



## International Energy Conservation Code Consistency and Administrative Subcommittee

### Meeting Notes

February 15, 2023  
12:00 PM EST to 2:00 PM EST (2 hours)

[Webex Link](#)

**Committee Chair:** Richard Potts  
**Committee Vice Chair:** Rich Truitt

1. Call to order.
  - a. Chair calls the meeting to order at 12:02 pm EST
  - b. Moment of silence for Heather Goggin
2. Roll Call.
  - a. Absent members:
    - Cliff Davis
  - b. Quorum established
3. Meeting Conduct. Staff
  - a. Identification of Representation/Conflict of Interest
  - b. ICC [Council Policy 7](#) Committees: Section 5.1.10 Representation of Interests
  - c. ICC [Code of Ethics](#): ICC advocates commitment to a standard of professional behavior that exemplifies the highest ideals and principles of ethical conduct which include integrity, honesty, and fairness. As part of this commitment it is expected that participants shall act with courtesy, competence and respect for others.
4. Action Items – Review Code Change Proposals.
  - a. RED1-18-22 (Carried over from 2/1/23 - Robert Schwarz, representing BUILDTank, Inc. ([robby@btankinc.com](mailto:robby@btankinc.com)))
    - Robert – Provides background of the proposal.
      - Greg Johnson – In the definition, we put a requirement, which may be problematic. Sees the word “confirmed” in several applications and would like clarity on who is confirming.
      - Robert – More than happy to use “shall” instead of “must” in the definition. “Confirmed” is already in the code in the R405 section where a cost compliance report is supposed to be created and submitted for permitting. The same language is also used in R406 for the energy rating compliance path. That language is being used to demonstrate the different time periods for when the compliance documents are to be turned in.
      - Ric Johnson – Would like to change the word “must” to “shall”

- Greg Johnson – Suggested the requirement in the definition be removed entirely and that neither “must” nor “shall” should be in the definition.
  - Andrea Papageorge – Agrees that requirements should not be in definitions. Recommends, “Documents created to demonstrate compliance that are developed and reviewed prior to the issuance of the building permit or before certificate of occupancy is released.”
  - Robert – Agrees with this change.
  - Chair – Asks for a motion based on the modified language.
  - Maureen Guttman – Moves to submit as modified. There are multiple requirements for compliance documentation throughout the code; this language clarifies that the requirements use a defined term, similar to construction documents.
  - Ric Johnson – Second.
  - Votes:
    - Unanimous approval.
- b. RED1-8-22 - Mike Nugent, representing BCAC ([bcac@iccsafe.org](mailto:bcac@iccsafe.org))
- Proponent not present. Chair opens the floor for discussion.
  - Ric Johnson – Moves to approve
  - Andrea Papageorge – Seconds the motion to provide consistency with the other International Codes regarding appendices. Doesn’t have a problem with this but does not think it’s necessary.
  - Michael Rhodes – Question on consistency. Is this section special so that it requires this type of statement? If so, should this be added in other sections?
  - Greg Johnson – BCAAC is working on adding this to all of the codes. Believes this is a very good change.
  - Ric Johnson – BCAAC is placing this here, and in all of the codes, so jurisdictions know that appendices must be specifically adopted.
  - Votes:
    - Unanimous approval.
- c. RED1-9-22 - Mike Nugent, representing BCAC ([bcac@iccsafe.org](mailto:bcac@iccsafe.org))
- Proponent not present. Chair opens the floor for discussion.
  - Ric Johnson – BCAAC is trying to align the codes. Moves to approve because this proposal aligns with the other codes.
  - Michael Rhodes – Second.
  - Votes:
    - Unanimous approval
- d. RED1-10-22 - Mike Nugent, representing BCAC ([bcac@iccsafe.org](mailto:bcac@iccsafe.org))
- Proponent not present. Chair opens the floor for discussion.
  - Ric Johnson – BCAAC is adding language to align the IECC with other I-codes. Moves to accept as presented to align the IECC with the other I-codes
  - Andrea Papageorge – Seconds. Checked the other codes and the language is there.
  - Votes:
    - Unanimous approval
- e. RED1-15-22 - Adam Berry, representing Colorado Energy Office ([adam.berry@state.co.us](mailto:adam.berry@state.co.us))
- Adam Berry – Intent is to align the inspection requirements with the  
**Copyright © 2021 International Code Council, Inc.**

requirements of the code. Wants to ensure that proper panel space and capacity is to correct.

