



**MINUTES**  
**BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING**

**November 18-19, 2020**

**Approved by the Board of Directors January 29, 2021.**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
Board of Directors Meeting  
November 18-19, 2020

<b>CALL TO ORDER</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>CODE OF ETHICS</b> .....	<b>2,9</b>
<b>ROLL CALL/INTRODUCTIONS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>REVIEW OF MEETING AGENDA</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
JUNE 23, 2020 .....	2
JULY 1, 2020 .....	2
<b>COUNCIL REPORTS</b> .....	<b>2-8</b>
TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL .....	2-8
PUBLISHING AND EDUCATION COUNCIL .....	8
MEMBERS COUNCIL .....	8
<b>EXECUTIVE SESSION</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>COMMITTEE REPORTS</b> .....	<b>10-13</b>
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE .....	10-11
AUGUST 12, 2020 .....	11
AUGUST 24, 2020 .....	11
OCTOBER 1, 2020 .....	11
OCTOBER 12, 2020 .....	11
NOVEMBER 5, 2020 .....	11
BUILDING EQ COMMITTEE .....	11-12
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE .....	12
NOMINATING COMMITTEE .....	12
PLANNING COMMITTEE .....	12-13
AUDIT COMMITTEE .....	13
<b>PRESIDENTIAL AD HOC COMMITTEE AND BOD TASK GROUP REPORTS</b> .....	<b>13-15</b>
PROACTIVE DIVERSITY TASK GROUP .....	13
ASHRAE HQ AD HOC .....	13-14
EPIDEMIC TASK FORCE .....	15
VISION 2030 AD HOC .....	15
SOCIETY TRANSFORMATION AD HOC .....	15
<b>NEW BUSINES</b> .....	<b>16-18</b>
PHOENIX 2021 MEETING .....	16-17
PORTFOLIO DEVELOPMENT GROUP .....	17
RECOUPING RESERVES .....	17-18
<b>UPCOMING MEETINGS</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b> .....	<b>18</b>

**PRINCIPAL APPROVED MOTIONS**

Board of Directors Meeting

November 18-19, 2020

<b>No. - Pg.</b>	<b>Motion</b>
1 - 2	That the minutes from the October 15, 2020 Board of Directors meeting be approved.
2 - 3	<p>That the following consent motions be approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/IES Addendum cr (Envelope Backstop) to ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1-2019, Standard for Buildings Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings, be approved for publication.</li> <li>○ Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/ASHE Addendum d (adds requirements for air intake separation distance) to ANSI/ASHRAE/ASHE Standard 170-2017, Ventilation of Health Care Facilities, be approved for publication.</li> <li>○ Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/ASHE Addendum e (planning requirements) to ANSI/ASHRAE/ASHE Standard 170-2017, Ventilation of Health Care Facilities, be approved for publication</li> <li>○ Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/ASHE Addendum j (Chapter 8 revision) to ANSI/ASHRAE/ASHE Standard 170-2017, Ventilation of Health Care Facilities, be approved for publication.</li> <li>○ Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/ASHE Addendum l (revises the space name and process definitions) to ANSI/ASHRAE/ASHE Standard 170-2017, Ventilation of Health Care Facilities, be approved for publication.</li> </ul>
3 - 3	<p>That the following consent motions be approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Addendum bj (Landscape Design Clarifications) ANSI/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Standard 189.1-2020, Standard for the Design of High-Performance Green Buildings Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings, be approved for publication.</li> <li>○ Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Addendum bo (Soil Gas Control) to ANSI/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Standard 189.1-2020, Standard for the Design of High-Performance Green Buildings Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings, be approved for publication.</li> <li>○ Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Addendum bo (Soil Gas Control) to ANSI/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Standard 189.1-2020, Standard for the Design of High-Performance Green Buildings Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings, be approved for publication.</li> </ul>
4 - 4	That Standards Committee recommends to the BOD that BSR/ASHRAE Addendum a (unvented combustion appliances) to ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.2-2019, Ventilation and Acceptable Indoor Air Quality, be approved for publication.
6 - 8	That MOTION 5 be postponed as the first order of business following executive session.

### ACTION ITEMS

Board of Directors Meeting

November 18-19, 2020

<b>No. - Pg.</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Summary of Action</b>	<b>Status</b>
1 -	Gulledge	Prepare a report on European membership growth, publications, training and the impact of dealing with other organizations for ExCom review. (Carryover from March 22, 2019)	
2 -	Mehboob, McQuade, Dean	Communicate budget changes to the Council's respective reporting committees as soon as possible. (Carryover from June 23, 2020)	
3 -	Mehboob	Work with Members Council and YEA to review the following - the age requirement to serve on the YEA Committee and determine if it is necessary; and the workload and necessity of two Vice Chairs. (Carryover from July 1, 2020)	



**MINUTES**  
**BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING**

November 18-19, 2020

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Chuck Gulledge, President  
Mick Schwedler, President-Elect  
Farooq Mehboob, Treasurer  
Don Brandt, Vice President  
Bill Dean, Vice President  
Tim McGinn, Vice President  
Bill McQuade, Vice President  
Jeff Littleton, Secretary  
Chris Phelan, Region I DRC  
Jeff Clarke, Region II DRC  
Dunstan Macauley, Region III DRC  
Steve Marek, Region IV DRC  
Doug Zentz, Region V DRC  
Rick Hermans, Region VI DRC  
Chris Gray, Region VII DRC  
Randy Schrecengost, Region VIII DRC

Tyler Glesne, Region IX DRC  
Devin Abellon, Region X DRC  
Russell Lavitt, Region XI DRC  
Robin Bryant, Region XII DRC  
Apichit Lumlertpongpana, Region XIII DRC  
Andres Sepulveda, Region XIV DRC  
Ahmed Alaa Eldin Mohamed, RAL DRC  
Kelley Cramm, DAL  
Wade Conlan, DAL  
Ken Fulk, DAL  
Katherine Hammack, DAL  
Jaap Hogeling, DAL  
Sarah Maston, DAL  
Chandra Sekhar, DAL  
Adrienne Thomle, DAL  
Ashish Rakheja, DAL

**GUESTS PRESENT:**

Dennis Knight	Iain Walker	Erik Sanchez
David Delaquila	Jeremy Smith	Rob Risley
Don Denton	Shannon Corcoran	Ginger Scoggins
Doug Cochrane	Heather Platt Gulledge	Sheila Hayter
Dru Crawley	Doug Cochrane	Keith Reihl
John Constantinide		
Nitin Naik		

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Candace DeVaughn, Manager - Board Services	Craig Wright, Director - Finance & Admin. Services
Chandrias Jacobs, Coordinator - Board Services	Alice Yates, Director - Government Affairs
Joyce Abrams, Director - Member Services	Daniel Gurley, Manager - Membership & Member Contact
Vanita Gupta, Director - Marketing	Jeanette McCray, Assistant Manager - Membership
Kim Mitchell, Chief Development Officer	Karen Murray, Manager - Professional Development
Mark Owen, Director - Publications & Education	Lilas Pratt, Manager - Special Projects
Stephanie Reiniche, Director - Technology	Vickie Grant, Manager - Region Activities
Lizzy Seymour, Manager - Conference Services	Sarah Foster, Editor
Tony Giometti, Sr. Manager - Conference Programs	Tanisha Meyers-Lisle, Procedures Administer
	Connor Barbaree, Sr. Manager - Standards

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Gulledge called the meeting to order at 8:00 am.

**CODE OF ETHICS**

Mr. Gulledge read the code of ethics commitment and encouraged all in attendance to read the full code of ethics statements and core values online.

**ROLL CALL/INTRODUCTIONS**

Roll call was conducted. Members and guests in attendance as noted above.

**REVIEW OF MEETING AGENDA**

Mr. Gulledge reviewed the meeting agenda. No changes were made.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Glesne moved and Dr. Alaa seconded that

1. The minutes from the October 15, 2020 Board of Directors meeting be approved.

**MOTION 1 PASSED** (Unanimous Voice Vote, CNV).

**REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS****JUNE 23, 2020**

Action items 1 and 4 were reported as ongoing. All other action items were reported as complete.

