



International Code Council IECC Residential Consistency and Administration Subcommittee

March 1st, 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	mguttpgh@gmail.com
Rich Truitt, Vice Chair	retruitt@harfordcountymd.gov
Cliff Davis	cdavis1@tollbrothers.com
Non-member Participants	Email
Paul Messplay, Secretary	paul.messplayiv@dhcd.virginia.gov
Eric Lacey, Responsible Energy Codes Alliance	
Darren Meyers, IECC LLC	
Patricia Chawla, Austin Energy	
Wanda Edwards, Hickman Group	
Joe Cain, Solar Energy Industry Association	
Hope Medina	
Craig Conner, Building Quality	
Theresa Weston, The Holt Weston Consultancy	
Greg Johnson, National Multifamily Housing Council	
Jerry Phelan, Covestro	
Shannon Corcoran, AGA	
Staff Liaison	Email
Kristopher Stenger	kstenger@iccsafe.org

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order – Chair called the meeting to order at 2:01 pm EST.
2. Conduct – Chair provided a brief overview of ICC policy.
3. Roll Call – Paul Messplay conducted roll call. Quorum established.
4. Approval of minutes –
 - a. Minutes are still being completed from the previous meeting. Will email to the group for approval upon their completion.
5. Action items –
 - a. REPI-153-21 – Patricia Chawla, Austin Energy
 - i. Patricia – Done in conjunction with REPI-156. Amending the structure of the appendix and opening it up to allow changes to the appendix. Items are struck for redundancy but no other content was change.
 - ii. Maureen – Should this not be a two-part proposal since it seeks to amend the IRC and IECC? Or can we handle the change to both codes in one motion?
 - iii. Kristopher – The intention here is for both, so staff will be able to do that with the approval of the main proposal.
 - iv. Maureen – Moves to approve as submitted.
 - v. Ric - Seconds the motion.
 1. In favor:
 - a. Michael
 - b. Maureen

c. Ric

d. Andrea

2. In opposition:

a. None

b. REPI-156-21 – Patricia Chawla

- i. Patricia – Continuation of the previous proposal reorganizing the appendix to align with the commercial appendix and opening the appendix to allow for more changes.
- ii. Michael – We have definitions for the CREF and REPC, but there are not definitions for OPP or Adjusted OPP, is it possible to add definitions for those?
- iii. Patricia – Are those included in other proposals that we should work together on?
- iv. Michael – And the second question, the adjusted OPP equation appears to be a graphic dropped into the document. Why is that when it's a typed thing? That's just for my own edification.
- v. Kris – That's probably the way the proponent of the original code change submitted it. Staff could probably duplicate that as text.
- vi. Michael – How do we request staff to do that? Is that something we can request?
- vii. Kris – Is there something in particular that's difficult about it?
- viii. Michael – No, it just looks out of place. It's just personal preference.
- ix. Kris – It's something I can note as we go along.
- x. Maureen – Just wants to suggest that if you look at #1 under RC103.2, you don't really need to define the term OPP since its definition is basically this calculation. It's a term that is defined by the equation. A definition would basically just repeat that equation.

- xi. Joe Cain, Solar Energy Industry Association – Has concerns about the definition with respect to other proposals making their way through subcommittees. Worries we may be creating correlation problems.
- xii. Patricia – There are three other co proposals for the zero-energy appendix and those are assigned to the electrical subcommittee, which is where I sit. I didn't see a definition for OPP. That might be something to discuss through the other proposals with the electrical subcommittee. The definitions that are underlined already exist; they're just moved to a definition section.
- xiii. Joe Cain – Perhaps this is a question for correlation. If we do have some variation, at what point do we pick up on consistency? Is it before multiple proposals go to the consensus committee that may need some reconciliation, or do we have to wait until we get to the public comment? Some of these definitions, though there are variations among them, can be very important in terms of legal obligations. Can Kris give some insight?
- xiv. Kris – There is time where this could still be considered at a subcommittee level to come back with a combined proposal. And there's the public comment. There're multiple opportunities. It doesn't have to be now. It's up to the subcommittee how they want to handle it.
- xv. Joe Cain – I'm just tossing out there that there could be correlation issues.
- xvi. Andrea – Points out that there is a proposed amendment for REPC, which would change the definition somewhat, with a duration of not less than 10 years. Just wanted to mention that there is a proposal that is out of sync with this one.

xvii. Craig Conner, Quality Building – This looks like it’s overly detailed and complicated. Does not think the code should deal with contracts.

xviii. Maureen – This proposal does not have any technical changes. It’s just moving the definition. If we pass this and then another proposal changes the definitions, that’s just a correlation issue that staff takes care of. We don’t need to wait and act on it later. Motions to approve as submitted.

xix. Ric – Seconds the motion.

1. In favor:

a. Ric

b. Maureen

c. Andrea

2. Opposed:

a. None

3. Abstentions:

a. Michael

b. Heather

xx. Kris – Provides clarification that abstentions count toward quorum.

c. REPI-159 – Patricia Chawla

i. Patricia – Adds new text to the zero-energy appendix that allows for above code programs. Eric Lacey reached out to provide a friendly amendment to include back stops in the language. Asks if that is acceptable to everyone? Patricia shares her screen to show the modifications.

