



**International Code Council  
International Energy Conservation Code  
2024 Development Committee  
Residential Sections  
Existing Buildings Subcommittee  
Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Date: March 21, 2023**

**Subcommittee Chair:** Gil Rossmiller [gil.rossmiller@shumscoda.com](mailto:gil.rossmiller@shumscoda.com)

**Subcommittee Vice Chair:** Edwin Hensley [EHensley@habitat.org](mailto:EHensley@habitat.org)

1. Call to order.

a. The meeting was called to order at approximately 2:02 PM EST.

2. Meeting Conduct.

a. IECC Secretariat Kris Stenger introduced this item and made attendees aware of ICC [Council Policy 7](#) Committees: Section 5.1.10 Representation of Interests and ICC [Code of Ethics](#).

3. Roll Call.

a. Subcommittee members in attendance at Roll Call:

Present	Name
N	Avila, Elgin
Y	Berg, Molly (alternate)
Y	Brown, Michael
Y	Chen, Yan (non-voting)
N	Demers, Paul
Y	Dent, Stephen
Y	Hensley, John Edwin
N	Krimgold, Fred
Y	Rossmiller, Gil
Y	Schwarz, Robby

Y	Swope, Clifford
Y	Wiley, Seth
Y	Zengel, Jim

b. Public in attendance: *See Attendee List from Online Meeting Platform below.*

c. ICC Staff in attendance: Kris Stenger

4. Approval of Minutes.

a. No objections to Agenda.

5. Approval of Agenda.

a. Motion to approved by Swoape. Second by Zengel. Unanimous approval.

6. Administrative Issues.

a. None

7. Action Items.

a. Discuss **RED1-266-22.**

1. Proponent Schwarz comments on history of proposal and prior revisions and development based on comments, and then talks Subcommittee through proposal in detail.

2. Marston comments with question put to code officials about the process of reporting – are code officials viewed for the purposes of this proposal as a “rater”?

3. Schwarz responds that current R405 does not require approved third party such as a “rater”, so only reference would be in original energy audit but compliance mechanism is what is already allowed/provided in code. Can be done by design professional, other approved third parties, etc.

4. Marston comments with question as to whether “rater” is an eyes and ears in the house/bulding for the code official?

5. Rossmiller responds affirmative that “rater” is the eyes and ears in the house/building for himself, a code official.

6. Marston comments that “rater” is valuable to the construction process, and positively about the proposal.

7. Zengel questions about blower door testing including 1850’s house and 1900’s house examples. Expresses concerns about bringing existing houses to 5ACH – that it’s likely not reasonably achievable – so one of the compliance paths may not be of real value.

8. Schwarz responds that the exception does not include lower nor higher limit of ACH and so allows for lower than 5ACH in example 1850’s house if needed. So not asking existing buildings to achieve new construction air leakage.

9. Crandell comments positively about proposal, and a few needed improvements. Audit by

RESNET and BPI should be made more generic so the code is not basically advertising for certain businesses. Comments that many older homes cannot achieve 5ACH and that proposal helps existing homes identify leakage problems which will save owners money – with example. Comments on performance compliance path in how it limits energy to existing consumption as being potentially problematic – suggests possibly adding benchmark EUIs targets for existing plus new averaging. Comments on 502.7 – creative use of ventilation – word “may” need to be changed to “shall be permitted”.

10. Brown comments that he is a code official in District of Columbia. Expresses concerns about blower door testing requirements – possibly better to be left out of code for existing portion of homes.

11. Johnson comments in agreement with Brown. In general section – language needs improvement – commentary and not enforcement language. Proposal seems to assume no thermal isolation between addition and existing – proposal should be structured as such. Other portions of proposal using prescriptive and performance should be edited to not use those terms to be consistent with current code work. Comments that checklist structure should be changed to narrative format to be consistent with current code development. Section 502.2.2 contains commentary that should be removed. Comments on other areas of proposal where language is unclear and vague and commentary in nature – so needs specific improvements and editing overall. Comments that does not have problem with proposal concept but that it needs language improvement. Comments that audit may be problematic.

