



International Code Council IECC Residential Consistency and Administration Subcommittee

February 1st, 2022

Committee Member	Email
Richard Potts, Chair	richard.potts@dhcd.virginia.gov
Rie Johnson	rie@capsbuilder.com
Heather Goggin	heather.goggin@adeca.alabama.gov
Andrea Lanier Papageorge	apapageo@southernco.com
Michael Rhodes	rhodes.michael@us.sika.com
Maureen Guttman	mguttpgh@gmail.com
Rich Truitt, Vice Chair	retruitt@harfordcountymd.gov
Cliff Davis	edavis1@tollbrothers.com
Non-member Participants	Email
Paul Messplay, Secretary	paul.messplayiv@dhcd.virginia.gov
Darren Meyers, IECC LLC, NRCA	dmeyers@ieccode.com
Theresa Weston, self	holtweston88@gmail.com
Steve Orłowski, Sundowne Building Code Consultants, LLC	
Robert De Vries, self	rdevries@nuwool.com
Staff Liaison	Email
Kristopher Stenger	kstenger@iccsafe.org

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order – Chair called the meeting to order at 2:04pm EST.
2. Conduct – Chair provides a brief overview of ICC policy.
3. Roll Call – Paul Messplay conducted roll call. Quorum established.
4. Approval of minutes –
 - a. Minutes to be reviewed prior to next meeting.
5. Action items –
 - a. CEPI-011-21 Part II
 - i. Darren Meyers: Representing national roofing contractors association (NRCA). Stands on reason statement. Definition of ATTIC, HABITABLE is cut and pasted directly from IRC. ATTIC definition adds the slope issue to accommodate the difference between flat roofs and shingled roofs. Open and amenable to changes, should they be considered.
 1. Maureen Guttman: Confused because it adds a new definition despite these terms coming from IBC or IRC. Why do we specifically need to add in the language regarding slope and where that comes into play. Was not aware this was a point of confusion.
 - a. Darren: The 2 in 12 threshold relates to the slope at which you get to low-slope roof systems vs. non-sloped or flat roof systems. Comes directly from IRC chapter 15.
 - b. Theresa Weston: Representing herself. Small modification suggestion to the committee is adding the words “underside of the” before “the ceiling framing”.

Wants to make sure we are looking at the bottom of the framing where that insulation is. It is clearer to put “the underside of the ceiling framing.”

- c. Maureen – Now doubly confused. Wouldn't the underside of the ceiling framing be the ceiling?
- d. Theresa: What I'm talking about is where the ceiling is. The framing that is holding the ceiling up and the insulation goes in between those joists. There are multiple ways in which you could do this and I thought underside of the ceiling framing made the most sense to me.
- e. Maureen: I'm not sure what the slope has to do with the attic. And I think the definitions that already exist in the IRC and IBC are adequate, but the differentiations you want to make both for insulation and slope probably belong somewhere else. The definition of the attic does not need to be so twisted. The definitions that exist are fine. I'm not sure I understand why this is happening.
- f. Darren: We at the NRCA didn't want this to blow up merely because someone in the commercial envelope committee suggests a specific clarification. We were working with Theresa and she thought this would make more sense to her. If you have a copy of the IRC nearby, you can look at the two definitions, Attic and Attic, Habitable, the reason why we are reproducing these is because they are not in the green book (the IECC). There are upwards of 200 references to attics. To lend a little

bit more support to the concern regarding the slope, in another proposal NRCA is putting together, the insulation tables that are in Chapter 4 only cite ceiling. They do not cite ceiling with attic or ceiling without attic. We have a separate proposal to clarify those title bars. The confusion is not ours; the confusion is AHJs imposing flat-roof insulation levels for low-slope decks.

- g. Michael Rhodes: Has questions about where exactly the insulation is installed.
- h. Maureen: Totally understands wanting to put this in the green book (IECC). However, I'm hearing what you're saying about the sloped piece. It makes sense to hear this definition change in conjunction with the other change or after. I would hate to make this change here and then not get that change, too. Would like to see the other change first.
- i. Theresa: I think the answer is where in the attic you put the insulation is not part of the definition. There are moisture concerns about where you put the insulation and I think there's probably some good changes that could be made to the code to specify where you put the insulation. Usually, it's all on the roof side or all on the attic floor, but when you look at what the code says, it just says, "Attic." If you're ever putting it on the floor, you should be putting it between the floor framing and the attic. There's probably a better place in the code to tell you where to split it up.