**AI - 1-2****JULY 1, 2020**

Action item 1 was reported as ongoing.

**AI - 3****COUNCIL REPORTS****TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL**

Mr. McQuade reported on behalf of Technology Council.

Mr. McQuade stated that the publication motions presented below are addenda that have unresolved objectors, negative project committee votes with reason, or a threat of legal action. These motions are preceded by formally voted recommendations from the project committees and Standards Committee. The rules do not require a vote from Technology Council. Appeals procedures now allow for consideration of an appeal of a BOD standards action or inaction only if the negative vote or unresolved comment is based solely upon procedural grounds. A reminder to Board members - members are to review these motions for adherence to ASHRAE's Procedures for Standards Actions (PASA) and ANSI Essential Requirements and not technical content. If the BOD disapproves a Standards Committee Document for publication, please record the detailed reason(s) in the minutes.

A summary of any unresolved commenters and/or negative project committee votes on these publication drafts is included in the analysis sheets that were distributed prior to the meeting. By default, all Standards Committee Documents will be processed by our ANSI Audited Designator

procedures unless otherwise indicated by the Board. In all cases, the fiscal impact for publication drafts is within existing budgets.

Mr. McQuade presented consent motions 1-8. Mr. Hermans requested that motions 1-5 be removed for separate consideration.

Mr. McQuade moved that

**2.** The following consent motions be approved.

- Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/IES Addendum cr (Envelope Backstop) to ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1-2019, Standard for Buildings Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings, be approved for publication.
- Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/ASHE Addendum d (adds requirements for air intake separation distance) to ANSI/ASHRAE/ASHE Standard 170-2017, Ventilation of Health Care Facilities, be approved for publication.
- Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/ASHE Addendum e (planning requirements) to ANSI/ASHRAE/ASHE Standard 170-2017, Ventilation of Health Care Facilities, be approved for publication.
- Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/ASHE Addendum j (Chapter 8 revision) to ANSI/ASHRAE/ASHE Standard 170-2017, Ventilation of Health Care Facilities, be approved for publication.
- Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/ASHE Addendum l (revises the space name and process definitions) to ANSI/ASHRAE/ASHE Standard 170-2017, Ventilation of Health Care Facilities, be approved for publication.

**MOTION 2 PASSED** (Voice Vote, CNV). Mr. Hermans abstained.

Mr. McQuade moved that

**3.** The following consent motions be approved.

- Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Addendum bj (Landscape Design Clarifications) ANSI/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Standard 189.1-2020, Standard for the Design of High-Performance Green Buildings Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings, be approved for publication.
- Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Addendum bo (Soil Gas Control) to ANSI/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Standard 189.1-2020, Standard for the Design of High-Performance Green Buildings Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings, be approved for publication.
- Standards Committee recommends that BSR/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Addendum bo (Soil Gas Control) to ANSI/ASHRAE/ICC/USGBC/IES Standard 189.1-2020, Standard for

the Design of High-Performance Green Buildings Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings, be approved for publication.

**MOTION 3 PASSED** (Unanimous Voice Vote, CNV).

Mr. McQuade stated that the following motion has unresolved commenters or negative project committee votes and negative votes by Standards Committee. The reasons for the negative votes were technical in nature along with alleged process violations and will be offered the right to appeal. There were also threats of legal action. Please refer to the analysis sheets for the full detail on the reasons for negative votes and/or unresolved commenters and a summary of Project Committee responses that were distributed prior to the meeting.

Mr. McQuade recused himself, stating that the organization he works for, AHRI, is an unresolved commenter. Mr. McQuade yielded the floor to Mr. McGinn.

Mr. McGinn moved that

4. Standards Committee recommends to the BOD that BSR/ASHRAE Addendum a (unvented combustion appliances) to ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.2-2019, Ventilation and Acceptable Indoor Air Quality, be approved for publication.

Mr. McGinn read the background of the motion:

*The ASHRAE Board of Directors approved the publication of BSR/ASHRAE Addendum a to ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.2-2016, on June 27, 2018.*

*In response to appeals filed by unresolved objectors, an Appeals Panel held an in-person hearing on November 1, 2018. The Appeals Panel upheld the claim of violations of PASA Section 7.4.6, Consideration of Public Review Comments Received, stating:*

*The Appeals Panel did not find sufficient documentation to prove reasonable efforts to attempt to resolve the commenters, and the SSPC did not appear to do enough to effectively attempt to resolve the comments.*

*The Appeals Panel did acknowledge that the commenter addressed the SSPC at the January 2018 meeting, however, the documentation shows this meeting was little more than wordsmithing previously drafted responses, and more substantial documented efforts to attempt to resolve commenters were needed.*

*Additionally, the Appeals Panel understands that there was a working group focused on the subject of the addendum for many years. While the drafting of the addendum and comment responses didn't occur in the working group, it could have been used as a mechanism to ensure that there were proper efforts to attempt to resolve commenters.*

*The Appeals Panel sent addendum 62.2a back to SSPC 62.2 to address procedural deficiencies stating, "In particular, SSPC 62.2 needs to make better documented efforts to attempt to resolve commenters on this addendum."*



*SSPC 62.2 conducted additional outreach to unresolved commenters and better documented their actions but no technical changes were made to the addendum. BSR/ASHRAE Addendum a to ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.2-2016, was then brought back for publication approval to Standards Committee in June 2019. While Standards Committee approved the recommendation, the Board of Directors disapproved publication without providing any reasons for its action. Standards Committee requested reasons for the negative votes and was informed that while no specific written reasons were submitted, the Board did not believe that process had been followed.*

*Standards Committee subsequently agreed to form an Ad Hoc Committee to review the issues surrounding 62.2a and determine if a compromise position could be made that would satisfy the objectors and SSPC 62.2.*

*Following the Standards Committee recommendation, the Ad Hoc and SSPC 62.2 developed a compromise proposal as addendum c to Standard 62.2. The SSPC approved a motion for publication public review of Addendum c to Standards 62.2 and brought it forward to SPLS for approval during its June 2020 meeting. The motion was tabled by SPLS with the understanding that SSPC 62.2 was reconsidering moving forward with the compromise addendum. SSPC 62.2 subsequently approved a motion to discontinue addendum 62.2c on September 3, 2020.*

*SSPC 62.2 requested Standards Committee approve a recommendation that the BOD approve publication of the original addendum a to 62.2-2016. If this addendum is approved a right to appeal letter will be sent to the unresolved objectors. The addendum cannot be published during the appeals period or while appeals are being considered up through ANSI appeals absent the approval of the Society President.*

Written comments submitted prior to the meeting were read by Mr. Schwedler and Mr. Mehboob. Comments are included in ATTACHMENT A.

Mr. Gulledge opened the floor to guests to make comments.

Mr. Walker stated that he is chair of 62.2 and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to address the BOD. The documentation that the BOD has just heard has by and large outlined the process. The perspective of the committee is that the additional meetings with unresolved objectors and changes made in response to unresolved commenters and compromise, that failed, indicate from a procedural standpoint that 62.2 is following the guidelines of PASA. PASA does not guarantee an outcome. Decisions are made on a technical basis. The committee does not believe that there has been a mathematical error; it is simply a rounding consideration.

Mr. Walker stated that he is happy to answer any questions that the BOD may have.

Mr. Delaquila stated that in the record presented to the BOD on this item the paragraph under the explanation contained incorrect timeline information. Addendum c was approved in June 2020 by 62.2 subject to a continuation and recirculation. It wasn't until August that the SPLS tabled the addendum. At the August 24<sup>th</sup> meeting 62.2 took two actions - return addendum a back to Standards Committee and the BOD, and discontinue the compromised proposal that would become addendum c. The most egregious decision made at that meeting was that the motion was not considered a standards action.

My understanding was that when the BOD rejected addendum a it no longer existed. This should have been a standards action and it was not. This is a procedural violation that the BOD should consider.

An additional correction to the timeline is that 62.2 did not meet in September.

When 62.2 considered addendum c there was an error in the calculation and the main reason addendum c was discontinued was because of the error in the calculation. The same calculation error is used in addendum a.

Mr. Crawley, Chair of Standards Committee, stated that the committee voted to recommend addendum a for approval to the BOD by majority. The majority of members did feel PASA had been followed. This coming before the BOD was initiated by 62.2.

