



International Code Council IECC Residential Consistency and Administration Subcommittee

February 15th, 2022

Committee Member	Email
Richard Potts, Chair	richard.potts@dhcd.virginia.gov
Ric Johnson	ric@capsbuilder.com
Heather Goggin	heather.goggin@adeca.alabama.gov
Andrea Lanier Papageorge	apapageo@southernco.com
Michael Rhodes	rhodes.michael@us.sika.com
Maureen Guttman	mguttprgh@gmail.com
Rich Truitt, Vice Chair	rctrutt@harfordcountymd.gov
Cliff Davis	cdavis1@tollbrothers.com
Non-member Participants	Email
Paul Messplay, Secretary	paul.messplayiv@dhcd.virginia.gov
Amy Boyce, IMT	amy.boyce@imt.org
Steve Orłowski, Sundowne Building Code Consultants, LLC (self)	
Joe Cain, Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA)	
Darren Meyers, IECC, LLC	
Kim Cheslak, New Buildings Institute (NBI)	
Staff Liaison	Email
Kristopher Stenger	kstenger@iccsafe.org

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order – Chair called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm EST.
2. Conduct – Chair provided a brief overview of ICC policy.
3. Roll Call – Vice Chair conducted roll call. Quorum established.
4. Approval of minutes –
 - a. January 18th minutes
 - i. Motion for approval: Andrea
 - ii. Second: Maureen
 - iii. Minutes approved unanimously
 - b. February 1st minutes
 - i. Motion for approval: Andrea
 - ii. Second: Maureen
 - iii. Minutes approved unanimously
5. Action items –
 - a. CEPI-24-21 – Amy Boyce, representing Institute for Market Transformation (IMT)
 - i. Amy: Proposal intends to clarify the use of the performance path. The performance path is not necessarily an accurate representation of performance. There are differences in the standard reference design and the proposed design, which will impact building performance. This proposal seeks to clarify that this is a model and it adds a definition of Simulated Building Performance. The changes to the proposal reflect the changes from the commercial subcommittee.
 1. Maureen: There's no notes on the website that say when this was approved by the modeling subcommittee. Do you happen to

know what date they approved this at the modeling subcommittee?

- a. Amy: Monday, February 7th.
2. Maureen: Motion to approve as amended (based on the tracked changes reflected on the screen)
- a. Rich: For consistency purposes, we should table this until it's fully vetted by the commercial side just in case it gets remanded back to the subcommittee. Let's table for a few weeks and see what happens on the commercial side.
 - b. Michael: Will second the motion, but will like further discussion as to why we might want to wait. If there was a significant change it would have happened in the subcommittee, not in the main.
 - c. Ric: Agrees with Rich. Thinks we should wait before making a decision.
 - d. Andrea: Will probably be voting against the motion, since she does not know what was passed by the subcommittee. There's always a possibility for amendment.
 - e. In support of the motion:
 - i. None
 - f. Opposed:
 - i. Rich
 - ii. Ric
 - iii. Andrea
 - iv. Heather

v. Maureen

vi. Michael

3. Rich: Motion to table discussion on CEPI-024-21 until it's been vetted by the consensus committee on the commercial side.

a. Ric: Second

b. Michael: Is there a specific date we need to provide for that table?

i. Kris: It's going to be on the consensus committee agenda for the 23rd of this month.

c. In support of motion:

i. Rich

ii. Andrea

iii. Maureen

iv. Heather

v. Michael

vi. Ric

d. Opposed:

i. None

b. REPI-024-21 – Joseph Cain, Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA)

i. Joseph: The section being struck was disapproved. This a list for a certificate of compliance, which are primarily verifiable features. Item 6, says essentially, that if an ERI method is used, the score, both with and without onsite production, shall be listed. So, a project where you don't use onsite renewable energy, this raises some confusion. There's no parallel language in the performance approach. This does not add anything and might just be confusing. Was already twice disapproved in prior processes, seeks to strike it out.

1. Maureen: The fact that the committee voted to suggest disapproval is one thing. The public comment hearing is not a real vote, it's a piece of a vote. The rest of that vote happens on line through cdp Access. It's important on this certificate, if the ERI was the compliance path chosen, that the information be noted so owners of the building are aware of how the building was approved and how modifications should be accounted for in the future.
2. Eric Lacey: "Me too" to everything Maureen said. This proposal was approved by 73% of the voters, so this wasn't a proposal that just squeaked through. The reason this is in here is because its useful information and it's free to include. It's very useful information for homeowners. ERI scores are being included in real estate documents. This is a straightforward piece of information that should be included. Encourages subcommittee to reject this proposal.
3. Darren Meyers: The Illinois energy office decided to remove this, as well, and we would support the solar energy industry's perspective on this. No one understands what the ERI is, because no ERI has been performed in the U.S. since its inception in the 2018 codes.
4. Michael: ERI is a wonderful method. Other countries around the world have similar programs that help the purchaser understand what they are buying. Unfortunately, the U.S. is behind the ball in the use of this system and the education to consumers purchasing homes. Would like to repeat the OGCV statement provided by Eric Lacey.

5. Maureen: One more thing, if in fact the ERI is not used anywhere, then I would suggest to remove that entire section from the code, at which point this particular change would be warranted. Believes this section should stay in. Moves for disapproval of this proposal.

a. Michael: Seconds the motion for disapproval.

b. In support of motion:

i. Ric

ii. Maureen

iii. Michael

iv. Heather

v. Andrea

vi. Rich

c. Opposed:

i. None.

c. REPI-069-21 – Kim Cheslak, New Buildings Institute (NBI)

i. Kim: This proposal seeks to align differences between the residential and commercial sides of the code as they relate to multi-family buildings.

There's another proposal being heard on the commercial side but makes a similar set of adjustments to further align what is happening.

1. Maureen: Kim, is this matching what is proposed on the commercial side?

2. Kimberly: We submitted them as two different code change proposals. Not sure why, on the ICC side, they weren't part I and part II. The sister proposal looks different since it's not doing the exact same set of things. It is not the same proposal.

3. Maureen: Mr. Chair was the commercial proposal assigned to us? CEPI-053-21
 - a. Kris: No, that's going to commercial envelope.
 - b. Maureen: Doesn't think it would be prudent to make a recommendation without collaboration on the commercial portion. Suspects it could mess things up if it was adopted in the res code and not the commercial code and they were not coordinated. Could the other one be re-assigned to us so we could have responsibility for looking at both and making a recommendation?
 - c. Kimberly: From NBI's point of view, it would not mess things up if one was passed and not the other, but there are already differences between residential and commercial applications. The differences are not irreconcilable.
 - d. Darren Meyers: In general, there has been too much tabling from subcommittees. Staff will ultimately correlate if there are discrepancies and submit public comment.
 - e. Michael: What was the CEPI equivalent?
 - f. Maureen: 53. The CEPI proposal is totally unrelated. Supports Kimberly's statement that the proposals are independent.
 - g. Maureen: Motion to approve.
 - i. Seconded by Ric
 - ii. In support of motion:
 1. Ric

2. Maureen

3. Michael

4. Heather

5. Andrea

6. Rich

6. Other business –

a. Chair discussed remaining proposals

b. ICC staff advised committee members to be on the lookout for a soon to be release memorandum.

7. Upcoming meetings – Next meeting is March 1st.

8. Meeting adjourned at approximately 3pm EST.