



MINUTES

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, November 10, 2025

Note: These draft minutes have not been approved and are not the official record until approved by the Executive Committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, November 10, 2025

CALL TO ORDER.....	2
VALUE STATEMENT.....	2
ROLL CALL/INTRODUCTIONS.....	2
REVIEW OF MEETING AGENDA.....	2
APPROVAL OF MINUTES.....	2
REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS.....	2
AASA APPLICATION	3-4
FINANCE COMMITTEE PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOD	4-5
IEQ HUB PROPOSED MOTION	5-7
PROPOSED DEI STANDING COMMITTEE	7-8
EXECUTIVE SESSION	8
UPCOMING MEETINGS.....	8
ADJOURNMENT.....	9

PRINCIPAL APPROVED MOTIONS

Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, November 10, 2025

No. - Pg.	Motion
2 – 4	MOTION 1 – AREA (<i>Air Conditioning and Refrigeration European Contractors Association</i>) be approved for membership in AASA - be postponed until the December ExCom meeting.
3 – 6	The Executive Committee requests that the Board of Directors approve the formation of a new standing committee called the Indoor Environmental Quality Center of Excellence (IEQ CE) beginning February 1, 2026.
4 - 7	ExCom recommends to the Board of Directors that a DEI standing committee be created that reports to Members Council.

ACTION ITEMS
 Executive Committee Meeting
 Monday, November 10, 2025

No. - Pg.	Responsibility	Summary of Action	Status	Goal Date
1 – 2	Bassel Anbari + GTIC RAL Regional Liaison	Develop a recommendation for a liaison to GSO. (Assigned March 20-22, 2025)		
2 – 2	Seymour	Develop a three-year business plan for hiring more staff, expanding CEC, and running more topical conferences. The action plan will be reviewed by ExCom at a future meeting. (Assigned March 20-22, 2025)		2026 Winter Conference
3 – 2	McQuade + Littleton	Develop a high-level framework for expanding education and training into the HVAC&R trade/technician/operator training. Contact SMACNA about training collaboration, specifically SMART104. The recommendation will be reviewed by ExCom at a future meeting. (Assigned March 20-22, 2025)		
4 – 2	Staff + McQuade	Cross reference the list of UNEP members with ASHRAE members to identify subject matter experts who would be good candidates to serve on UNEP technical action committees. (Assigned June 21+25, 2025)		
5 – 2	Littleton	Work to update the current NEBB MOU and submit to NEBB leadership for approval. (Assigned June 21+25, 2025)		
6 – 2	Jim Wolf	Investigate opportunities to expand ASHRAE's relationship with UNEP into other areas; for example, energy efficiency and IEQ. (Assigned June 21+25, 2025)		2026 Winter Conference
7 - 2	McQuade	Investigate if carbon offset purchases should continue and, if so, who they should be purchased for. (Assigned June 21+25, 2025)		2026 Winter Conference



MINUTES
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, November 10, 2025

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bill McQuade, President
Sarah Maston, President-Elect
Ashish Rakheja, Treasurer
Devin Abellon, Vice President
Ken Fulk, Vice President
Trent Hunt, Vice President
Andres Sepulveda, Vice President
Jeff Littleton, Secretary

GUESTS PRESENT:

Bassel Anbari	Jason Alphonso
Buzz Wright	Jonathan Smith
Carrie Brown	Julia Timberman
Corey Metzger	Maggie Moninski
Daniel Nall	Mahroo Eftekhari
Doug Cochrane	Martin Dieryckx
Genevieve Lussier	Mike Pouchak
Pankaj Dharkar	Ong Ching Loon
Pat Marks	Rob Craddock
Sherry Abbott-Adkins	Scott Peach
Wade Conlan	Steve Kujak

STAFF PRESENT:

Candace Denton, Sr. Manager - Board Services
Chandrias Jolly, Manager - Board Services
Vanita Gupta, Director – Marketing
Lizzy Seymour – Director – Member Services
Mark Owen, Director - Publications & Education
Kirstin Pilot, Director - Development
Stephanie Reiniche, Director - Technology
Alice Yates, Director - Government Affairs
Craig Wright, Director of Finance

Tammy Catchings, Manager – Region Activities
Daniel Gurley, Sr. Manager - Membership
Rhiannon Masterson, Manager – Chapter Programs
Selina Parks, Manager – Conferences Services

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 am.

VALUE STATEMENT

Mr. McQuade read the value statement and advised that the full code of ethics, core values and diversity statements were available online.

ROLL CALL/INTRODUCTIONS

Roll call was conducted; members, guests, and staff were in attendance as noted above.

REVIEW OF MEETING AGENDA

Mr. McQuade reviewed the meeting agenda. There were no changes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the June 21 + 25, 2025 open session ExCom meeting were approved via acclamation without objection.

REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS

Action item 1 was reported as ongoing. It was reported that GSO is based in Saudi Arabia, and it was suggested that a member from the chapter could serve as liaison. It was also suggested that the liaison coordinate with GTIC, the GTIC regional liaison, and the DRC. AI 1-7

The action item was updated to be assigned to Mr. Anbari and the GTIC Regional Liaison from RAL.

Action item 2 was reported as ongoing. It was reported that the date of completion would be the 2026 Winter Conference.

Action item 3 was reported as ongoing. The action item was updated to be assigned to Mr. McQuade and Mr. Littleton. Additional action of contacting SMACNA about training collaboration, specifically SMART104, was added to the ongoing action item.

Action item 4 was reported as complete. It was reported that a process was in place and a pilot was being conducted.

Action item 5 was reported as ongoing. It was reported that the date of completion would be the 2026 Winter Conference.

Action item 6 was reported as complete.

Action item 7 was reported as ongoing.

Action items 8 and 9 were reported as ongoing. It was reported that the date of completion would be the 2026 Winter Conference.

AASA APPLICATION

Mr. Littleton reported that AREA (Air Conditioning and Refrigeration European Contractors Association) was a large trade association, based in Italy, that represents contractors and manufacturers. He suggested that they would be a good fit for AASA. He reported that AREA has also requested an MOU with Society.

It was reported that ExCom approves AASA membership and new members are reported to the BOD via the ExCom report to the BOD.

Mr. McQuade asked if the request for an MOU reflected AREA's desire to collaborate with Society.

Mr. Littleton responded that he spoke to AREA leadership and they provided a short list of items that could be included in an MOU. He reported that AREA currently interviews the ASHRAE President and features that interview in their magazine.

Mr. McQuade moved and Mr. Abellon seconded that

1. AREA (Air Conditioning and Refrigeration European Contractors Association) be approved for membership in AASA.

There was discussion of the motion. A summary of that discussion is below:

Spoke in favor of the motion. AREA is based in Brussels, and they are an association of associations. They have limited members because their members are associations in each country. Request that any collaborations with AREA be sensitive to Society's relationship with REHVA.

AREA is a completely separate group and is not part of REHVA. AREA is a national association of installers.

There may be AREA members that are already members of AASA. Speak in favor of reaching out to many organizations via one group.

Should AREA be part of AASA or should we enter into an MOU? As they are an association of associations, does an MOU make sense?

Suggest that it could go either way. REHVA is not a member of AASA but some of their member associations are. If we follow that pattern, AREA should not be added to AASA and an MOU should be created.

U3ARC is a member of AASA and they are also an association of associations so there is precedence for that path as well.

Suggest that from a fundamental standpoint ExCom decide how associations like AREA and REHVA are handled as it relates to AASA membership and an MOU.

Mr. Sepulveda offered to investigate this request further. He expressed that he had a good relationship with AREA leadership.

Mr. Hunt moved and Mr. Fulk seconded that

2. MOTION 1 – AREA (Air Conditioning and Refrigeration European Contractors Association) be approved for membership in AASA - be postponed until the December ExCom meeting.

MOTION 2 PASSED (Unanimous Voice Vote, CNV).

FINANCE COMMITTEE PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOD

Mr. Rakheja led a discussion of the Finance Committee Planning Subcommittee recommendation:

The Planning Subcommittee recommends to the Finance Committee a minimum dues increase of \$12 (based on the dues calculation formula) for SY26-27, which is inclusive of a \$3 offset due to future fund annual returns.

Mr. Littleton encouraged members of ExCom to not draw final conclusions as a result of the discussion. He expressed concern at subsets of the BOD coming to conclusions in advance of the BOD discussion and before hearing all comments from BOD members.

Mr. Rakheja thanked Mr. Littleton and advised that the discussion was intended to be an information item for ExCom. He reported that the recommendation was on the upcoming BOD meeting agenda and would be discussed and voted on there.

He reported that Society has two formulas that are used each year to assist the Finance Committee in developing a recommendation to the BOD regarding dues. The two formulas were shown on the screen. He reported that the last dues increase, two years ago, was a large increase because dues had not increased for some time. As a result of not increasing dues for the past two years, Society now has a “dues back log.” He reported that the Finance Committee is considering a dues increase between \$15 and \$45 to address this “back log.”

He reported that the draft budget for the upcoming Society Year included higher than average revenue from the AHR Expo because it will be in Las Vegas. The first draft budget for next Society Year reflects a proposed deficit of \$495,000.

He reported that the Finance Committee will be recommending a dues increase of \$15 from the BOD. He explained that the lower end of the range is recommended because Society reserves are healthy. He reported that the recommended net increase is \$12 as \$3 would come from the Future Fund.