Mr. Gulledge thanked guests for their verbal and written comments. He reminded the BOD that the focus of the discussion should be on procedural issues and not the technical content.

Mr. Hermans spoke against the motion. He thanked Standards Committee for their work. This is a classic example of breach of process. The appeals panel realized this was a breach of process but only sighted a lack of documentation. Staff did a fantastic job coaching the project committee. The project committee wasn't serious about resolving comments and violated the whole idea of the process.

Mr. Hermans asked the BOD to review Susanna Hansons' reason for her negative vote; that alone is justification for a 'no' vote. The BOD has an important role in the standards approval process. Addendum c could have been acceptable to all parties, it resolved the issue but the project committee refuses to compromise. The project committee doesn't want to compromise and follow the rules; have violated the spirit of the law and have done so for many years.

This addendum goes beyond what this project committee and ASHRAE should be doing; should not be banning products.

Mr. Brandt spoke in favor of the motion. The BOD can vote on addenda as many times as it sees fit.

Mr. Conlan spoke in favor of the motion. Some information in the background is incorrectly indicated. The notes from the Orlando meeting clearly indicate the purpose of that ad hoc - *the chair of that Ad Hoc has been tasked with reviewing the issues and determining if there was due process*. The task was not to reach a compromise. Tech Council has not received anything from this working group.

Mr. Conlan added that he believes that after the appeals process every unresolved commenter was offered five minutes to present issues with the standard as written. There have been many more meetings since where there was an opportunity to address issues.

Not sure why addendum c is relevant to the motion at hand.

PASA does not preclude Society from banning a product. However, addendum a does not ban a product, it limits the size.

Ms. Thomle spoke against the motion for procedure and process violations. She reviewed the 62.2 minutes from Atlanta, which stated he was asked to change the minutes. The minutes reflect the

commenters were allowed 15 minutes and several commenters offered solutions and compromises. Online responses have been updated and still do not reflect why solutions and compromises were rejected. Evidence of a lack of good faith effort by the Committee, which is required by PASA. There are still 15 unresolved commenters on substantive sections.

Concerned with the integrity of the process. The committee has not adequately responded to commenters.

Mr. Schwedler stated that he will abstain from the vote, as he works with an unresolved commenter. Believes that the proper procedure after June 2019 should be looking at the process since then, not prior to. Remember that in the procedures the SSPC is the consensus forming body, whose job it is to reach substantial consensus but not unanimity.

Mr. Hogeling spoke in favor of the motion. The process was correctly followed by Standards.

Mr. McGinn stated that he is Vice Chair of Tech Council. Sympathizes with the BOD members trying to get up to speed on this issue. Speaking in favor of the motion because the majority of the committees have voted this up to the BOD. Look to the SSPC and Standards to guide my decision. Convinced me that I should vote in favor.

Mr. Gray asked Ms. Thomle to reiterate what her perceived violation was and provide additional information.

Ms. Thomle stated that when she was reading through the minutes it sounded like they were allowing the negative commenters to talk, but in the minutes it didn't sound like they were listening. All of the suggestions that the commenters had to improve the addenda were not addressed in the online comments. There was a lot of writing that danced around it but really did not come to the point of addressing the issues that were brought up during the meeting. Later, when there was the compromise 62.2 voted on by an overwhelming majority, it was not approved by SPLS - addendum c was tabled because of a mathematical error.

Mr. Conlan stated that many commenters were on SSPC and would be beyond the 15 minutes they were given to present.

**MOTION 4 PASSED (22:6:1, CNV).**

Mr. Hermans voted negatively because the SSPC did not follow due process and did not consider adequately the objections of unresolved commenters.

Ms. Cramm voted negatively because in reading the details of the objections the committee did not put forth a good faith effort to resolve commenters and did not follow procedure in reintroducing addendum a.

Mr. Fulk voted negatively and echoed Ms. Cramm's comments.

Ms. Hammack voted negatively because there was no effort to find a compromise position.

Ms. Thomle voted negatively because of the lack of due process and no good faith effort to compromise with commenters.

Mr. Rakheja voted negatively and echoed Ms. Cramm's comments.

Mr. Schwedler abstained.

Mr. Gulledge thanked guests for attending and for the spirited discussion by the BOD.

Mr. McQuade respectfully submitted the remainder of the report to the BOD for review.

#### **PUBLISHING AND EDUCATION COUNCIL**

Mr. Dean reported on behalf of the Publishing and Education Council. The council has had very few minutes this quarter.

The dashboard is shared to show the overall health of the activities of the council and to be far more transparent in the way information is presented. Very small net profit. PDH offerings are extremely strong.

#### **MEMBERS COUNCIL**

Mr. Schwedler reported on behalf of Members Council.

Mr. Schwedler moved that

5. COVID-19 be declared a hardship case as per Manual of Chapter Operations Section 3.15 and Society membership dues be reduced by 50% for all memberships that are in their grace period or cancelled as a direct result of COVID-19 during the 2020-2021 fiscal year.

Members interested in applying for hardship must be unemployed or have experienced a reduction in salary as a direct result of COVID-19 (documentation required).

Digital copies of the ASHRAE Journal and Handbook publications shall be provided to these members in lieu of the printed copies. All other member benefits shall remain unchanged.

Mr. Schwedler moved and Mr. McGinn seconded that

6. Motion 5 be postponed as the first order of business following executive session.

It was discussed that BOD members do not have the necessary information to vote on the motion. The motion will be considered in open session immediately following executive session.

**MOTION 6 PASSED** (Unanimous Voice Vote, CNV).

**MOTION 5 POSTPONED**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Executive session was called at 9:35 am.

The meeting recessed at 12:00 pm.

The meeting reconvened at 8:01 am on Thursday, November 19.

**CODE OF ETHICS**

Mr. Gulledge read the code of ethics commitment and encouraged all in attendance to read the full code of ethics statements and core values online.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Executive session was called at 8:08 am.

Open session reconvened at 9:06 am.

**Postponed Motion 5 was brought back to the floor.**

5. COVID-19 be declared a hardship case as per Manual of Chapter Operations Section 3.15 and Society membership dues be reduced by 50% for all memberships that are in their grace period or cancelled as a direct result of COVID-19 during the 2020-2021 fiscal year.

Members interested in applying for hardship must be unemployed or have experienced a reduction in salary as a direct result of COVID-19 (documentation required).

Digital copies of the ASHRAE Journal and Handbook publications shall be provided to these members in lieu of the printed copies. All other member benefits shall remain unchanged.

Mr. Schwedler commended Members Council for bringing the motion forward.

He spoke against the motion. There is already a process in place to support our members and it provides a higher benefit. There is already a message on the membership dues instructing members to contact Member Services; this should be publicized more. This motion would increase what members are required to do to receive relief.

Ms. Bryant spoke against the motion. It is the responsibility of the DRC to understand the current process. This motion limits Member Services in helping members. If a member is actively wanting to keep membership they will reach out to staff.

Mr. Brandt spoke against the motion. As written, the motion has no limit and could cost Society millions. The existing policy should suffice.

Mr. Rakheja echoed Ms. Bryant's comments. Staff is already handling incidents on a case by case basis.

Mr. Sanchez stated that the intent of the motion is to help members facing hardship as a result of COVID-19. If approved, it will keep us from losing members in the short term.

Mr. Smith, Vice Chair of the MP Committee, stated that the committee has spent more than 40 hours discussing this item. The vast majority of members are not aware that this hardship clause exists. The motion would only be effective through June of 2021. We need to stop the bleeding of membership, down almost 10% and continuing to fall.

Mr. Urso stated that the motion clarifies what is in the MCO regarding hardship cases. It is up to Members Council to determine what a hardship case is and how to reconcile this with members. COVID-19 is a hardship on our members. If you look at the trend since March, the average decline has been about 500 members per month. Projecting that out through the end of the fiscal year, that will be a 12% decline or 50,000 members. Unaware of correspondence directing members experiencing a hardship to contact Member Services.

Mr. Hermans spoke against the motion. The real issue is communication. Use DRCs to communicate to members to make sure that everyone is aware of the existing hardship clause.

