

International Energy Conservation Code Consensus Committee-Residential

Draft Meeting Agenda (2/24 posting)

Webex Meeting Link

March 3, 2022 2:00 PM EST to 5 PM EST (3 hours)

Committee Chair: JC Hudgison, CBO, Assoc. AIA

Committee Vice Chair: Bridget Herring & Robin Yochum, LEED Green Associate

- 1. Call to order.
- 2. Meeting Conduct.
 - a. Identification of Representation/Conflict of Interest
 - b. ICC Council Policy 7 Committees: Section 5.1.10 Representation of Interests
 - c. ICC <u>Code of Ethics</u>: ICC advocates commitment to a standard of professional behavior that exemplifies the highest ideals and principles of ethical conduct which include integrity, honesty, and fairness. As part of this commitment it is expected that participants shall act with courtesy, competence and respect for others.
- 3. Roll Call.
- 4. Approve Agenda
- 5. Approval of Minutes
- 6. Administrative issues-staff
- 7. Action Items
 - a. Code Change Proposals

CEPI-12-21 Part II (Biomass definition) (Elec. Pwr/Light as modified 10-2) REPI-112 21 Part I (Light Cntrl Large Home)(Elec. Pwr/Light as modified) REPI-112 21 Part II (Light Cntrl Large Home)(Elec. Pwr/Light as modified) REPI-102-21 Part I (Lighting Efficacy) (Elec. Pwr/Light approve 11-0-1) REPI-102-21 Part II (Lighting Efficacy) (Elec. Pwr/Light approve 11-0-1) REPI-100-21 (High Efficacy lighting) (Elec. Pwr/Light deny 11-0-1) REPI-103-21 (High Efficacy Light sources) (Elec. Pwr/Light deny 11-0-1) REPI-24-21 (Certificate) (Econ/Admin deny 6-2) REPI-69-21 (Multifamily alignment) (Econ/Admin approve 6-0) REPI-118-21 (Performance Path Backstop) (Econ/Admin as modified 13-3)

REPI-129-21 (ERI on-site renew backstop) (Econ/Modeling approve 11-7)

REPI-128-21 (ERI envelope backstop)

REPI-13-21 (Radiant Barrier)

REPI-42-21 (Radiant Barrier)

REPI-32-21 (Low Slope Roof R U Table)

REPI-67-21 (Air Barrier Boxes)

REPI-146-21 (Roof Replacement)

(Econ/Modeling deny 11-7)

(Envelope as modified 9-5)

(Envelope approve 11-5)

(Envelope deny 15-1)

(Envelope deny 15-1)

(Existing Bldg deny unanimous)

8. Subcommittee Reports

Subcommittee guidance

- a. Economics, Modeling, and Whole-Building Metrics
 - 1. Cost Effectiveness
- 9. Other business.
- 10. Upcoming meetings. March 17 at 2 PM EST
- 11. Adjourn.

FOR FURTHER IECC Residential INFORMATION BE SURE TO VISIT THE ICC WEBSITE: IECC Residential Website

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT:

Kristopher Stenger, AIA, CBO Director of Energy Programs International Code Council kstenger@iccsafe.org



Proposal #	CEPI-012-21 Part II Biomass definition
CDP ID #	249
Code	IECC RE
Code Section(s)	R202 New Section n
Location	base
Proponent	Diana Burk diana@newbuildings.org
Proposal Status	SC rev
Subcommittee	RE Elec, Light
Subcommittee Notes	
Recommendation	Follow approval from commercial committee. Modification to remove comma between biofuel and feedstock
Vote	As modified 10-2
Recommendation Date	2.14.22
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus Committee X
Consensus Committee	
Committee Response	
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee
Date	



Proposal #	REPI-112-21 Part I Lighting control system large home
CDP ID #	487
Code	IECC RE
Code Section(s)	R404.4 New Section y
Location	base
Proponent	Michael Jouaneh mjouaneh@lutron.com
Proposal Status	SC rev
Subcommittee	RE Elec, Light
Subcommittee Notes	
Recommendation	
Vote	As modified
Recommendation Date	2/14/22
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus CommitteeX
Consensus Committee	
Committee Response	
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee
Date	



Proposal #	REPI-112-21 Part II Lighting control system large nome
CDP ID #	581
Code	IRC
Code Section(s)	N1104.4 New Section y
Location	base
Proponent	Michael Jouaneh mjouaneh@lutron.com
Proposal Status	SC rev
Subcommittee	RE Elec, Light
Subcommittee Notes	
Recommendation	
Vote	As modified
Recommendation Date	2/14/22
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus CommitteeX
Consensus Committee	
Committee Response	
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee
Date	

Topic: (for internal use)

Lighting control system for large homes

Summary Purpose/Reason/Background (for internal use)

Require large homes to install lighting control system.

ICC Code or Standard: (list the code the change applies to, ex. IECC, IRC, IEBC)

IECC

Affected Code Section: (list code sections to be revised or added)

R404.4

Proposed Change: (paste in code text, <u>underline new text</u>, strikethrough deleted text. Use one of the following at the beginning of each proposed section of code text as appropriate)

- Add new definition as follows:
- 2. Revise as follows:
- 3. Add new text as follows:

Add new text as follows:

Dwelling units with greater than 5000 ft² (460 m²) of conditioned floor area shall have a lighting control system that has the capability to turn off all permanently installed interior luminaires from a control located at an exit door or have a lighting control system that has the capability to turn off all permanently installed interior lighting from remote locations.