12. Wiley comments positively on proposal but that language overall needs to be significantly improved and that possibly citation of R403.1.1 in R502.3 is a weakening of the code and that it should be R403.1 without proposed change – and similar concerns about R502.4.

13. Kochkin comments that as a Committee Member he would vote no. Technically, performance path needs work - unworkable, prescriptive path needs work – verbiage is from commercial code new construction so concepts do not work. Organizational & language, proposal needs to basically be rewritten.

14. Weston comments positively on concepts in proposal – especially regarding audits. Air leakage exception – may need wording change but thinks mechanisms are reasonable and cost effective. Comments that language needs re-writing in places and would like to hear from proponent whether he has time to rewrite for clerical changes and bring back to next meeting.

15. *Hensley motion call to question.*

16. Schwarz responds to various comments. Positive reception of comments on language reworks. Regarding checklist formatting – not receptive to comments because feels checklist formatting is helpful to owners and code officials. Regarding R402.1.1 & R403.1 & etc. - briefly notes references. Open to friendly amendment now to remove RESNET & BPI references. Adds various comments on reasoning behind proposal.

17. *Hensley motion to disapprove. Zengell second. Reason statement: language is not standard code language and terminology has discrepancies. Rossmiller adds that additions would need to be basically zero energy to comply & that would like to see proposal come back. Vote by hand. 6 in favor of disapproval. 1 against. Disapproval passes. Chairs comments on need to move more quickly to get through all proposals in this meeting.*

b. Discuss **RED1-273-22 (tabled from 2/7/2023)**.

1. Proponent Kochkin comments on background of proposal development & taking comments into consideration – with Crandell. Requests modification be brought up on the screen.

Comments that modification is extensive but looks to address comments.

2. Crandell comments on working with Kochkin and detailed provisions.

3. Kochkin comments on “minimize deviation” provision – takes advantage of good concept.

4. Johnson question about item 2 red text “minimizes deviation” - may want to be added to end of item 3 for mass wall section.
5. Kochkin agrees with Johnson.
6. Johnson question if some IRC language can be eliminated.
7. Crandell agrees with Johnson.
8. Johnson comments would be cleaner and not change intent. Question about last sentence - that reference to section R703.1.1 may be enough.
9. Kochkin responds with reason for language and is happy to amend.
10. Johnson comments that language improvement may be better.
11. Crandell responds that language here may be helpful but that also happy to edit.
12. Weston comments positively.
13. Wiley comments in favor of proposal but that R702.7 language may need to be adjusted to not inadvertently limit the available options for continuous insulation with respect to vapor retarder.
14. Crandell agrees with the building science of Wiley comments and responds that R702.7 provides for Wiley concerns.
15. Various members and participants comment cooperatively to edit language on screen.
16. Weston comments that “based on Climate Zone...” be eliminated to improve wording plus some other language improvements.
17. Kochkin comments that ok with changes. Rossmiller makes changes on screen.
18. *Wiley motion to approve as modified on screen. Zengell second. Reason statement: Proposal provides flexibility for construction affecting existing structures – especially with regard to wall assemblies, exterior finishes, and not disturbing existing construction outside scope of work as well as providing for coordination with existing construction. 7 votes in favor. 0 against. Unanimous support.*

c. Discuss **RECD1-5-22**.

1. Proponent listed on proposal as Rossmiller but proposed by Wiley. Rossmiller passes to Wiley for proponent comments.
2. Johnson questions the use of the term fossil fuel as it is not defined term in the code.
3. Kochkin comments he would support proposal if “additions” are not included.
4. Wiley responds on fossil fuels and is would need to consider eliminating “additions” but would likely consider it a friendly amendment.
5. Schwarz comments question of how to demonstrate compliance.
6. Wiley responds that compliance was considered but intentionally left out to not impose onerous compliance on owners, and that including the proposal in the code would allow for future edits of the code to develop the concept further – including compliance as well as other aspect as determined by future committees.
7. Hensley agrees with Kochkin comment about removal of “additions”.
8. Swoape comments about electrification and how market differs by region and not in support of proposal.
9. Crandell comments about differences between fuel sources, how biomass is ok is burn given it is not a net add to atmospheric carbon balance, but that fossil fuels are not ok to burn because they contribute to global warming and so that language of the proposal is appropriate and well-focused – that fossil fuel burning is at the center of the climate problem. Proposes to add “capacity” after “burning” - that this would help the proposal. Proposes to add an exception for decorative appliances after emergency power, and possibly to add another exception for backup heating as well.
10. Wiley responds in appreciation of comments and willing to edit proposal to include.