- Joe Cain (SEIA) – Is this intended to call the attention of the inspector to include this at rough-in?
- Adam Berry – We wanted to align the requirements in appendix RB, similar to how we've aligned the solar ready requirements, with this section.
- Michael Rhodes – Is the person who inspecting the wire going to have to verify the calculations for the requirement amount of space and capacity?
- Adam Berry – Does not have a response to the specifics of the rough in process and how this is reviewed.
- Ric Johnson – In order to pull an electrical permit you have to do a load calculation and during rough in you have to pull the correct wire and the panel has to be sized to have the correct space. Thinks this is unnecessary
- Adam Berry – We are trying to make this holistic with the NEC.
- Ric Johnson – When you add “proper panel space and capacity..” you have redundant language.
- Steve Rosenstock (Edison Electric Institute) – The beginning of the section states, “electrical system,” so wouldn't that cover the panels?
- Ric Johnson – Not trying to change additional language, but yes that includes the panel, the meter, what the power company will bring in, etc. Moves for disapproval. Believes this is unnecessary language that's already covered in Section R105.2.6
- Andrea Papageorge – Seconds the motion.
- Votes:
  - Unanimous disapproval.

f. RED1-16-22 - Robert Schwarz, representing BUILDTank, Inc. ([robby@btankinc.com](mailto:robby@btankinc.com))

- Robert Schwarz – Provides overview of the proposal. Energy code is becoming more complex and there is a variety of computer driven modeling required in some of the pathways. Energy consultants are creating compliance documents and potentially going in the field for inspections. This creates some confusion in the field because third party approved inspection agencies are not always on the same page as the authority having jurisdiction. This proposal outlines the relationship between the AHJ and third-party inspector.
- Joe Cain (SEIA) – Proposal has merit and could be useful but there is some language issues in terms of things that are defined and things that are not defined. In using the term “approved third party” – there's no definition.
- Greg Johnson – Also has concerns related to language. For instance, “Where authorized” might work better as “Where approved”. The sentences aren't structured in a way to best present the idea of what is trying to be captured.
- Robert Schwarz – There is precedence in the language of the current code with “approved third party inspection agency”, so that's where that language came from. Understands the issues with the language and wants to point out that when approved third parties are utilized in the field, they often don't understand they have the authority to fail an inspection. Because that isn't clearly discussed in this scope section, it causes great confusion in the field or the builder, for the third-party, and for the

jurisdiction. It sounds that people think this has some merit. Is willing to bring this back with guidance from Joe and Greg to make this language work better within the context of the code and address the issues that we are seeing.

- Greg – Starting place for redeveloping might be Ch. 17 of the IBC.
- Michael Rhodes – Likes the idea for working on the language and bringing it back. There are some positives in this but needs to be relocated a bit with members of the subcommittee.
- Andrea Papageorge – Agrees there's merit in this. Likes the idea of fleshing out "third party inspection agencies".
- Maureen Guttman – Moves to table until the next meeting on March 1st.
- Andrea Papageorge – Seconds the motion.
- Votes:
  - Unanimous.

g. RED1-17-22 - Mike Nugent, representing BCAC ([bcac@iccsafe.org](mailto:bcac@iccsafe.org))

- Proponent absent from meeting.
- Ric Johnson – This is a coordination by BCAAC. Moves to approve as submitted as this continues to coordinate within the family of codes.
- Michael Rhodes – Second.
  - Votes:
    - 3 approval
    - 1 abstention (Chair)

h. RED1-7-22 - Ryan Meres, representing RESNET ([ryan.meres@gmail.com](mailto:ryan.meres@gmail.com))

- Ryan Meres – Provides overview of the proposal. Purpose is to update the referenced standard
- Andrea Papageorge – You said this is going to be approved. Is this not approved yet?
- Ryan – Only addendum C is not approved yet.
- Andrea Papageorge – Based on other committees, if the addenda has not been published, then we don't let it come into the code.
- Ryan – This is similar to what we've done in the past. Under the 2018 code we did a reprint of the standard so all of the addenda are included.
- Michael Rhodes – Would there be any objection to table for two meetings to let this catch up?
- Ryan – Does not have any objection to that. Public comment goes until Feb 27<sup>th</sup> and then those comments go to the committee and then standards management board for final approval. It could take a month or two.
- Kris – Another option is if you could approve it and there's still the option after public comment draft 2 to make modifications. You could take action on it today and then if there are any issues you could take care of it during public comment draft 2.
- Ric Johnson – If we did take action on this and Addendum C does not receive approval, it would just be taken out, right?
- Kris – Correct.
- Ric Johnson – So there's really no downside to approving it today. Moves to accept the language as is because we want the most up-to-date Resnet language in the IECC 2024.
- Andrea Papageorge – Second.
- Votes :
  - 3 approval

- 1 abstention (Chair)

5. Other business – Review Code Change Proposals if Time Permits.

a. RED1-26-22

b. RED1-6-22

6. Upcoming meetings: March 1, 2023

7. Adjourned at 1:11pm EST

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION BE SURE TO VISIT THE ICC WEBSITE:  
[ICC Energy webpage](#)  
[Code Change Monograph](#)