counted.

The committee decided that while this change was not critical, it could be made for clarity. No objections were raised, and the committee moved on.

**Row 51**

A commenter suggested expanding the definition of construction documents to include achieving substantial completion and final completion, as well as adding product submittals approved by the architect or engineer of record. However, the committee felt this may be too specific and that the current definition, which includes the documentation needed to obtain a building permit, is broad enough to cover the required information.

There was expressed concern about going too deep into details with product submittals, especially for single-family homes. Erin Bordelon also agreed that product submittals are not typical practices in single-family construction, although they are in multifamily. The committee ultimately decided to maintain the existing definition of construction documents as it is, without adding language about product submittals or completion stages beyond obtaining a permit. No objections were raised, and the committee moved on.

**Row 52**

A comment was made regarding the definition of "comparable product types." The commenter suggested changing the wording from "materially similar" to "identical or equivalent" and expanding the definition to include terms like composition, functional capabilities, applicable performance attributes, and manufacturing.

The committee agreed with much of the suggestion but decided to exclude details about manufacturing processes, as they may not be accessible or relevant in practice.

Erin Bordelon also recommended removing "to satisfy all applicable code requirements" from the definition, citing that it is too broad. This was accepted by the committee, and the revised text was adopted with these changes.

**Row 54**

A commenter suggested using gross floor area instead of conditioned floor area, specifically asking for garage space to be excluded from the calculation. The committee discussed this and agreed that garages should remain included in gross floor area as per the original intent. The committee decided to reject the comment and maintain the current calculation method. No objections were raised, and the comment was rejected.

**Row 55**

The committee discussed changing "assessed home" to "assessed building" to make the term more intuitive, especially for larger multi-unit buildings. After considering the suggestion, they agreed that "building" was a better fit. They also clarified the term "dwelling unit" to ensure it accurately applies to individual units in multi-unit buildings, rather than an entire building. The term "dwelling unit" will be used throughout the standard for consistency and clarity.

The issue of assessing accessory buildings like barns or sheds was addressed, with the committee confirming that the standard applies only to residential buildings and dwelling units, not accessory structures.

**Row 56**

The commenter pointed out that in the definition of lifecycle assessment (LCA), the term "assessed home" should be updated to "assessed dwelling unit," which aligns with previous discussions. Additionally, the commenter suggested that the term "product" be included in the definition, as the lifecycle assessment is not only of the building but also of the individual products used within the building. The committee agreed that the suggested change to "assessed dwelling unit" will be incorporated throughout the standard. The suggestion to include "product" in the definition was accepted, as the LCA process involves evaluating products as part of the building's overall assessment.

The committee agreed to proceed with these changes without any concerns.

**Row 57**

The committee addressed a comment on the definition of "minimum assessed products" for projected assessments, noting inconsistencies between projected and verified assessments. The committee agreed that both should reference the Products Table (10.1.1) for product inclusion, rather than the data table, which is for reference. The Exclusion Table (10.1.5) was clarified as supplementary. The committee decided to align the definitions for both projected and verified assessments, with no concerns about the change. The next comment, which had the opposite perspective, was also resolved by this adjustment.

**Row 59**

Rows 59 and 60 both addressed clarifications in the “Data Hierarchy Table.” The committee acknowledged and addressed these points from the two separate commenters.

**Row 60**

A commenter suggested removing Scenario C from the data table, as it overlapped with Scenario B. Another commenter recommended clarifying that an industry average EPD is valid only if the product's manufacturer is listed. The final change, as reflected in Row M, removed Scenario C and added the clarification about the manufacturer being listed on the EPD. The committee agreed that this clarification should apply to both projected and verified assessments, as products may change between these phases.

The committee approved the changes, and the next meeting will begin at **Row 61**.

**Meeting ended at 1:27 PM (EST)**