**SDC 301 CALCULATIONS SC Call Draft Minutes**

September 9th, 2024 | 1:00 PM – 2:30 PM Eastern

[***MEETING RECORDING HERE***](https://transcripts.gotomeeting.com/#/s/64451de814f1644133277803532e585e37a3ed6c1eb84d60f6f3e6b137620ffc)

**Members Present:** Brian Christensen, Gayathri Vijayakumar, Scott Horowitz, Philip Fairey, Rob Salcido, William Ranson, Neal Kruis

**Absent:** Charlie Haack, Nick Sisler

**RESNET Staff Present:** Clara Hedrick, Rick Dixon, Molly Miller

**Minutes Prepared By:**

Molly Miller, Clara Hedrick

The meeting was called to order at 1:04 PM ET.

**Approve agenda**

Gayathri Vijayakumar made a motion to approve the agenda. Brian Christensen seconded. The motion passed by voice vote.

**Approve 8/5 meeting minutes (**[**here**](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.dropbox.com_scl_fi_5oy3fu7t4fmfw60z8jxn1_SDC-2D301-2DCALCULATIONS-2DSC-2DCall-2DDraft-2DMinutes-2D8-2D5-2D2024.docx-3Frlkey-3Dzmlort2aq1iv5t60hk2pepydl-26st-3Dvwsft920-26dl-3D0&d=DwMCaQ&c=euGZstcaTDllvimEN8b7jXrwqOf-v5A_CdpgnVfiiMM&r=7XUwxAZbmftOVV1BsRddTg&m=2lxtWL7toGuPiCLVcoO3Iah4Eqvtm7GvYUC9w7Dr8V5JnnwdXwW53XkUPyNLM3Kl&s=RNaNXy-d9WeKapacYGAdmpnmmK8QQNshSfMHejm_07g&e=)**)**

Rob Salcido made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Gayathri Vijayakumar seconded. The motion passed.

**Responses to comments on Addendum 76 (see attached file)**

Addendum 76 will be adopted as soon as possibleas specified by the SMB’s guidelines.

Comment #1:

Brian Christensen agreed with the proposed response submitted by the committee. No other discussion was had on this comment.

Comment #2:

Brian Christensen motioned to approve the response as proposed to reject this comment. Gayathri seconded. This motion passed.

**Review of 301-2025 PDS-01 Comments received to date (Rick Dixon)**

Rick Dixon shared that the target to get this adopted is early January 2025. There is no time for a PDS-02. ANSI does not allow RESNET to recommend this for adoption by the IECC or even refer to this document as an ANSI standard until it’s received final approval. Holidays and weekends cannot be counted as balloting days, which extend the public comment period. There are a lot of factors that slow down the approval of unresolved comments. The first five comments will not be resolved because of the deadline.

Though there is always room for enhancement, Rick encourages the committee to only address fatal flaws with PDS-01 to avoid having to proceed with PDS-02.

Comment #1:

This will not end up in the standard 25 addendum. Rick Dixon shared that this would go into addendum and 301.25. Rick Dixon shared that addendum 79 needs updated references; these updates will also appear in other relevant documents. An addendum to 301-2025 will be created that will include accepted changes addressing items that are not deemed fatal flaws. IECC has acknowledged this and is planning accordingly.

Brian Christensen requested a copy of this document be sent to the sub-committee for review to assist in this discussion.

Comment #2:

Philip Fairey said this never got changed from the 2022 standard and will hopefully be changed in the 2025 standard when it is published. Scott Horowitz shared that his comment was exactly what Philip Fairey shared.

Comment #3:

Philip Fairey shared that it is asking that the heating and cooling equipment be sized to at least equal the larger building heating. Scott Horowitz said the language has taken on some new meanings over the years. Philip Fairey said the word “sensible” should be removed in the future.

Comment #4:

Philip Fairey shared we are rejecting comment #4 because comment #5 withdraws the previous comment.

