



International Energy Conservation Code Electric Power, Lighting, and Renewables (PLR) Subcommittee

Meeting Agenda

Aug. 7, 2023

11:00 AM EST to 12:30 PM EDT (1.5-hours)

[Webex Link](#)

Committee Chair: Michael Jouaneh (mjouaneh@lutron.com); **Committee Vice Chair:** Jack Bailey (jbailey@oneluxstudio.com); **Note Taker:** Michael Myer (Michael.myer@pnnl.gov)

1. Call to order – Jouaneh [**start 11:02 am**]
2. Roll Call – Bailey (11 SC voting members needed for quorum)

	First Name	Last Name	Category	Company
	Ali	Alaswadi*	Gov. Regulator	DC
X	Jack	Bailey*	User	One Lux Studio/Int'l Assoc. of Lighting Designers
x	Bernard	Bauer	User	Integrated Lighting Concepts
x	Payam	Bozorgchami	Gov. Regulator	CA Energy Comm
x	Joe	Cain	Manufacturer	Solar Industries Assoc
x	Nick	Ferzacca	User	IMEG Corp.
x	Anthony	Floyd*	Gov. Regulator	City of Scottsdale
	Glenn	Heinmiller	User	Lam Partners/Int'l Assoc. of Lighting Designers
x	Bryan	Holland*	Standards Promulgator	NEMA
x	Harold	Jepsen	Manufacturer	Legrand
x	Michael	Jouaneh*	Manufacturer	Lutron
x	Joyce	Kelly	User	GLHN Architects & Engineers
x	Andrew	Klein*	Consumer	BOMA
x	Mark	Lien	Standards Promulgator	IES
x	Jon	McHugh	Gov. Regulator	McHugh Energy
	Hope	Medina*	Gov. Regulator	Cherry Hills Village
	Melissa	Moseley*	User	HDR/American Society of Interior Designers
	Susan	Musngi*	Consumer	Camden
x	Michael	Myer	Consultant	PNNL
x	Steven	Rosenstock*	Utility	Edison Electric Institute
x	Wayne	Stoppelmoor	Manufacturer	Schneider Electric
	Mitchell	Tolbert	Gov. Regulator	City of Austin
x	Michael	Turns	Utility	MA Program Administrator

*denotes member of EC4 consensus committee

3. Introduction of any guests -- Bailey (name/representation type into chat)

4. Review/approve agenda – Jouaneh
 - 1st – Steve Rosenstock
 - 2nd – Anthony Floyd
 - Agenda Approved
5. Meeting conduct -- Jouaneh
6. Review key actions from last meeting and approve minutes – Jouaneh **[end by 11:10 am]**
 - Discussed that electric ready passed the SC but failed at the larger committee.
 - Stairwell controls passed the SC, but failed at the larger committee.
7. Update on process/schedule – Jouaneh/Bailey
8. New business. **[end by 12:20 pm]**

Energy Monitoring (2)

CE2D-30-23	C405.13.2	Energy monitoring	Bryan Holland	bryan.holland@nema.org
CE2D-31-23	C405.13.2	End-use metering categories	Steven Rosenstock	srosenstock@eei.org

CE2D-30

- Rosenstock: Opposes as it is a “half measure”
- Discussion about possibly tabling related to other measure
- Motion to Table until last meeting in August:
 - 1st – Wayne Stopplemoor
 - 2nd – Bryan Holland
 - Vote: No opposition to tabling

CE2D-31

- Rosenstock: Adds language for EV charging. This is for on-site purposes
- Tillou: Good intent / concepts, but this is different than how modeling works
- Jepsen: Agrees with Tillou, also, focus on the purpose of energy monitoring
- McHugh: Disagrees with entire proposal
- Ferzacca: Questioned if applied to all vehicle fuel including
- Motion to disapprove:
 - 1st – Wayne Stopplemoor
 - 2nd – Jon McHugh
 - Vote: 12 – 3 – 0 – 1
 - Reason statement: Meters are needed to disaggregate the energy used to charge vehicles from the energy used by the building.

EVSE and ESS (4)

CE2D-35-23	C405.14	EV minimum power requirements	Quincy Davis	quincyd@mac.com
CE2D-37-23 PI	C405.14.5.2	EV circuit capacity	Quincy Davis	quincyd@mac.com
CE2D-36-23	C405.14.5	EV system and circuit capacity	Eric Tate	eric.tate@atmosenergy.com
CE2D-38-23	C405.16.2.4	ESS-ready min system capacity	Steven Rosenstock	srosenstock@eei.org

CE2D-35 / 37

- Stenger: 35 is a comment and not a modification. Suggests only acting on 37.

