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**Format for today's meeting​**

The format will be to discuss comments, questions, and concerns left on the Standard draft.

**Comments & discussion​**

Overall, there were no major issues noted on the Standard.

Residential definition:

Desire to include buildings that are outside common definition of Residential.

Achieved by including “Dwelling Units and Sleeping Units in Residential or Commercial Buildings, excepting hotels and motels.”

* Brian expressed concerns regarding the limiting side of the definition of three stories or less.
* Ari asked if it would help to put single- and multi-family units before dwelling.
* Alexis asked if a mention of low- and mid-rise should be included.
  + Chris said this was considered but there is not a consistent definition of either.
* Matthew Cooper suggested via chat: “Dwelling Units and Sleeping Units in Residential buildings, whether categorized as residential or commercial with regards to building code(s).”
* Ari asked via chat if instead of “single-family and multi-family” the language could be “whole building dwelling units”

Spatial Boundary

In Section 5 Embodied Carbon Emissions Data Requirements

* Ari asked if non-contiguous includes detached garages.
  + Chris said no and that perhaps the language can be made clearer.
* Brian expressed concern regarding the interpretation of non-contiguous. It seems to leave interpretation to what is and is not connected.
  + Example: A driveway that is not included but is connected by being adjacent to the property.
  + Ari suggested explicitly listing what is not included so there is no ambiguity.

Carbon Storage

In Section 6.2.2

* Jeff said there may be a different way to calculate the actual waste factor as opposed to including this.
  + Chris said there is a waste factor table that was taken from ASHRAE 240.
* Michael said removing this may make the section less complicated.
  + Chris said since the factors are included in the table it is not overly complicated.
* Any other Standard A1-A3 would include a waste factor.
* Michael asked: In the waste factor tables, does it clarify the amount of materials disposed of?
  + The table is just a percentage of volume.
  + The Standard does not apply end-of-life guidance.
  + Chris suggested removing the notion of the waste factor in just this section. It would still be included elsewhere.

Documentation

In section 7.2.3

* Brian suggested via comment “2-years with specific direction to destroy digital/electronic data upon conclusion of the custody period. Destroyed versus deleted is an important legal distinction.”
  + Currently out for public comment are updates to QA processes with which RESNET will align.
  + They are asking for more photo documentation with 2 years of retention and, after that period, all records are destroyed.
* Jeff agreed with the comment but suggested stating *at least 2 years* to allow for 3-year retention policies.
  + Brian is opposed to this change to cover legal bases.
* Michael suggested via chat “I would support making waste factor adjustments a separate part of the embodied carbon standard that is not included in the first version of the standard. Waste could be eventually be addressed similar to the way that LEED v4 Homes and Multifamily handles waste records in MR Credit Construction Waste Management.”

Verification

In section 10.4

Chris asked if it is unreasonable to require inspections according to Appendix B, and if there needs to be a definition for “equivalent”

* Brian noted changes are coming to protocols for insulation inspection.
* Brian said it is unreasonable to require inspections.
* Michael said this would be hard to verify in person.
* Michael said the word equivalent could be removed.

Minimum Rated Products

In section 5.5.1

There is confusion about “frame walls” in this section.

* Ari suggested specifying what is included in the definition of frame walls. Ari suggested adding perimeter and assembly walls.
* Michael noted this could be confusing.

Garages and Accessory Buildings

* The current language reads “Includes all components in this table” but clarification was requested.
* Brian would be less opposed to the broadness of the phrasing if it was clearly defined that it had the same special limitations.
* Jacob suggested via chat changing “buildings” to “dwellings.”
* Michael asked if garages and accessory buildings are mandatory to be assessed when attached.
  + Chris said yes.
* Tracy asked via chat if this addressed garages and ADUs only and no other storage.
* Chris suggested rephrasing this as attached and detached garages and leaving out a reference to ADUs since they are rarely used.
* Michael said via chat, “I would support including only detached garages at this time. Like the waste factor - Other detached structures could be thoroughly addressed in a separate future add-on to the original standard.”

Assessment Types

In section 4.1

A comment was made that there does not have to be two assessment types. The contradictory language will be fixed.

Realistically, there is no confirmed assessment without a projected estimate. There must be a model made based on the plans of the building in order for someone to go out to the site and confirm it.

The projected estimate will need to be completed before the confirmed estimate.

Reused Materials

In section 5.3.7

GWP factor is listed as 20%. This is a rough placeholder for an amount.

* Brian noted that including a percentage may be difficult as the 20% may end up changing based on different scenarios.
* The 20% came from different countries and how they approached labels and certification programs.

Verification and QA

In section 7.3

Chris asked if 7.3 is enough to drop other references to QA.

Should QA be left for continuous maintenance?

* Ari asked if this Standard is meant to be applied only by certified Raters®.
  + Chris said not necessarily.
* Brian said to leave QA in.
* Andy asked via chat if there is a QA Standard/protocol that exists in other LCA Standards.
* Matthew Cooper suggested via chat leaving in QA to be aligned with RESNET processes and percentages when Embodied carbon Ratings are produced by Raters.

Sampling

Intended to enable assessment of multiple Dwellings and Dwelling Units with optional Minimum Rated Products.

* Sampling may be the wrong language for this section.
* Matthew said the group should not encourage sampling. Matthew suggested using “Worst-Case Projected Ratings versus Verified” instead of Sampling.

**New topics/comments (if time allows)​**

Chris asked that no new comments be added to the Standard draft so the current comments can be revised and prioritized.

**Next meeting**

Chris will present a new draft with today’s comments incorporated by June 28th.

Comments with suggested text are preferred.

Working groups will review/edit the updated draft sections.

The group will then vote to pass the draft to the SDC.

**Other business**

Meeting adjourned.