Mr. Bryant stated that there is a section in the ROB addressing hardship cases. If something is not included, the chair of Members Council and staff have the ability to come up with a solution and that is what is currently happening.

Mr. Glesne stated that it is necessary to promote that we are helping our members.

Mr. Littleton applauded the desire of Members Council to look after members that are experiencing hardship. This motion would make things worse for the member.

**MOTION 5 FAILED (6:23:1, CNV).**

Mr. Conlan voted negatively. Based on the increase in cases in the current pandemic I felt that an increase in dues, to areas that are developing economies that are currently experiencing a significant decrease in their dollar value compared to the US dollar than it was 6 months ago. I do not believe projecting it out 6 months from now that it can be done at this time and this change will reduce the number of members that maintain their membership.

Mr. Schwedler thanked Mr. Smith and Mr. Urso for their participation and feedback. Communication of the current hardship policy has not been adequate. He expressed appreciation for the stewardship of the MP Committee.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Mr. Gullledge reviewed information items for each of the following ExCom meetings.

**AUGUST 12, 2020**

The CEC *Lessons Learned* report will be utilized moving forward now that the Winter Conference will be virtual as well.

**AUGUST 24, 2020**

Mr. Gulledge reported that ExCom acted on behalf of the BOD to approve the Charles E. Henck Endowed Scholarship.

The Society Transformation Ad Hoc was formed. The new Ad Hoc combines a number of initiatives from previous ad hocs.

The possibility of monetizing the ETF is an ongoing scenario that is being investigated.

ASHRAE will participate in the discussion of an offsite construction standard.

**OCTOBER 1, 2020**

ExCom continues to work on finalizing and prioritizing visits to other organizations.

DL travel has been suspended through the end of the calendar year.

A site visit to Caesars will be conducted to ensure that the hotel has improved its IAQ baseline. Excited to critique, question, and make sure.

Work on the ASHRAE-CIBSE strategic partnership agreement (SPA) is ongoing.

**OCTOBER 12, 2020**

Officers were assigned to attend virtual conferences to represent ASHRAE.

**NOVEMBER 5, 2020**

A draft MOU with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is currently being reviewed by DHS. This new MOU could come before the BOD for approval very soon.

ExCom approved MOU renewals with KSFA, NAFA, and NASEO.

**BUILDING EQ COMMITTEE**

Mr. Dean reported that he was very impressed with the amount of effort that the committee has put in.

Mr. Constantinide reported that the committee is reviewing ASHRAE MOUs to see which organizations would best benefit from using the portal. The BOD is encouraged to send recommendations.

A proposal for a digital twin strategy will be presented at a later date.

The Committee is investigating opportunities for portal advertising revenue. The hope is that this could partially pay for the cost to maintain the portal.

The committee's full report is included in ATTACHMENT B.

### **DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Mr. McGinn reported that signage is now up at the new HQ building for major gift donors who received naming opportunities.

The all member phase of fundraising for the new HQ was put on hold due to the pandemic. The campaign kicked off with two emails in October. Would like to solicit the support of new BOD members so that we can continue the tradition of 100% BOD support. This will allow the committee to solicit contributions with the assertion that the campaign is supported by all BOD members.

Ms. Mitchell thanked President Gullede and Ms. Scoggins for traveling to HQ to record videos. President Gullede recorded thank you videos to significant donors to the HQ building campaign. A thank you video will also be sent to all donors.

Ms. Hammack asked about the HQ commemorative magazine and if it can be produced digitally to save money. Just as we have gone virtual, we need to start to go paperless.

Ms. Mitchell reported that certain promises were made when gifts were solicited. Printing the commemorative magazines is included in the campaign budget. The magazine will be distributed with the February issue of the *Journal*. The cost to print and mail the magazine is fully supported by the campaign.

### **NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

Ms. Hayter reported that the Nominating Committee recently held its fall meeting. This meeting was the first time that a full committee meeting to address candidates was conducted in a virtual environment. There was good participation and discussion.

The committee discussed a motion to move Society Vice President from a one-year to a two-year term. A similar motion was discussed a couple of years ago and there was support that the term should change. When it was discussed this time, the committee was split, with lots of passion on both sides.

Nominating felt that it was important that this be brought before the BOD. SRC has recently considered this motion and the BOD will likely hear from them soon. At that point, it will be up to the BOD to decide how to move forward.

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Ms. Maston reported that the Planning Committee has been very busy this fall.

Ms. Platt Gullede, Chair of the Post COVID Subcommittee, thanked the BOD for the opportunity to report. Following this presentation, the subcommittee would like confirmation that they are headed in the right direction and any additional input/feedback as they prepare the final report for the BOD.



The subcommittee's full report is included in ATTACHMENT C.

The following organizations were recommended for the subcommittee to reach out to:

AIA	ASPE	APPA	SCANVAC
ARBS	ASABE	IES	USGBC
AEE	I2SL	IIR	
AIRAH	IEEE	MOU Organizations	
MCA	ASME	ASCE	

The BOD was asked to send additional comments and feedback directly to Ms. Maston.

Mr. McGinn expressed caution over the survey results. BOD members and committee chairs are highly likely to respond to surveys. Recommend sending different survey links to different groups. For example, one link to members not currently serving on a committee and one link to Society level committee members.

Mr. Knight addressed the survey comments regarding the ETF. The ETF falls under the responsibility of the Environmental Health Committee. It operates like a technical committee. Over 125 subject matter experts, who currently sit on TCs have assisted the group with their work.

Mr. Gulledge thanked the Post COVID Subcommittee for their work. Please keep moving along this path.

#### **AUDIT COMMITTEE**

Mr. Lavitt reported that the committee reviewed the results of the external auditor's report. There were no discrepancies.

There were no whistleblower complaints or conflict of interest issues that came before the committee.

#### **PRESIDENTIAL AD HOC COMMITTEE AND BOD TASK GROUP REPORTS**

##### **PROACTIVE DIVERSITY TASK GROUP**

Mr. McGinn reported that the group has met nine times.

Following the work session with the BOD in August, the group has established five goals.

The task group has sponsored an article in *Insights* and distributed a member survey.

Mr. Gulledge thanked the task group for their report and encouraged them to keep up the good work.

##### **ASHRAE HQ AD HOC**

The full presentation is included in ATTACHMENT D.

Mr. Scoggins reported that the ad hoc is wrapping up their work on the main project.

Have moved into the new HQ building. Pictures of the new building were shared. Currently in the middle of ongoing commissioning efforts. Hope to have commissioning wrapped up in the next two weeks.

There are four working charging stations in the parking lot.

The GA Power rebate was anticipated to be around \$40,000 but ended up being \$34,000. Work is ongoing on other rebate opportunities.

March is the anticipated completion date for PV installation. Will be about \$50-70,000 short in regard to PV.

Overall, the project will be a little short in terms of budget. The money saved will end up partially paying for the PV consultants.

There is access to the walking path. Elected not to build stairs directly to the path for security reasons. Access to the path is not the most direct route, but it is easily navigated.

The move went very, very well even though it was complicated by the pandemic. Ms. Reiniche was tasked with coordinating the move; she did a great job. Staff is fully moved in and unpacked. There are still some common areas that need to be organized and unpacked.

The basement is being used as storage. Currently spending quite a bit of money on off-site storage. Have been discussing a plan to go through that storage, cleaning it up and moving it to the additional storage space in the basement to save money. As we become more digital, it is possible that we could look to bring the fulfillment process back in house. However, storage is the first priority for the basement space.

Ms. Mitchell reported that an additional \$30,000 cash has been contributed to the building fund from the member campaign and major donors. The in-kind numbers have gone down but that is only because the equipment was revalued.

Mr. Gray stated that he has not been inside yet, but it looks beautiful and the ad hoc did a great job. Will there be another budget request?

Ms. Scoggins responded that at the last BOD meeting, the BOD approved the purchase of the solar with a slight deficit. The ad hoc is working to understand what the deficit will be. At that time, Finance will investigate how to offset that cost.

Mr. Littleton reported that the \$4 million loan is being paid back from the NIBE contribution; as they make their \$500,000 annual donation.

