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**Members Present:** Dave Roberts (Chair), Brian Christensen, Gayathri Vijayakumar, Nick Sisler, Scott Horowitz, Rob Salcido, William Ranson

**RESNET Staff Present:** Neal Kruis, Rick Dixon

**Minutes Prepared By:** Christine Do (minutes prepared post-meeting)

Meeting called to order at 1:03 PM Eastern.

**Discussion of 301-2022 Addendum C**

A summary document of amendments that the Calculations Subcommittee has reviewed and agreed to recommend for Addendum was distribute prior to this call. This document also included other errors and problems identified by Rick Dixon, as well as editorial cleanups. Finally, this document also provides an overview of the SCC’s new proposal.

On “ASHRAE requests on ceiling area and interior shades (pgs 7, 10)”, Brian Christensen discussed the consequences of changes to Table 4.2.2(1) Specifications for the Energy Rating Reference and Rate Homes. If the reference home is eliminating a vault by creating a flat ceiling, volume is in essence also being eliminated. After discussion by the group, it was determined that more information was needed from ASHRAE on this item. The second item that ASHRAE requested, pertaining to fenestrations facing within 15 degrees of true south or true north, Brian asked if this language would no longer support passive solar heating then. Scott asked if there are any software tools that are taking advantage of this. To the best of the group’s knowledge, no software are.

On “Almost final SEER2/HSPF 2 criteria from MINHERS Addendum 71”, Dave informed the group that public comments were received on this that will need to be responded to. Neal also mentioned that Dean Gamble pointed out that ductless systems were not covered, but that Neal has an idea of how to proceed.

On “Onsite battery storage”, Nick inquired about the potential response if adding a battery would strictly increase their HERS score. Neal agreed that it was an interesting point; language could be changed so that batteries are not modeled for ERI, but it is for CO2 Index, so that batteries are not disincentivized just because of the ERI. Scott proposed that since there will be more technology shift, it may make more sense to credit solely in CO2 Index. The language in Section 4.2.2.9 was edited to reflect this, and to clarify that on-site battery storage shall not be included in the calculations of the Energy Rating Index. An informative note was also added. Group discussion followed on its impact, and it was agreed that further public comment will allow this to be clarified. Any edits to language were consequently removed.

Rick discussed errors/problems that he found when combining 301-2019 addenda with 301-2022, and other editorial cleanups. Gayathri asked for clarification, on whether duct leakage happens with the air handler. The group agreed on this. Rick suggested to allow the language in Addendum C, and have it go through public comment.

Neal then discussed the SCC’s New Proposal, with the biggest change being the new normative Appendix C. This contains the basic modeling assumptions that historically have not been specified, and consequently there was some chance that inconsistent assumptions were being made. Nick and Brian discussed the material thermal properties for wood in Table C.1(1). Brian shared calculations on species that are in common use. Neal stated that the whole point of creating a table for material thermal properties is to have something that would be enforceable consistently across different software, not necessarily to propose values.

Neal also discussed a portion of the proposal that makes refrigerator energy use a function of space temperature. There is a noticeable difference in terms of energy use, and adds another layer of complexity.

Neal also discussed handling of imbalance duct leakage in cases where return and supply are measured separately. Depending on where ducts are located, where makeup air is being pulled, the intent is to handle the mass balance of air correctly, which software tools had not necessarily been doing consistently.

Finally, Brian discussed the SCC CFIS Proposal on mechanical ventilation flow testing. He included a definition for CFIS System. It was clarified that Air Cycler is the brand name for the original CFIS system.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM Eastern.