- Holland: Speaking in opposition
- McHugh: Spoke in support, raised concerns of over building
- Jepsen: Dwell time is not addressed in this change
- Holland: 50A is a compromise between high-powered DCFC and low-powered cord-and-plug connected EVSE.
- Motion for disapproval:
 - 1st – Harold Jepsen
 - 2nd – Bryan Holland
 - Vote: 13 – 0 – 1 – 1
 - Reason statement: Does not provide sufficient charge rate for EV in commercial buildings

CE2D-36

- Tate: Would lead to carbon increase. Better to be placed into a stretch code.
- Holland: Spoke in opposition
- Rosenstock: Spoke in opposition
- McHugh: Spoke in opposition
- Motion to disapprove:
 - 1st – Bryan Holland
 - 2nd – Collin
 - Vote: 14-0-0-1
 - Reason Statement: Deleting the minimum system and circuit capacity would not ensure sufficient electrical infrastructure is installed to supply the required EV parking spaces.

CE2D-38

- Rosenstock: Though that this was previously addressed. Energy is kWh, maximum output is kW. Wants to get it right technically
- Tillou: Agreed, thought it had been corrected, but appears an oversight
- Jouaneh: Basically, editorial
- Motion to approve:
 - 1st – Payam
 - 2nd – Harold Jepsen
 - Vote: 15-0-0-1
 - Reason statement: Editorial correction of the equation

Various Lighting Controls (5)

CE2D-39-23	C405.2.1	Occupant sensor controls	Aaron McEwin	amcewin@jordanskala.com
CE2D-40-23	C405.2.10.1	Sleeping/dwelling units hotels, motels edit	Greg Johnson	gjohnsonconsulting@gmail.com
CE2D-41-23	C405.2.10.2	Sleeping units in congregate living	Bryan Holland	bryan.holland@nema.org
CE2D-42-23	C405.2.3.1	Dimming control function	Michael Jouaneh	mjouaneh@lutron.com
CE2D-43-23	C405.2.3.1	Dimming control function	Michael Jouaneh	mjouaneh@lutron.com

CE2D-39

- McEwin: Recommend removing corridors out the list of the spaces. Building code defines corridor as an enclosed exit path. Recommends removing this space type.
- Bailey: Difference in exit passageway and corridor
- Jepsen: Disagrees. The two are not synonymous.
- Holland:
 - EXIT PASSAGEWAY. An exit component that is separated from other interior spaces of a building or structure by fire-resistance-rated construction and opening protectives, and provides for a protected path of egress travel in a horizontal direction to an exit or to the exit discharge.
 - CORRIDOR. An enclosed exit access component that defines and provides a path of egress travel.
- Motion to disapprove:
 - 1st – Jack Bailey
 - 2nd – Jon McHugh
 - Vote: 13-0-1-1
 - Reason: Corridors are exit access components, so there is no conflict with the exception for exit passageways in the IECC. The committee also sees no conflict with the life safety requirements in the IBC. There is significant energy savings associated with keeping the requirement for OS in corridors.

CE2D-40

- Johnson: editorial changes
- Motion to approve:
 - 1st – Steve Rosenstock
 - 2nd – Harold Jepsen
 - Vote: 13-0-0-1
 - Reason: These are editorial changes that help to clarify the language.

CE2D-41

- Myer: Raised concerns over the term “permanently marked” and how faceplates can be changed
- Cain: Supportive of the addendum
- McHugh: Don’t we have a similar requirement for scene controls?
- Modified to read “marked to indicate its function.”
- Motion to approve:
 - 1st – Bryan Holland
 - 2nd – Harold Jepsen
 - Vote: 13 – 0 – 0 – 1
 - Reason Statement: Replaces a vague term and defined term with an enforceable marking requirement

9. Other business – Jouaneh **[end by 12:29 pm]**

10. Future meeting(s):

- Aug. 14, 2023 (11 am to 12:30 pm EDT), Aug. 21, 2023 (11 am to 12:30 pm EDT), Aug. 28, 2023 (11 am to 12:30 pm EDT)

11. Adjourn **[12:30 pm]**

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION BE SURE TO VISIT THE ICC WEBSITE:

Copyright © 2023 International Code Council, Inc.

[ICC Energy webpage](#)
[Code Change Monograph](#)

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT:
Subcommittee Chair



CE2D-41-23 AM by
PLR on Aug. 7, 2023.d



E4C PLR SC
08-07-2023.pptx



Chat eplr 8723.txt