Ideally, the HQ building will be a net zero building. The estimated payback on the PV is six to eight years.

Mr. Gullledge stated that the building is a stunning asset for our members. Great work to everyone involved in delivering the building.

**EPIDEMIC TASK FORCE**

Mr. Conlan was asked to present on behalf of the ETF.

Mr. Conlan reported that the ETF hopes to release what is being called *core principles*. All members have been tasked with ensuring that we are not in any perceived conflict between the guidance.

Laboratory guidance just came out.

The group was formed to look at where we are as well as long term. Dr. Bahnfleth and Mr. Knight are starting to compile guidance and determine how we take what we've built and ensure it is utilized.

Ms. Yates stated that the ETF has done amazing work. Their guidance has been included in legislation across the country. NYSERDA has paid work lined up for the ETF.

The Biden transition team has indicated that they want to talk to us. Hopeful that Dr. Bahnfleth will be requested to advise the team.

Ms. Yates thanked the ETF for all of their work.

**VISION 2030 AD HOC**

Mr. McGinn reported on behalf of the ad hoc. The ad hoc has been working diligently. Currently working on a draft elevator statement.

Have a webpage that is mocked up and, when finalized, will be the main means to transfer information. There will be videos, information, and links. Meant to be a webpage that lives on.

A detailed written report will be submitted at the Winter Meeting.

Mr. Gullede applauded the ad hoc for approaching this as a dynamic living tool; it is an inspiring approach.

**SOCIETY TRANSFORMATION AD HOC**

Mr. Mehboob reported that the ad hoc has three main streams of thinking related to the 2021 Presidential theme.

Have been training on the lean process. Moving fairly rapidly. Have defined targets and a defined audience and problems to be addressed.

Intention is to provide a preliminary model at the Winter Meeting.

The streamlining group intends to enter into discussion with almost all stakeholders involved in the streamlining. Will be setting up meetings with groups of DRCs, DALs, and each of the councils. Very important for us to speak to members of the BOD.

Will not make any recommendations that are not supported by firm data.

**NEW BUSINESS****PHOENIX 2021 MEETING**

Mr. Brandt reported that in addition to being a Vice President he is also the General Chair of the Phoenix 2021 Conference. The pandemic is presenting us with challenges and changes. Have a huge amount of respect for the work that the Austin Chapter did in preparation for the June 2020 Conference before the decision was made to go virtual. Goal is to limit the work that the Phoenix Chapter members do if the meeting is going to go virtual.

Uncertainty and likely travel bans are reasons for moving the meeting virtual sooner rather than later.

Is there a go/no go date for Phoenix?

Mr. Littleton reported that it is a complicated decision that is driven by our ability to negotiate contracts with the hotels. Challenging to do that this far out.

Is it the preference of the BOD, all other factors being equal, if we are able to negotiate an exit for the contracts, to go virtual for the Phoenix Conference?

Mr. Zentz stated that we have proven that we can take a summer meeting and turn it into an income generator. If we had the time to properly plan would be able to make it a much more positive experience. The sooner we make that decision the better for everyone involved.

Mr. Gray stated that we will quickly hit virtual conference fatigue; not convinced we will have the same success. If there is a vaccine available, the hotel will be unlikely to negotiate the contract. If there is a way to go face-to-face, in favor of that, based on feedback from our members.

Should use as much time as we possibly have. It would be a mistake to make a decision right now. Respect Don's point but if we have the time, we need to take it.

Ms. Bryant stated that we need to understand the force majeure clauses. Respect volunteer's time but there are legal issues that we need to better understand before a decision is made.

Mr. Hermans stated that he prefers to have a face-to-face meeting in Phoenix but realistically it seems that attendance would be low even if the state and city allowed it, which is doubtful. Rather than risk it and have the host committee go through the pain of planning and having very few people show up, don't think face-to-face will work for us.

Ms. Maston stated that a lot of work has been done for a virtual conference this summer. Vaccines will likely be available, but distribution is questionable. Leaning towards the virtual conference, it is the safe and fiscally responsible decision.

Mr. Sekhar stated that he can't see that the global community will have confidence to attend an in-person meeting. A decision to go virtual may be the right decision, for the Host Committee and success of a virtual conference.

Mr. Conlan stated that his concern is with the timing of hotel contracts. Not sure if hotel forgiveness will be there later. Need to decide sooner rather than later.

Mr. Littleton stated that his personal opinion is that if we went to the hotel now and said we want to explore cancellation and use a future meeting in Phoenix as leverage, the response would not be good. Very delicate and fine line to walk. We can certainly pursue the hotel contracts more aggressively as opposed to waiting to see if the pandemic will force us to do so further down the road.

Mr. Gulledge stated that we need to start considering what it means to take action to go virtual, hybrid, or face-to-face. Need to bring best information before the BOD in executive session at a future meeting.

Mr. Littleton reported that staff can provide scenarios and options pretty quickly. The driver is the hotel contracts. Will consult with legal counsel further. Consensus is for staff to fully explore options for going virtual and bring that before the BOD as soon as possible.

Mr. Gulledge added that the goal will be to bring the information before the BOD at the December 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. May not have the full narrative but at a minimum will be able to better understand where we are, and what the risk and opportunities are.

Ms. Seymour reported that there are three contracts for Phoenix - convention center, Sheraton, and Hyatt. Staff has had conversations with all three and they have verbally agreed to be flexible. Legal counsel recommends investigating closer to the end of the year, before that we would not be able to claim force majeure in this pandemic environment.

#### **PORTFOLIO DEVELOPMENT GROUP**

Mr. Mehboob reported that he is looking for guidance from the BOD on two interlinked issues - new products and services and recouping reserves. Must look to enhance revenue.

Society Transformation Ad Hoc put forward the idea of a portfolio and services development group. Would be comprised of the Vice Chairs of Councils and input from Finance and Planning.

Strongly feel that we need to act sooner rather than later.

Ms. Maston stated that to Mr. Mehboob's point, we have talked about this in the Streamlining Ad Hoc. Putting this together would be a step in the right direction as well as a good way of breaking silos.

Mr. Macauley stated that Finance should take this. We talk about the speed of ASHRAE and this is a critical item to our budget. Finance can host a meeting and invite the appropriate parties. That way, the process can get started sooner rather than later.

Mr. Gulledge stated that this issue will not be solved today. The message is clear - need to be moving beyond this. Will consider this and will come back after discussing with senior leadership.

#### **RECOUPING RESERVES**

Mr. Mehboob stated that he would like the BOD to provide some ideas that can be taken back to Finance Committee. Any guidance would be most welcome.

Mr. Macauley stated that Finance Committee recommendations from the previous Society year could be used as a starting point.

Mr. Wright stated that Mr. Knight created a plan specific to the building that can be used as a starting point.

Mr. Littleton stated that replenishing reserves is simple. Balanced budgets allow depreciation and excess cash to be moved into reserves. An expense line can be committed to reserves. There are multiple ways to institutionalize replenishing reserves.

Mr. Gulledge stated that reserve replenishment needs to be in Finance and needs to be part of budget planning over a multi-year perspective. If any BOD member has supplemental information they would like to present, please send to Finance directly.

#### **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

Mr. Gulledge reported that there will be two election practice sessions - December 9 at 8:00 am and December 10 at 3:00 pm. Members may participate in one or both practice sessions.

The BOD election will be held December 14 at 8:00 am.