Comment #5:

Rick Dixon shared that the old language was written inappropriately and not using RESNET language. The old language was stricken in total and was rewritten based on a task group agreement. There are discussions in progress regarding the definition of bedroom across several standards. This proposed change has been rejected for now, but in future addenda, this suggested change should not affect the discussions already in progress. A Follow-up with Carla will be needed on this item.

Comment #6:

Philip Fairey shared this comment discusses the difference between three masonry walls versus two. Rick Dixon said that he included the table in the document to help understand the comment. The proposed change to the table was taken out of context. Comment #7 better addresses the objection and changes to the table.

Comment #7:

Philip Fairey shared that this comment is about having only a single value for web thickness. Philip Fairey agreed that the tables are confusing. The suggestion in this comment only suggests a change to the R values, and it was found that the calculations were done differently than the original version. This committee looked at the values before they were presented or included in Appendix C in the 2025 standard. Philip drafted a proposed statement to reject these changes. The NCMA catalog and the somewhat larger values are proposed in Table C. As a result of the wall system, it is going to be greater in the National Concrete Masonry data. The commenter suggests reducing the SPF foam cores as having greater resistance than the 4.6.

Philip Fairey opened the floor to comments and questions. Brian Christensen is looking forward to reviewing it more in-depth. Philip Fairey modified the original spreadsheet and will share that with anyone interested in seeing it. Brian would like to see it. Rick Dixon would like the SDC recommendations sooner rather than later. Gayathri made a motion to approve the six comments as drafted. Brian abstained. Gayathri reminded the group that these rejected comments can be addressed via a MINHERS Addendum or an amendment to the standard in 2025. The group generally agreed to review the comments more in-depth offline along with future comments received with ballots to follow. Gayathri is looking for a response to the comments reviewed on today’s call by next Monday, September 16th. The motion failed due to no second.

**Report on HERS Index score analysis (Neal Kruis)**

Neal shared that the first item is a recent RESNET policy change related to any time there are amendments to MINHERS that are related to HERS scores. Neal started running the software. The changes in C and E are not mandatory and do not conflict with further changes down the road. The minor changes that have been made. The thermal load schedules, lighting, etc. At the end of these tests, the report will be sent primarily to the SMB. Rick Dixon stated that this report will also be sent to everyone else who requests it. Brian Christensen asked if the software will be tested plus or minus all three. Neal answered yes. Rick Dixon praised Neal on this software and Neal’s findings. Philip Fairey asked when this will be available. Neal answered it looks like Tuesday, September 17th. Rick Dixon shared that the information does not have to be shared with the SCC.

**Report on upcoming heat pump addendum (Neal Kruis)**

Neal Kruis shared Standard 301 states the seasonal ratings, capacity, and a few other items, but it doesn’t say how to model the equipment. This addendum is to help better inform modeling approaches. Neal shared more details on the progress made so far and the extent of the work yet to be done.

Brian Christensen and Neal discussed user accessibility. Philip Fairey said that Neal has done incredible work on this database, and it is light years ahead; it will be standardized and will lead to fewer questions. Gayathri asked how this document will be sent out. Neal confirmed that he and Rick are working on this and hope to have more information soon. Scott Horowitz asked Neal how long the comment period will be open. Neal answered that he doesn’t believe the language needs to be changed but his hope is this will be out for public review in the next month. Rick Dixon said the minimum is 45 days and it can go out to 60 days per the standards. Philip Fairey suggested sending this out to the subcommittees and it would be on the October 7th agenda. Neal said he thought that was a great idea. Scott Horowitz inquired about the need for a public comment period since it's not easily digestible for Raters anyway. Neal answered that the public review is for getting manufacturers' comments. Scott Horowitz suggested that after public review, it should go into the MINHERS Addendum. Neal stated that before going into the MINHERS Addendum, it would receive more application to the HERS index for the next round of changes/tests. Philip reminded everyone this is not going to happen overnight and asked Neal to send it out to the subcommittee so it can be added to the agendas, to which Neal agreed.

Gayathri Vijayakumar will be leading the next meeting on October 7th, 2024.

**Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 2:32 PM ET.