Mr. McQuade asked for clarification on AHR Mexico revenue in the upcoming Society Year. Mr. Littleton advised that there would be an AHR Mexico expo in Guadalajara; however, Guadalajara was the smaller of the three shows so there would be less revenue than was realized in the current SY.

Mr. Rakheja stated that the current budget reflected a small surplus based on the assumption that Society would receive additional funds from the DOE grant.

Mr. Littleton reported that DOE had circulated a list of grants to be terminated and Society's grant was on the list. He stated that Society does not know the final status of the grant and anything can happen at this point; because of this, Society has decided to move forward with work on the grant until an official stop work order is received.

He advised that if the grant were to be cancelled, the financial exposure would be less than \$400,000 in the current Society Year and the next two Society Year's related to staff costs surrounding the budget that would have otherwise been reimbursed had the grant not been cancelled.

IEQ HUB PROPOSED MOTION

Mr. McQuade yielded the floor to Mr. Conlan.

Mr. Conlan thanked the IEQ Strategic Evaluation Ad Hoc for their great work. He reviewed that ad hoc's charge and shared the group's presentation; the presentation was shown on screen and was attached to the agenda.

He reported that there was consensus from the ad hoc that a new standing committee was needed.

It was suggested that affordability be a focus of Society moving forward. He suggested that affordability is even more important as it relates to residential buildings.

Mr. McQuade responded that there have been discussions with other organizations related to affordability. He suggested that Society should focus on the "why" of buildings – the people in them – and that should be emphasized. He expressed that the EHC isn't built to do the kind of outreach to other parts of ASHRAE that the proposed IEQ Hub would touch, which is another reason to approve this new committee to drive that outreach.

Ms. Maston expressed a structural concern – when the CEBD was formed it was focused on strategy and implementation but they are now saying they are just strategic. She expressed concern that if Society continues to split implementation from strategy there will be a bump in the road. She expressed her opinion that the split was not fair to the members or the groups expected to handle implementation. She stated that Society needed more members to think strategically and if Society continues to compartmentalize that will not happen.

She stated that she more appreciated the model that the Planning Committee has used where there is an implementation subcommittee; putting responsibility for implementation on one or two people puts a lot of pressure on those representative members.

Mr. Conlan responded that there would be representation from EHC.

It was asked if the current liaisons from TAC and Standards would be carried over from the ad hoc to the proposed standing committee. It was also asked if EHC would be satisfied with the new structure.

Mr. Conlan responded that some members expressed a desire to add positions on the committee, but others were comfortable moving forward and seeing if additional changes were needed further down the road.

Mr. Rakheja expressed agreement with Ms. Maston. He shared his opinion that there is merit to having everything combined and that liaisons can create silos.

Mr. Fulk shared his opinion that efficiencies gained at all levels related to the elimination of duplication would result in EHC not needing new members.

Mr. Conlan agreed and suggested that no changes be made at this time and that EHC be allowed to adjust membership as needed in the future.

Mr. Alphonso expressed concern at the creation of standing committees to support a Presidential theme. He expressed concern that ambitious changes to Society's structure were outpacing member and staff capacity.

Mr. Conlan responded that it may appear as though this recommendation was a result of Mr. McQuade's Presidential theme, but these recommendations are supported by other members, independent of the current Society theme.

Ms. Reiniche reported that she discussed the proposed change with her team and there was consensus that the current Technology staff team could absorb the additional responsibilities of a new standing committee.

Mr. McQuade reported that IEQ was included in the current and previous strategic plan. He expressed his opinion that the Presidential theme should help drive the strategic plan. He stated that the intent is to obtain grants that would help to offset the costs of staff and projects. He added that there were a lot of opportunities to engage with other organizations that focus on the health of specific populations like children and the elderly.

He stated that this recommendation would pull what are now separate entities together and allow them to move forward from a strategic standpoint.

Mr. Littleton reported that the creation of a new standing committee was not automatically considered a major organizational change per the rules. When the CEBD was created, the BOD voted to consider it a major organizational change. If this recommendation were to be approved by ExCom, it would be up to the BOD to determine if it is a major organizational change or not.

Mr. McQuade moved and Mr. Fulk seconded that

3. The Executive Committee requests that the Board of Directors approve the formation of a new standing committee called the Indoor Environmental Quality Center of Excellence (IEQ CE) beginning February 1, 2026.

Mr. McQuade reviewed the background; it was shown on the screen and attached to the agenda.

He reported that the fiscal impact would be between \$232,000 and \$272,000. General Reserves would be used initially, with the goal of the Future Fund offsetting some or all the associated costs in the years to come. Additional details on the fiscal impact were included in the report which was attached to the agenda and shown on screen.