Virtual Winter Conference meetings dates are January 29 at 8:00 am and February 4 at 8:00 am.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 12:02 pm.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'JH Littleton', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Jeff H. Littleton, Secretary

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

- A. Standard 62.2 Addendum A Written Comments to the BOD
- B. Building EQ Committee Report
- C. Planning Committee Post COVID Subcommittee Report
- D. ASHRAE HQ Ad Hoc Report

## Standard 62.2 2016 Addendum a Comments

- **David Delaquila, Cleveland Chapter** - *As a member of SSPC 62.2 and an unresolved commenter I respectfully petition the ASHRAE Board (BOD) to reject addendum “a” to standard 62.2 2016 for the following reasons.*

*In June 2018 the BOD approved addendum “a” for publication. Following that action, I filed an appeal that was upheld by an ASHRAE Appeals Panel. The Panel cited a PASA violation and that 62.2 Committee, “failed to make an effort to resolve the Appellant’s issues raised during public review as required by Section 7.4.6.” Some have argued that the appeal was not a procedural failure, but rather a simple lack of documentation. The BOD is well aware that an appeal is conducted on the grounds of procedural violations, not a lack of documentation. So, it is misleading to claim that the appeal was the result of a lack of documentation.*

*After the appeal, in early 2019, the 62.2 Committee simply repeated its previous course of action by adding some text to the responses to unresolved commenters. Again, there was no effort to resolve comments or to seek a compromise. Eventually, in June 2019, addendum “a” was rejected by the BOD by an overwhelming majority vote of 7 yes, 17 no, and 6 abstentions. Now the 62.2 Committee wants to try again with a new BOD expecting to get a different result.*

*Furthermore, in early 2020, in light of the BOD rejection of the addendum, the ASHRAE Standards Committee (StdC) took up this issue and formed an ad hoc WG consisting of myself, industry representatives, 62.2 Committee leadership and StdC members. This successful effort resulted in a compromise proposal that was acceptable to all the parties involved. To advance that success, in June the 62.2 Committee overwhelmingly approved that proposal for publication public review by a supermajority vote of 20 yes, 6 no, and 3 abstentions. I thought we were finally moving in the right direction, but I would be wrong. Just weeks later the Committee reversed that decision in favor of resurrecting addendum “a.” Moreover, the Committee also decided to discontinue processing the compromise proposal.*

*It is important to note that the severe sizing restriction imposed by addendum “a” will result in the 62.2 standard effectively banning a viable heating product. There is no doubt that this is exactly the Committee’s objective. This is supported by the fact that the 62.2 Committee is presently considering a new draft proposal that will strictly prohibit (i.e. ban) the installation of these products. Clearly that is the goal.*

*For these reasons and others, I kindly request that the BOD again reject the publication of addendum “a” and allow the process to move forward in order to reach a compromise that will resolve all objections.*

- **Don Denton** - *I am an unresolved commenter on Standard 62.2 Addendum “a” that has been resubmitted unchanged to the Board for approval, and I urge you to reject it.*

*In November 2018 the industry won an appeal based on a procedural violation of PASA stating in*

*part that the 62.2 Committee had not made reasonable efforts to resolve public comments. This decision is well documented in the record. I can attest that following the appeal the situation did not improve, and at its June 2019 meeting the Board rejected Addendum "a."*

*In early 2020 the Standards Committee established an Ad Hoc Working Group with the goal of developing a compromise proposal that both 62.2 and the industry would agree upon. The current and previous 62.2 Chairmen, another industry representative and I, and Standards Committee members made up the Working Group. This effort resulted in an acceptable compromise proposal. In June 2020 the 62.2 Committee approved it by a substantial majority.*

*However, two months later the 62.2 Committee overturned its approval of the compromise proposal and decided to resubmit the original Addendum "a" unchanged for approval and publication. Unbelievably, the 62.2 Committee overturned the compromise proposal for containing a mathematic error of one constant in an equation, and Addendum "a" contains exactly the same error. The Addendum "a" before the Board today is identical to what it rejected the last time around.*

*The recent actions of the 62.2 Committee to derail the compromise proposal clearly show its unwillingness to work reasonably with materially affected parties. I remain unresolved and request the Board to reject Addendum "a" as it did in June 2019.*

- **Shannon Corcoran, AHRI** - *On behalf of the Air-Conditioning, Heating and Refrigeration Institute (AHRI), I, Shannon Corcoran, Lead Regulatory Advisor, request the ASHRAE Board of Directors to reaffirm its actions from the June 26, 2019 meeting and reject the proposed Addendum "a" as written.*

*Since the Board's initial rejection of Addendum "a," significant work was accomplished by an Ad Hoc Working Group (AHWG) established by the Standards Committee consisting of members from the Standards Committee, SSPC 62.2, and the vent-free industry. The AHWG developed a compromise proposal, Addendum "c," that was presented to the SSPC 62.2 members and was voted and approved for publication and public review. However, it was later overturned due to a mathematical error found in Addendum "c." Addendum "a" was moved forward for publication. However, the same error was also found in the content in Addendum "a." The ASHRAE Board rejected Addendum "a."*

*Since the Board's initial rejection, nothing in the content nor in the handling of Addendum "a's" unresolved comments has changed. And for this reason, I request the Board reject the proposed Addendum "a."*

*I appreciate the opportunity to present these comments to the ASHRAE Board of Directors. Thank you.*

- **Ted Williams, American Gas Association** - *To Members of the ASHRAE Board of Directors: The American Gas Association (AGA), founded in 1918, represents more than 200 local energy*



*companies that deliver clean natural gas throughout the United States. There are more than 71 million residential, commercial and industrial natural gas customers in the U.S., of which 92 percent - more than 65 million customers - receive their gas from AGA members. Today, natural gas meets almost one-fourth of the United States' energy needs.*

*As a member of the ASHRAE SSPC 62.2 since 2000, I most vociferously object to the SSPC's return of Addendum 'a' to the Board for reconsideration. According to our records of Board consideration of this standards action, the Board properly rejected this Addendum and returned it to SSPC for further action on the relevant subject matter: Standard 62.2 coverage of unvented gas-fired heating appliances as a source affecting indoor air quality. While SSPC 62.2 continues to push forward with this flawed standards action and the procedural problems leading to its original development and eventual disapproval, ASHRAE efforts to develop constructive standards requirements for these products have been stymied.*

*As the ASHRAE Senior Manager of Standards, Conner Barbaree reported to the SSPC at a recent meeting, the Board action on Addendum 'a' rendered the Addendum "dead," allowing the SSPC to address unvented gas-fired heating appliances through a new standards action. In response to the return of Addendum 'a' to the SSPC, an ad hoc working group composed of members of the SSPC, Standards Committee, and Environmental Health Committee developed an alternative proposal, which eventually emerged as Addendum 'c.' This new addendum was approved during an SSPC meeting voice vote, but when a small group of SSPC members convinced the broader membership that Addendum 'a' was still viable (and over Mr. Barbaree's guidance and the Board's disapproval), Addendum 'c' was effectively tabled in favor of a vote to return Addendum 'a' to the Board. This action can and should be interpreted as the SSPC effectively thumbing its nose at the Board action since it had already disapproved the Addendum. As an SSPC member, I do not want to be associated with such dissident actions and use of clever procedure at the SSPC level to dispute ASHRAE standards actions and Board decisions.*

*I am and remain an unresolved negative commenter on Addendum 'a' and have no record of the SSPC attempting to resolve my negative comment. Yet I voted in support of Addendum 'c' as a constructive attempt to resolve technical issues that Addendum 'a' presented and to avoid the effective ban of these ANSI standard-approved products (in accordance with Standard Z21.11.2 maintained by the ANSI accredited standards for safety developer, CSA Group). This standard certification directly addresses testing and limitation of emissions of nitrogen dioxide, the very product of combustion raised in the Addendum 'a' debate as the reason for promulgating unobtainable limits. At the same time as the SSPC has repeatedly pushed for an effective ban of the products through Addendum 'a,' neither the SSPC members supporting Addendum 'a' nor the SSPC as a group has ever made proposals to Standard Z21.11.2 to achieve the nitrogen dioxide emission reductions it sought through Addendum 'a.'*

*Further consideration of Addendum 'a' will only lead to continuing acrimony within ASHRAE as a whole and within SSPC 62.2 where debate over this action has consumed hundreds of committee member hours at the expense of other agenda items on ventilation and indoor air quality. The Board's upholding of its original rejection of Addendum 'a' is the most constructive course for the*

*SSPC ultimately since it allows us to go forward on constructive measures to control unvented gas combustion as an indoor air contaminant source.*



# Building EQ Committee Report to Board of Directors

November 18-19, 2020



# Business Development



- Review of ASHRAE MOUs
  - Target organizations that would benefit from Portal use and collaboration with ASHRAE.
  - Prioritize to maximize committee member resources and return on time invested.
  - Input encouraged from BOD members on MOUs to target
- Building EQ Seminar
  - Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE) Virtual Conference in October
- Portal User Survey
  - Intended to determine the value of various Portal features in order to identify what offerings could be monetized.

