**Interpretation:** Effect of Compression in Insulation Grading

**Designation** 301-2019-021

**Approved:** January 13, 2021by RESNET SDC 300

**Effective Date:** February 12, 2021

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **R****equest from:** | | Name: | | Jamie Dovell | | | | | | |
|  | |  | |  | | | | | | |
|  | | Affiliation: | | PEG, LLC | | | | | | |
|  | |  | |  | | | | | | |
|  | | Address: | | 3975 Fair Ridge Drive, Suite T15S | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | City: | Fairfax | | | State: | Virginia | | Zip: | 22033 |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Telephone: | | 703.934.2777 | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | E-mail: | | jdovell@pegenv.com | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reference:** | | This request for interpretation refers to the requirements presented in Standard:  ANSI/RESNET/ICC 301-2019 standard Normative Appendix A | | | | | | | | |
|  | |  | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Page Number(s): | | | page A-4 | | | | | |
|  | | Section(s): | | | A-2.1.1 through A-2.1.2.1 | | | | | |
|  | | Table(s): | | |  | | | | | |
|  | | Relating to: | | | Insulation Grading | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **B****ackground:** | | Based on the ANSI/RESNET/ICC 301-2019 standard Normative Appendix A, Both Grade I and Grade II definitions state that batt or loose fill insulation shall not be compressed more than ¾ inch of the specified insulation thickness in **any** given location. (Emphasis added)  It seems that the way this standard is written and the definitions for Grade I and Grade II would push builders to use Blown-in Blankets or spray foam as opposed to batts. Or another type of wall assembly. It seems a bit extreme and yet that is how I interpret that standard as written. | | | | | | | | |
|  | |  | | | | | | | | |
|  | |  | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Interpretation:** | | We interpret this to mean that ANY compression greater than ¾ inch would deem that total insulated area as Grade III. | | | | | | | | |
|  | |  | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Question:** | Is this Interpretation correct? | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **SDC Answer:** | | (Yes) | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **SDC Comments:** | | As currently written, batt and loose fill insulation that is installed with compression “more than ¾” of the specified insulation thickness in any given location”, would be deemed to be a Grade III.  The key phrase in these sections, however, is the “specified insulation thickness” and the “thickness required to attain the labeled R-Value”.  For a Grade I installation, some minimal amount of compression below the “specified insulation thickness” is acceptable. For example, if the total assembly being graded consisted of 100 sqft of area, up to 2 sqft of area can be compressed between 0 and ¾” of the “specified insulation thickness”.  ¾” is the typical compression of inset stapled tabs on batt insulation. These sections in Appendix A are not intended to mean that inset stapled batt installation cannot meet the requirement for Grade I installation. The inset area is part of the “thickness required to attain the labeled R-Value”.  If the insulation specified achieves its labeled R-value, while including some amount of reduced thickness for inset staples, Grade I can still be achieved. Compression that exceeds ¾” of that “specified insulation thickness” would result in Grade III.  If the “thickness required to attain the labeled R-Value” is not achieved because it is compressed by some nominal amount (0-¾”), that would only be acceptable for Grade I, IF that compressed area is not more than 2% of the area being graded and for Grade II, not more than 15% of the area being graded.  Remember that the assembly as a whole can be graded or if the rater would like, the assembly can be broken up into smaller entries in the software, each with a different Grade. | | | | | | | | |