- j. Steve Orłowski: Representing himself. Why do we need to bring these terms over if the energy code says you can use the codes previously defined in the other codes? Typically, we only change/add definitions that aren't already defined in the energy code. Also wonders why we are modifying the attic definition since the code action committees are going through to correlate definitions among the codes.
- k. Darren: The terms are used throughout the green book and without the term in the green book it could be lost in translation and we've seen those instances where over zealous code officials have not made that correlation that you have made. We are attempting to make the connection in the book of origin where the term is used in at least 200+ locations. I respect the position that you have. It was a thought of ours.
- l. Andrea Papageorge: Taking a look at the definition of Attic. Why do you think that a different definition of attic is necessary and why do you think the users of the IECC need it? Will anything be inadvertently left out because slopes are defined in the definition?
- m. Darren: We see what you're saying. There's no intention to out-scope any roof construction. We've seen AHJs create confusion without clarity between low-sloped and flat roof ceilings.
- n. Heather Goggin: Does not understand why the definition would be different than the IRC.

- o. Darren: The words “roof assembly” and “ceiling assembly” ... ceiling assembly is not defined while roof assembly is defined. We believe this is where code enforcement is getting confused. The misinterpretation can be explained by the lack of clarity in the IRC.
- p. Maureen: Makes a motion to table the proposal until the residential envelope committee has made a decision on REPI-32.
- q. Michael: Seconds the motion.
- r. Those in favor:
 - i. Maureen
 - ii. Michael
 - iii. Andrea
 - iv. Heather
- s. No opposition.
- t. Table timeline is until Feb. 15th meeting provided REPI-31 is acted on by Res Envelope Committee

b. CEPI-013-21 Part II

- i. Robert De Vries: Representing self. Makes a floor modification to replace the word “within” with the word “by” to read “An area, room or space that is enclosed by the building thermal envelope...” The reason being that some thermal boundaries assemblies can get rather thick and some people play loose with that space saying they are within the thermal boundary. The intent, in one case, is to get the duct work out of that space. The state of Ohio has gone to something like this because when you use the term “Within” some believe that is any part of the assembly that is making that thermal envelope. Sometimes that thermal

envelope can be several inches thick and when you start putting duct work or other material in that space you do not get full thickness insulation you otherwise you would be able to have.

- ii. Maureen: I'm confused by the intent of the modification.
- iii. Chair: Provides clarification.
- iv. Maureen: Makes a motion to disapprove. Does not see this as a clarification.
 - 1. No second to the motion. New motion needed.
- v. Michael: Requests to re-write. Maureen, would you give an edit to this to make it better? How would you change it?
 - 1. Maureen: Does not feel it is confusing based on the original language. Would not make a change.
- vi. Chair: asks the committee for a new motion.
 - 1. Andrea: Not for a motion. Goes back and forth with the fact that conditioned space is already defined in the IRC. If there's a problem with the IRC definition, I would love to see a change to that. Should we approve a code change that is different than something that is already defined.
 - 2. Heather: Raises concerns about the grammar and syntax with this change.
 - 3. Maureen: "An area room or space that is enclosed by the building thermal envelope and that is directly..." Maybe this solves the confusion. "But not within" is confusing in and of itself.
 - 4. Michael: Agrees with Maureen's original motion.
 - 5. Maureen: Moves to disapprove based on not seeing any clarity with this proposal.

- a. Michael: Second
 - b. Those in favor of disapproval:
 - i. Maureen
 - ii. Michael
 - iii. Heather
 - iv. Andrea
 - c. No opposition.
6. Other business –
- a. No other business for discussion.
7. Upcoming meetings – Next meeting is February 15th.
8. Adjournment –
- a. Motion to adjourn: Andrea
 - b. Second: Heather
 - c. Meeting adjourned at 2:57pm EST.