# Marketing Efforts



- Building EQ Student Competition
  - Requested by Student Activities Committee
  - For students conducting Level 1 Energy Audits.
  - Award to be launched for SY 21-22.
- Building EQ Energy Genius Award
  - Developed to recognize top In Operation Assessments
  - Proposal sent to Honors & Awards Committee
  - Winners to be highlighted on webpage and ASHRAE articles
- Building EQ Presentations
  - (July-Oct): 1 CRC, 6 chapters, 1 technical session
  - (Nov-Dec): 1 CRC, 2 chapters

# Other Initiatives



- Case studies
  - Created from Orlando Seminar 42 and other university buildings
  - Other Building Types to follow
  - Will be posted on website and used as handouts
- ASHRAE HQ Building – As Designed Rating
  - Assessment being done pro bono by ASHRAE members
  - Still resolving some final issues with the design model
- Testing Proposed As Designed Methodology
  - Aligns with Standard 90.1 Performance Rating Method (PRM)
  - Field testing to be conducted on ASHRAE HQ Building

# New Initiatives



- Digital Twin Opportunities
  - Strategy being developed with MTG.BIM and Standards Committee
  - Proposal will detail recommendations and rough costs
- Portal Advertising
  - Working with Publications Staff on logistics
  - Portal pages identified as candidates for ad banners
- Building EQ Tech Hour
  - Working with CTTC
  - Draft slide deck currently under review
  - Presentations logistics are being planned

# Technical Development



- Standard 211 interpretation request
  - Regarding remote site visits to conduct building energy audits during epidemics and pandemic situations
- Adding Data Centers to Portal
  - Benefits buildings with large energy loads from data centers
  - Collaborating with TC 9.9 to align with Standard 90.4.
- System Level KPIs
  - Being investigated as future addition to Portal
  - Would provide more specific information to building owners to improve building energy performance.



# Active Related Research



- DOE SBIR grant to Carmel Software (\$200k).
  - Work is underway. Results will create API to accept input from 30 outside sources which will provide opportunities for partnerships.
- *1771-RP (\$199k)*
  - *Energy Modeling of Typical Commercial Buildings in Support of ASHRAE Building Energy Quotient Energy Rating Program.*
  - Work is wrapping up. Results will support improvements to the As Designed assessment methodology.
- *1836-RP (\$62k)*
  - *Developing a Standardized Categorization System for Energy Efficiency Measures.*
  - Work is underway. Results will support improvements to In Operation assessment auditing protocols.

# Building EQ Usage



## Portal Statistics as of November 4, 2020:

- Users: 1242 (*1141 at beginning of SY*)
- Projects: 799 (*736 at beginning of SY*)
- Submitted/Approved projects: 51
- Reports purchased: 7 (\$1150)
- Paid credentials: 48 (\$890)

# Building EQ Committee



- Focus of SY 20-21 MBOs
  - Increasing Portal Usage
  - Identifying and pursuing Revenue sources
  - Prioritizing development opportunities
  - Identifying outside funding sources
  - Assessing committee organization and reporting structure



**QUESTIONS ??**

---



# Planning for a Post COVID ASHRAE

Planning Committee  
Post COVID Subcommittee  
November 19, 2020

# Agenda

- Introduction
- ASHRAE Post COVID Surveys
- Impact of the Coronavirus on our Industry
- How ASHRAE should/could move forward?

# Planning Committee

## Post COVID Subcommittee Members

- Heather Platt Gullede – Chair \*
- Trent Hunt – Vice Chair \*
- Ahmed Alaa Eldin Mohamed
- Blake Ellis
- Mark Miller
- Vanessa Freidberg
- Sarah Maston, Planning Committee Chair \*
- Bill Klock, Planning Committee Vice Chair

\*Members presenting today



# Post COVID Subcommittee Introduction

- Purpose of the Subcommittee
- Determining the “New Normal”
- Best Practices for ASHRAE moving forward



# ASHRAE Post COVID Survey - Purpose

Gather the opinions of our members regarding the Opportunity, Strategy, and the Positioning of ASHRAE. As an organization, ASHRAE can continue meeting virtually which allows for the most efficient and productive use of the member's time in the Post COVID "New Normal".

# ASHRAE Post COVID Survey - Results

## Consistent Themes:

- The virtual meeting was productive use of time
- Virtual meetings are a great option for companies providing continuing education for their employees.
- There should be a future combination of in-person and virtual meetings.
- Are we using the best virtual tools?

# Board of Director Survey – Public Perception

## **ASHRAE has a higher public profile as a result of the pandemic**

- 85% believe it is an advantage, leading to.....
- Increased membership (71%), training course sales (61%) and standard sales (59%)
- Discussions: Focused on overall increased awareness and recognition as an authoritative body

# Board of Director Survey – Public Perception

**When asked how ASHRAE can improve on its public perception, there was no clear path that stood out amongst the others.**

- Top 4: Increasing Research (63%), Increasing Training (54%), Increasing Publications (51%), Enhancing Marketing in the Industry (51%)
- Discussions:
  - Need to be a data driven (research) based organization
  - Forget the public, focus on the HVAC industry... ASHRAE will never win the public

# Board of Director Survey – AHR Expo/Winter Meeting

## **Should ASHRAE stay connected with AHR Expo?**

Without Expo Revenue: 76% agree or strongly agree

With Expo Revenue: 84% agree or strongly agree

**People think “business as usual” will return  
in Las Vegas at a 3:1 ratio  
(versus not returning to normal)**

# Board of Director Survey – AHR Expo/Winter Meeting

## Should ASHRAE stay connected with AHR Expo?

- Discussion
  - A successful vaccine is key
  - Virtual meetings aren't going away
  - Opportunity to reimagine a combined online and in person conference

# Board of Director Survey – Epidemic Task Force (ETF)

## How does the ETF move to the next level?

- Continue to spread information (low cost/no cost)
  - Webinars, through members & chapters, public outreach, etc.
- Continue to update guidance and provide examples

# Board of Director Survey – Epidemic Task Force (ETF)

## How do we integrate ETF within ASHRAE?

- Incorporate into Standards & Develop Standards
- No need to integrate
- Continue to focus on “Normal” building design, not just a pandemic response



# Society Committees Survey - Impact on Group Operations

## Advantages

- It should be easier in the future to have combined in-person and virtual meetings.
- The future should incorporate more remote options to allow for more participation from members that are not always able to travel.
- Recruiting and retaining new/young members the longer we stay virtual

# Society Committees Survey - Impact on Group Operations

## Disadvantages

- Slow down the progress of standards development
- More challenging for new members to the committee to become acquainted with long term members and get active in the committee
- Recruiting and retaining new/young members the longer we stay virtual
- Committee members are struggling in their paid jobs and personal lives, which impacts the time they have to dedicate to volunteering.

# Society Committees Survey - Virtual ASHRAE

## How does “virtual” ASHRAE need to change to be more effective?

- Discussions
  - The effective meeting tool/platform or software should allow member and guest participation at a similar level to what we have during an in-person meeting. Perhaps having administration control or organizer to facilitate appropriate interactions during meetings.
  - Difficult for provisional and corresponding members to engage.
  - Concentrate meetings. Spreading it out over a few months was too much and lost the natural flow of the meetings.

# Society Committees Survey - Virtual ASHRAE

## How can ASHRAE remain effective and an industry leader in the age of virtual meetings?

- Reduce the time of attendees' recognition and introduction and increasing number of meetings per month.
- Having attractive programs and minimizing the long sessions.

# Society Committees Survey - Virtual ASHRAE

## How did your committee find the value of the Annual Virtual Conference?

- 53% of respondents felt indifferent to the value
- 35% of respondents felt the value was high – very high quality

# Regional and Chapter Committees – Virtual Meetings

## Advantages

- Technical content is reaching more members, with greater opportunities for speakers and DL's to talk with members
- 86.7% of respondents thought virtual meetings offered more flexibility for participation
- Only 12% of respondents reported their meeting attendance did not change for the better.
- 94.5% of respondents reported increased engagement and effectiveness with the option of virtual meetings.
- 40% of respondents thought it would be easier to get volunteers to participate at a region/ chapter level, when offering virtual meetings



CELEBRATING  
**125**  
YEARS

# Regional and Chapter Committees – Virtual Meetings

## Disadvantages

- Only 21% of respondents had at least a “good” social event, in comparison to a face-to-face event.

