



# International Energy Conservation Code Consistency and Administrative Subcommittee

## Meeting Agenda

March 29, 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.

Chair calls the meeting to order at 12:01pm

2. Roll Call.

Vice Chair calls roll. 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. RED1-21-22 Pt I, Pt II – Bruce Swieciki, NPGA

a. Bruce – Intent is to open up the possibilities for carbon reduction. Definition for Renewable Biomass is similar, if not identical, to what the EPA uses.

i. Rich – Where will a code official see this and how will they validate this material in the energy code. What does this mean to a code official by putting this in here?

ii. Bruce – Through other refinements in the code, there will be opportunity to leverage these fuels. Similar to certification of renewable energy into the power grid. The fuel mix that's being delivered, in the case of propane, is a renewable fuel to a certain proportion and that will allow you to leverage the code to reduce the carbon intensity associated with the building.

iii. Rich – So there is a certification body? The code official will be able to receive a document that states the fuel being delivered to the structure is going to be in compliance?

iv. Bruce – That's correct.

- v. Rich – Wouldn't it make sense to list that certification body somewhere or are we not to that point yet?
  - vi. Bruce – We're not there yet. We don't have the infrastructure available to do that at the moment. So until that time, this will be a placeholder for the implementation in the future.
  - vii. Michael Rhodes – A lot of these biomass conversations happened last week. Do we have access to the results of those conversations with the commercial side?
  - viii. Bruce – Diana Burk and several others had submitted proposals on the commercial side very similar to what we are discussing right now. Diana and some of her colleagues are working on refining the details.
  - ix. Kris – The committee proposal that was put forward was not approved by the consensus committee. The minutes for that meeting are posted on the committee's website, but overall it was not successful.
  - x. Jim Edelson – Working with Diana. Has tried to include a definition and certification process in the proposal and has not been successful. Will be withdrawing any attempt to approve a specification for a renewable biomass.
  - xi. Steven Rosenstock – On the commercial committee. At the meeting last week all of the biomass proposals were disapproved by the full committee.
  - xii. Jim – New Buildings Institute is opposed to these definitions. Asks the committee to vote for disapproval.
  - xiii. Michael Rhodes – Based on the conversations today and the previous actions of the commercial committees, motion for disapproval.
  - xiv. Rich – Seconds the motion. Likes where the proposal is going, but as a code official he needs more to ensure proper enforcement. Great comments. Moving in the right direction. Not ready yet for this edition.
  - xv. Votes: 5-1-0 for disapproval.
- b. RED1-22-22 – Diana Burk, NBI
- a. Jim Edelson – Believes this is the correct way to address the renewable fuels question. This should apply to propane, biodiesel, and biofuels, both liquid and gaseous. Asks for disapproval since this still needs more work.
  - b. Robin Yochum – Would you be amenable to withdrawing so it doesn't go to the full committee?
  - c. Jim – I'm not listed, but yes.
  - d. Steven Rosenstock – Only the proponent can withdraw.
  - e. Kris – Dianna could send an email to withdraw.
  - f. Maureen – Motion to disapprove at the request of the proponent's coworker.
  - g. Rich – Second
  - h. Votes – 6-0-0 in favor of the motion.
- c. RED1-23-22 - Diana Burk, NBI
- a. Jim Edelson – This is the language that was approved and published in the first comment draft on the commercial side. Wants to further refine the definition of biomass with the definition of Biomass Waste. Improves the enforceability. Ensures this is a renewable resource. Urgers committee approval.
  - b. Steve Rosenstock – A problem with the definition is that the term "biofuel" is an umbrella term that covers various liquids, gasses, and solids.
  - c. Tom Ortiz, NPGA – The question has arisen as to how the delivery of certain fuel sources could be enforced by a code official. Offers the opinion that in almost any case the code official has no idea where an energy source comes from.

- d. Michael Rhodes – Motion for disapproval based on similar conversations at the commercial level and other conversations that this isn't ready yet. Need to incorporate measures to properly validate and track at the code official level.
- e. Andrea – Second
- f. Votes – 6-0-0 for disapproval.

5. Other business

6. Upcoming meetings:

7. Adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 12:51 EST

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION BE SURE TO VISIT THE ICC WEBSITE:

[ICC Energy webpage](#)

[Code Change Monograph](#)