

- 2/7/22 is next meeting. Today's meeting was delayed one day in observance of MLK Birthday Holiday.
- Ground Rules
  - Chair will abstain on votes. Only votes in the case of a tie.
  - 5 minutes for proposals
  - 20 minutes for discussion
  - Accept, Reject, Revise
  - Week for revisions
  - 2 Proposals currently in revision. Will be on agenda for next meeting. Will vote on revisions at next meeting
- New Business
- Change Proposal
  - CEPI-208 Marcin Pazera
    - Tried to recognize requirements of the present code C402 intent
    - Roof requirements should be referenced under Table C407.2
    - Sealing, add insulation for roof assemblies,
    - Does not introduce new requirements
    - Important measures – Joints,
    - Question – C402.5 is currently in the code. Proposal to add other requirements to the code. Answer yes.
    - Question – Charles Eley speaks in support . Make prescriptive measures mandatory. Impossible to model. Details are beyond what models usually deal with.
    - Question – Anna McCullough – Continuous insulation – Performance path does it need two layers too. Response from Marcin- Prescriptive requirement for two layers in today's code. Preferred and typical insulation includes two layers. National contractors association support 2 layers (joint staggered) 2.6" in two layers.
    - Comment - David Goldstein – Comment - One reason for mandatory instead of prescriptive is it cannot be modeled accurately. Hope that this holds for other measures.
    - Comment Amiya Panigrahi – Can be modelled. Minimum is what is important.
    - Vote – Members raise hands – Accept 14 Reject - 0 Revise 0 Code Change – Pass
  - Consensus for 1/26? Marcin Pazera agrees
  - CEPI – 255, 256 Proponent – Sick out of office reply. Kristopher Stenger did receive email from Hope Medina saying she was sick.
    - Charles Eley – Language for pools and spas repeated for automated covers. Kris will ask Hope to modify proposal. Editorial
- Charles Eley – Proposal
  - Overview of Additional Energy Credits in C406

- Multiple code change proposals on the same section of the code
- If we approve one proposal it will change context for how other proposals are addressed
- Mandatory – Table C407.2, Prescriptive, Extra Efficiency Measures in C406 (list of options with a point score, compliance requires minimum of 10 points)
- Designers can choose.
- Categorization C406
  - One proposal is complete overhaul (48 pages) CEPI-193. Credits depend on occupancy and climate zone. Credits are grouped into energy efficiency, renewables, and load management. C407 performance target based on credits in C406.
  - Other code change proposals would have to be revised to CEPI-193.
  - Also need coordination with other Subcommittees, Envelope, HVAC, SWH, and Electrical Subcommittees by June.
  - Interaction between C406 and/or C407 – Address last minute changes to the prescriptive section. (C407.2, C407.4.1)
  - List of C406
    - 193 Overhaul
    - 194
    - 196
    - 197
    - 198
    - 199
    - 200
    - 201 (EV – Coordination with Electrical SC is needed)
    - Code changes are assigned to other SCs. (18 code change proposals)
  - Need exception to the 5 minute presentation rule.
  - Not going to vote on CEPI - 193 today.
  - Comment Krishnan Gowri – Answer Reid Hart – If you are modeling in C407 you do not use the extra credits. Don't do check list. Some of the credits should be mandatory. If you follow C407 the target goes up. Charles Eley – Credits can usually be modelled but some cannot. Energy monitoring, fault detection cannot be modelled.
  - Comment Steve Rosenstock – List of proposals 193 to 201. 201 is Steve Rosenstock is his proposal. 201 does not change Energy Credits already working on it in electrical. There is a consensus proposal in place now. Need to coordinate with chairs for 201. Charles Eley disagrees that C406 is affected. Steve no proposal does not propose anything related to Energy Credits or performance. Greg Eades will work with other chair to get resolution for 201.
  - Comment T Weston – Question about air leakage. At last envelope meeting – leakage is being worked on. Some have changes to C406. Already made a recommendation – terminology change to add C405 and C406 sections. Not a technical change. Doesn't change the numbers. Need blower door test. Simplify to one protocol. Credit value may change. How should envelope and

modeling SC coordinate? Charles Eley identified all proposals that reference C406.

- Michael Rosenberg – SC could work with other SCs but time intensive. Perhaps should wait until other SCs are finished on proposals that affect C406.
- Alfonso Hernandez – On performance path is there any coverage for shading for EV charging stations? If shade is automatic up and down shade is set. What if the shade is not automatic? Greg - No
- Diana Burk – Similar proposals should be worked on by a small working group. Greg- reasonable approach. Diana volunteered to coordinate.
- Greg – Thank you to Charles for presentation
- Amiya Panigrahi – Disagrees with the assignment of credits. Are we not going to ask for justification of credit assignments? Are we not going to ask for justification of cost? 193 Proposal must be validated.
- Charles Eley – For 193 group, Inconsistent with respect to underlines and strike throughs. Had trouble understanding what is new. Trouble with tables. It would be helpful for proposal to be corrected.
- Maria Karpman comments are in chat. – Sorry, my audio didn't work. My question is whether the thinking is that modeling rules should be updated to account for savings opportunities allowed by credits? For example, even for credits like fault detection and energy monitoring, the same approaches that were used to estimate point weighting may also be used for updating modeling requirements. Charles Eley reply. No modeling rules that apply to the IECC. Very little guidance in the IECC.
- Ried Hart – Point value has changed. Old point savings versus proposed savings...Some buildings can do more. Some climate zones can do more. Cost effectiveness DOE does not require each item to be cost effective. Demonstration package backs up justification in Tech Brief. Some credits are based on fuzzy metering and fault detection. If allowance in C407 allowed then development of proposals must be done.

Adjourned at 11:13 CST.

Need reason statement for Kristopher for tomorrow.