## Discussion (Regarding leveraging the value of virtual meetings)

- 65% responded w/ comments
- More technical content was shared- pandemic topics were of interest; PDH's are valuable.
- More shared meeting presentations between chapters/regions
- Promotion and timely meeting alerts would help more

# Regional and Chapter Committees – Virtual Meetings

## **Discussion** (BOG Perception of virtual meetings)

- 65% responded w/ comments
- Time saving, better programs
- Many comments were that the virtual meetings were perceived as good, effective, and necessary
- Members interested in technical issues are generally satisfied; Members in sales are not
- Promotion and timely meeting alerts would help more
- Generally, groups that used virtual platforms before have better attendance. Some groups have not held a virtual meeting.



CELEBRATING  
**125**  
YEARS



# Regional and Chapter Committees – Virtual Meetings

## **Discussion** (What changes should ASHRAE consider)

- Get back to face-to-face meetings, as soon as safely possible
- Offer hybrid of virtual and in-person content
- Offer success stories of businesses that adapted due to COVID
- Have DALs speak to more than one chapter at a time virtually
- 55-60% of comments mentioned keeping some kind of virtual component



CELEBRATING  
**125**  
YEARS

# First Time and Recurring Virtual Conference Attendee Surveys

## **First Timers “How many virtual conference seminars did you attend?”**

- Roughly 30% said “3-5 seminars”
- 22% said “5-10 seminars”
- Impact Statement? 22% said “no seminars attended”

## **Recurring Attendees “Did you attend more or less seminars/ workshops vs in-person conference?”**

- 27% said “similar”
- 45% said “less or significantly less”

# First Time and Recurring Virtual Conference Attendee Surveys

## Recurring Attendees “How do you envision your ASHRAE Post COVID involvement?”

- Overwhelmingly 60% of recurring attendees said “about the same”
- 26% said “move involved” or “a lot more involved”

# First Time and Recurring Virtual Conference Attendee Surveys

## Which format would you attend if both virtual and in-person conferences are offered?

- **First Timers...**

- 52% said all virtual or mostly virtual
- 23% said mostly in-person

- **Recurring Attendees...**

- 25% said mostly virtual or all virtual
- 51% said mostly in-person or all in-person

# First Time and Recurring Virtual Conference Attendee Surveys

## How does a virtual conference affect your productivity?

- **First Timers...**

- 50% said increases productivity (another 9% said greatly increases)
- 18% said productivity decreased or greatly decreased

- **Recurring Attendees...**

- 34% said increases productivity (another 7% said greatly increases)
- 31% said productivity decreased or greatly decreased



CELEBRATING  
**125**  
YEARS

# First Time and Recurring Virtual Conference Attendee Surveys

## Assuming a vaccine, would you attend 2022 AHR Expo in Las Vegas?

- **First Timers...**

- 27% said absolutely and 24% said possibly (51% total)
- 35% said unlikely or not attending

- **Recurring Attendees...**

- 39% said absolutely and 38% said possibly (77% total)
- 11% said unlikely or not attending

# First Time and Recurring Virtual Conference Attendee Surveys

## How should ASHRAE consider adapting to a Post-COVID culture?

### Highlights...

- On-going hybrid conference formats (virtual/ live)
- One virtual and one in-person conference per year
- Virtual “chat rooms” for topics being covered; encourage small group discussion
- Change in the best possible way depending on the prevailing situation
- The real benefit of ASHRAE is the human connections



# First Time and Recurring Virtual Conference Attendee Surveys

## How should ASHRAE consider adapting to a Post-COVID culture?

- **Highlights...**

- People will travel less and participate virtually more often.  
Optimize for the virtual
- Net Loss to NOT have an in-person conference; may not be readily measurable
- Find ways to make virtual conferences and meetings more connected to the participant; allow more face-to-face viewing (lack of reactions is a detriment)



# Impact of the Coronavirus on our Industry

## **Question for Other Organizations:**

- In what way has Coronavirus changed how your organization conducts business?
- What impact to operations has your organization experienced?
- Has your organization experienced an impact to member participation, if so how?

# Impact of the Coronavirus on our Industry



# How ASHRAE should/could move forward?

## **Are we using the best virtual tools?**



# How ASHRAE should/could move forward?

ASHRAE can continue meeting virtually which allows for the most efficient and productive use of the member's time.

**Are we utilizing the best means to conduct business?**

## Questions or Discussions

D

BOD Open Session Minutes 2020 Nov. 18-19

## Report to the ASHRAE Board of Directors

November 18th, 2020



### AD-HOC Committee Members

Ginger Scoggins, Chair

Darryl Boyce

Michael Cooper

Jeff Littleton, Staff

Tim McGinn, NVM, Chair of TASC (Technical Activities Sub-Committee)

Blake Ellis

Don Brandt

Kent Petersen



# Project Status & Schedule

- ✓ •Sep. 25 and Oct. 23 – design progress reviews with Ad Hoc Committee
  - ✓ •Oct. 4 – issue 95% Architectural/Structural for GMP pricing
  - ✓ •Oct. 11 – issue 95% MEP for GMP pricing
  - ✓ •Oct. 12 – submit to Gwinnett County for Fire/Safety/Health permit
  - ✓ •TBD – submit to Peachtree Corners for building permit (following Gwinnett Co. approval)
  - ✓ •Nov. 4 – Draft GMP due to Design Team for review
  - ✓ •Nov. 7 – GMP proposal due to Owner
  - ✓ •Nov. 15 – Board Meeting
  - ✓ •Dec. 1 – GMP contract amendment
  - ✓ •Jan. 2, 2020 – Mobilization
  - ✓ •Jan. 3, 2020 – 100% reconciled CDs
  - ✓ •Aug. 28 – Substantial Completion
- Sept. 30th

## ADDITIONAL DATES:

- 10/1/30 – 10/30/20 Commissioning Efforts
- ✓ 10/12/2020 Owner Move-In
- ✓ 10/31/2020 Official Move-out date from existing HQ





# PROGRESS PHOTOS

[www.ashrae.org/newhq](http://www.ashrae.org/newhq)







# PROGRESS PHOTOS

---

[www.ashrae.org/newhq](http://www.ashrae.org/newhq)



## Budget & Donations

---

### BUDGET

---

Original BOD Approved Budget:	\$15,750,000
Additional BOD Authorization (July 2019)	\$2,355,000
Additional BOD Authorization (Nov 2019)	\$1,895,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$20,000,000</b>

---

---

### DONATIONS

---

Cash & Pledges	\$6,494,898
In-Kind Equipment & Services	\$4,054,928
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$10,549,826</b>

---



• Unused Owner's Contingency	\$365,292
• Unused Contractor's Savings	\$163,828
• Allowances	
• Contractor Contingency	
	<hr/>
<b>TOTAL REMAINING FUNDS:</b>	<b>\$529,120</b>

Recent Final Costs

• Appliances	(\$73,154)
• Deck Furniture	
• BAS Dashboard	
• Acoustical Door Seals	
• Additional low-voltage wiring	
	<hr/>
• <b>Current Remaining Funds:</b> (Approximately 2% of \$20 million)	<b>\$472,203</b>



# Georgia Power Rebate:

## Prescriptive:

Improvements	Rebate Total Amount
Partial Building Lighting - New Construction	\$4,920.00
Reflective Roof	\$1,400.00
Variable Speed Drive - HVAC Fans	\$2,000.00
Variable Speed Drive - HVAC Pumps	\$31,250.00
Daylight Sensor	\$1,000.00
<b>Total Rebate: \$40,570.00</b>	

**Actual Georgia Power Rebate: \$34,255**



# Photo-voltaic System

System Size 319.13 kW DC



Estimated Energy Production (Year 1): 435,124 kWh



## Costs:

- PV \$500,000
- Site \$50,000
- Total \$550,000





Questions?

---