11. *Swoape motion disapprove. Zengell second. Reasons statement: The term fossil fuel is misleading and the net result will not improve energy efficiency. Wiley comments that very happy to take comments into account and bring proposal to next meeting. Zengell comments again about concerns as stated previously. Swoape comments that the term fossil fuel is misleading citing examples of fuel sources including renewable natural gas. Wiley comments that renewable natural gas is not a fossil fuel. Swoape agrees that renewable natural gas is not a fossil fuel. Vote by hands. 4 hands in favor of disapproval. 3 against disapproval. Recount. 4 hands in favor of disapproval. 3 against disapproval. Disapproval motion carries.*

8. Open Discussion. (See Chat Room below)

- a. Chair clarifies Agenda for April 4<sup>th</sup> and that an additional meeting would be needed if more proposals brought forth by the Subcommittee.
- b. Schwarz questions whether modification can be brought forward based on Subcommittee action. Chair clarifies disapproval will be brought forward to Committee.
- c. Stenger questions Marston on R506 proposal. Marston responds.

9. Other Business.

- a. K Stenger commented that Subcommittee Proposals will likely have an April 13<sup>th</sup> deadline.
- b. Chair comments that he needs the past meeting's proposal RED1-268-22 "On Screen Modifications" as soon as possible. Co-Chair Hensley responds that he will provide very soon.

10. Adjournment.

- a. Motion to adjourn by Hensley. Second by Zengell. Adjourn 3:53 pm EST. Unanimous support.

Attendee List from Online Meeting Platform:

Alex Smith	asmith@nahb.org
Amy Martino	amartino@buildingsitesynergy.com
Clifford Swoape	cswoape@mtng.com
Edwin Hensley	ehensley@habitat.org
Eric Lacey	eric@reca-codes.com
Gil Rossmiller	gil.rossmiller@shumscoda.com
Greg Johnson	gjohnsonconsulting@gmail.com
Jay Crandell	jcrandell@aresconsulting.biz
Jim Zengel	jim@zengelgroup.com
Kristopher Stenger	kstenger@iccsafe.org
Lucyna de Barbaro	ldebarbaro@gmail.com
Mark Lyles	markl@newbuildings.org
Maureen Guttman	mguttpgh@gmail.com
Michael Brown	michael.brown@dc.gov
Molly B.	mberg@habitat.org
Norman Wang	norman.wang1@maryland.gov
Robby Schwarz	robby@btankinc.com

Seth Wiley	N/A
Shannon Corcoran	scorcoran@aga.org
Stephen Dent s	ddent@gmail.com
Steve Orlovski	attendee
T Weston	holtweston88@gmail.com
TED WAYNE	
Thomas Marston	thommgreengurus@gmail.com
Ty Jennings	attendee
Vladimir Kochkin	vkochkin@nahb.org
Yan Chen	yan.chen@pnnl.gov

Chat Room:

March 21, 2023	3:20 PM	from Greg Johnson to everyone: Provides flexibility for construction affecting existing structures
March 21, 2023	3:21 PM	from Seth Wiley, AIA, Subcommittee Member to everyone: Who seconded the motion?
March 21, 2023	3:22 PM	from Edwin Hensley to everyone: Jim
March 21, 2023	3:22 PM	from Seth Wiley, AIA, Subcommittee Member to everyone: Thanks
March 21, 2023	3:46 PM	from Seth Wiley, AIA, Subcommittee Member to everyone: Renewable natural gas is not fossil fuel.