He reported that staff believe these activities can be supported by existing staff and that this could be added to the responsibilities of the Manager of Decarbonization. Additional details on the staff impact were included in the report which was attached to the agenda and shown on screen.

There was additional discussion of the recommendation.

Mr. Hunt spoke in favor of the motion. He shared his opinion that if Society is to be a factor in IEQ a center of excellence was needed.

He also expressed concern at the fiscal impact. He stated that it would be ideal if Society could find other ways to help cover the costs.

Mr. Conlan clarified that fiscal impact was without any outside grants; the fiscal impact provided was the upper limit of what would be needed but the goal is to spend less.

MOTION 3 PASSED (Unanimous Voice Vote, CNV).

PROPOSED DEI STANDING COMMITTEE

Ms. Maston reported on behalf of the DEI Grassroots Ad Hoc Committee. The full report was attached to the agenda and shown on the screen.

She reported that the ad hoc was created to do a deep dive into requests from the regions and chapters for additional guidance on implementing DEI initiatives at the grassroots level. The ad hoc's final recommendation is to create a new standing committee that would report to Members Council.

Mr. McQuade reported that DEI positions were created at the chapter and regional levels and they were essentially tasked with developing policies and initiatives on their own. The BOD DEI Subcommittee was contacted for assistance and that group advised that their charge was focused on Society level strategy. He stated that the recommendation was developed to help support members who have been asked to take on these roles at the grassroots level.

Mr. Maston moved and Mr. Abellon seconded that

4. ExCom recommends to the Board of Directors that a DEI standing committee be created that reports to Members Council.

There was discussion of the motion. A summary of that discussion is below:

Did not speak for or against the motion. Suggested that the Historical Committee was in a similar position in that they are a Society level committee that provides guidance to the Regional and Chapter Historians. The Historical Committee had a gap where the information provided didn't necessarily get to the members that needed it; this gap has since been addressed. Tend to think that something similar should happen with the DEI Subcommittee. Is there a less expensive way to address this issue? Expressed concern with discussions of "equity goals" and what that means in practice.

Right now, there is not a committee providing guidance to Regional and Chapter DEI Chairs. The recommendation would create an entity to provide that guidance. Currently, Regional and Chapter DEI Chairs are developing policies and presentations on their own – this has been successful thus far but there could be a situation where these materials do not align with Society's position. Feel that we are not currently providing support to grassroots members who have been assigned this task.

Members Council is already burdened to the point that they can't finish their meetings on time.

The BOD DEI Subcommittee voted unanimously in favor of this recommendation. The DEI Subcommittee has not had the time to put resources together for the grassroots and the group felt a standing committee would be beneficial to move Society forward as a whole. The number one complaint from Chapter and Regional DEI Chairs has been lack of resources and support.

Spoke in favor of the motion. This has been needed for quite some time to provide consistency at the grassroots level.

Do not feel that a BOD DEI Subcommittee is needed if a new standing committee is approved.

MOTION 4 PASSED (4:1:1, CNV). Mr. Rakheja voted against and Mr. Fulk abstained.

Mr. Rakheja provided the following reason for his negative vote – *In my opinion, DEI is a culture of an organization, and one does not require a standing committee to enforce culture. The existing BOD subcommittee has done commendable work in conveying the message effectively. While additional funds may be allocated for activities of DEI, creating a standing committee is not the best use of ASHRAE resources and time.*

Mr. Fulk provided the following reason for his abstention – *My concerns were several:*

1. *I did not think we needed two separate standing committees doing a lot of the same thing (IMO).*
2. *Based on the above we could avoid the added expense of a second committee. I think we need to pick which one we want and go that route.*
3. *I felt that the existing DEI Subcommittee was fully capable of providing guidance and resources to the regions and chapters, if done in the manner I described (minimum of quarterly communication to regional and chapter chairs to include at least two local chapter officers).*
4. *There was wording under "Scope and Purpose," Item #4, which says, "Measure and report progress toward diversity and equity goals through data collection and performance metrics." I am not sure what that means and I am fearful that language could lead to unintended consequences which would create bigger issues down the road. Someone needs to explain what this means. I cannot vote for it if no one can explain what this means.*
5. *We do have other successful examples of grassroots guidance being provided by a Society Standing Committee which also addresses Society level scope (Historical Committee).*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Executive session was called at 9:56 am.

Open session reconvened at 10:32 am.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

There was a discussion of availability of a second November conference call; November 17 from 7:00 – 9:00 am ET was selected.

It was discussed that agenda items not discussed at this meeting as well as selection of the 2026 Fall BOD meeting location would be discussed at the November 17th meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:43 am without objection.

Jeff Littleton

Jeff H. Littleton, Secretary