1. Option 1:

a. Buildings approved in writing by such an above code program shall be considered to be in compliance with this appendix where such buildings also meet the

requirements identified in Table R405.2 and the proposed total building thermal envelope UA, which is the sum of U-Factor times assembly area, shall be less than or equal to the building thermal envelope UA using the prescriptive U-Factors from Table R402.1.2 multiplied by 1.15 in accordance with Equation 4-1. The area-weighted maximum fenestration SHGC permitted in Climate Zones 0 through 3 shall be 0.30.

2. Option 2:

- a. Buildings approved in writing but such an above code program shall be considered to be in compliance with the appendix where such buildings also meet the requirements identified in Section R102.1.1.
- ii. Craig Conner – Is leery of things beyond energy equivalencies. Does not think we have to deal with back stops any more than the code already addresses.
- iii. Theresa Westin – This is an appendix for a jurisdiction to adopt for an above code level, but you're tying it to what's in the code. What's the criteria jurisdictions use to adopt an above code program that would meet in this appendix?
- iv. Maureen – Is an agreement with Theresa. Thinks this proposal is unnecessary.
- v. Joe Cain – We have multiple balls in the air right now. Are we talking only about this proposed modification and then coming back to the main proposal?
- vi. Richard – Yes, that's how I see it right now. We'll talk to the mod on the screen.

- vii. Joe Cain – We don't need an envelope backstop in this section. I'm not sure this is even necessary.
- viii. Eric Lacey – If you comply with the appendix right now, you'd have to comply with footnote A anyways.
- d. Maureen – Motion to approve amendment (option 2)
 - i. Michael – Seconds the motion.
 - a. Votes in favor of motion:
 - i. Michael
 - ii. Andrea
 - iii. Maureen
 - iv. Heather
 - v. Ric
 - e. Maureen – Motion to approve original motion as amended by option 2.
 - i. Michael – Seconds the motion.
 - a. Votes in favor of motion:
 - i. Michael
 - ii. Andrea
 - iii. Maureen
 - iv. Heather
 - v. Ric
 - f. REPI-166 – Hope Medina, Cherry Hills Village, Shums Code Associates
 - i. Hope – This appendix deals with the construction and decarbonization associated with site waste. The provisions in the proposal are not brand new, they are coming from other codes and standards utilized within the I-codes family.
 - ii. Maureen – Motion to approve as submitted

1. No second to the motion
- iii. Ric – Motion for disapproval
 1. Andrea – Seconds the motion for disapproval
- iv. Maureen – Curious to hear the opposition. This proposal looks like a really good appendix
- v. Michael – Does not have opposition, but would like to hear more since he is on the fence. Can be persuaded either way.
- vi. Andrea – The reason for the second was to have more of a discussion. Is sitting on the fence, as well.
- vii. Hope – This was extremely favorable with stakeholders. Has a lot of jurisdictions that have been looking at how to deal with construction and site waste issues. What this does is makes this a more standardized process that has been vetted in other venues. This is brought into the appendix to provide the opportunity for jurisdictions who want this, to adopt it. This should be a no-brainer since construction and site waste recycling is not addressed. This would give guidance and the opportunity for jurisdictions to work with it.
- viii. Andrea – Is this taken verbatim from the IGCC and NGBS?
- ix. Hope – It’s a culmination of it. A couple things were moved since this is dealing with the residential components and the IGCC wouldn’t correlate well. But yes, for the most part it is.
- x. Patricia – Urges the committee members to vote in support of the proposal.
- xi. Ric – Made a motion to disapprove so we can get a discussion going. What’s proposed is very good, just a little nitpicking that needs to be dealt with.
- xii. Votes in support of the motion for disapproval

1. None
- xiii. Michael – Motions to approve as submitted
 1. Maureen – Seconds the motion
 - a. Votes in favor of motion:
 - i. Michael
 - ii. Andrea
 - iii. Maureen
 - iv. Heather
 - v. Ric
- xiv. Joe Cain – Point of order. (no position on this proposal) The same motion was made twice, just wants to make sure that procedurally we are correct.
- xv. Ric Johnson – Clarifies the procedure and that the committee is acting in accordance with the rules.
- g. CEPI-24 – Amy Boyce, AECC
 - i. Amy – This was discussed two weeks ago. This is mostly a clarification to add the terms “Simulated” to the total building performance option language to indicate that it is not measuring performance, it’s just a clarification. The last commercial full meeting approved this as modified, which is reflected on the screen. This should alleviate concerns with regard to consistency.
 - ii. Maureen – Makes a motion to approve as amended
 1. Ric – Seconds the motion
 - a. Votes in favor of the motion:
 - i. Ric
 - ii. Michael
 - iii. Maureen

iv. Andrea

v. Heather

6. Other business –

a. None

7. Upcoming meetings –

a. Richard: Today's meeting should wrap up the proposals for consideration. We can approve the meeting minutes via email.

8. Adjournment –

a. Motion to adjourn: Andrea

b. Second: Ric

c. Meeting adjourned at 3:05pm EST.