Exceptions:

- 1. Up to 5% of the total lighting power may remain uncontrolled.
- 2. Spaces where lighting is controlled by a count-down timer or occupant sensor control.

Reason: (provide substantiation reason statements for the proposal)

This proposal is similar to what in ASHRAE 90.2. The intent to require lighting in large homes to have a control system or smart light fixtures such that the lighting can be shutoff from the exit or remote locations (e.g., using a phone app). This control strategy will save energy by allowing occupants to shutoff the lighting as they leave (or while they are away) so that unneeded lighting is not left on when no one is home. Note that the intent is for lighting to have the capability to be shutoff, not mandate lighting be shutoff.

Bibliography: (cite sources, studies, reports and supporting information)

ASHRAE 90.2 section 7.5.3.

https://www.bpa.gov/EE/Technology/EE-emerging-technologies/Projects-Reports-Archives/Documents/FutureResLightingPaper%20FINAL%20DRAFT%20docx%20-%202018-08-15.pdf [11% lighting savings from energy management system, cost is \$150 at high end. See page 37]

The median size of a completed single-family house was 2,261 square feet. https://www.census.gov/construction/chars/highlights.html

CEE LightingMarketCharacterization.pdf (cee1.org)

Cost Impact: (select one of the following statements. Where desired, add supporting information)

- 1. The code change proposal will not increase or decrease the cost of construction
- 2. The code change proposal will decrease the cost of construction
- 3. The code change proposal will increase the cost of construction

The code change proposal will increase the cost of construction (but many of these homes will install a lighting control system or smart light fixtures anyway so may not be an increase in real world application). Cost effective based on ASRHAE 90.1 scalar ratio method. See separate cost effectiveness analysis file.

													ocuments/FutureResLightingPaper%20FINAL%20DRAFT%20docx%20-%202018-08-15.pd			lociments/EntireDecliabtingDaner%20FINAI%20NDAET%20docx%20,%2003018,08-15 nd	Ocuments) i utal encoligintinge aper 8201 met. 82000041 1 72000047820 782020 a. 40.50																				
													oorts-Archives/			Jorte-Archivec/	VOID-MICHAES/1				ncremental	irst cost	onnected	ghting													\$150.00
								-cost					es/Projects-Reg	nart-bulbs/	in-charts/	ac/Drojecte.Der	cs/rioletts-hep			Annual	Energy Cost II			lighting li	\$4.16	\$5.14	\$0.98	\$0.40	\$0.41	\$0.99	\$1.15	\$0.14	\$0.14	\$1.02	\$1.02	\$0.20	\$15.74
								let-installation					ing-technologi	es/best-led-sn	ulbs-compariso	ing-technologi						Savings for	Connected	Lighting	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	
								witch-and-out					ogy/EE-emerg	ergy-and-utiliti	es/led-light-bu	oav/FE-emera	ORY/ LL-CITICIES			Ave.	ge hours ON			report)							96 2.3		7.6 1.5	7.5 2	7.5 2		1813.8 1.716667
						+		ack.com/p/s					//EE/Technol	m/home/ene	sy.com/guid	/FE/Technol	/rr/ recilion				Watta	tage for all	oom rooms			123	22.4 13	40.8 4	52.2	83	96	17.6	17.6	97.5 9	97.5 9	20.8 2	773 181
						ims in CEE repor		//www.thumbt					//www.bpa.gov	//www.cnet.co	://learn.earthea	//www.hna.go	//www.npa.go						33		14	15	16	12	18	14	15	16	16	15	15	16	
		report	report			e. from all roo	used)	S7 https:					https	https:	https:	httne	- Company				mber	amps Ave. I	E watta		8.9	8.2	1.4	3.4	2.9	4.5	6.4	1.1	1.1	6.5	6.5	1.3	52.2
		\$28.10 CE	\$21.99 CE			15 Ave	dimmers are			0.13		20%	\$150	\$15	\$5	11%	***	ve.	umber	flamps					4.6	8	1.4	3.4	5.9	4.5	6.4	1.1	1.1	6.5	6.5	1.3	42.7
							or occ (Using CFL/LED											4	_	0		Assumed num. of c	rooms for test	case home R	4	2	9	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	25
 Dimmers installed in living spaces 	2 occupancy sensor in non-living spaces	3 Occ sensor cost	4 Dimmer cost	C Heiner CD limbing only	S Using LED lighting only	6 LED wattage/lamp	7 Installation costs same for switch vs. dimmer	8 Toggle light switch cost	9 No maintance costs or salvage value	10 energy cost per kwh	11 Test home is 3 bed, 2 bathroom home	12 percent of luminaires controlled	13 Cost of control-based HEMS	14 Cost of smart bulbs	15 Cost of average LED bulb	16 Cayings from copperted lighting controls	דס מאווולף וויסוון רסוווופרנכים וולווינוול רסווינים							Occ or Dimmer or Switch	Bathroom O	Bedroom D	Closet 0	Dining room D	Garage 0	Hall S	Kitchen D	Laudry room O	Utility room 0	Living room S	Family room D	Office S	Total
	1 Dimers installed in living spaces	1 Dimmers installed in living spaces 2 occupancy sensor in non-living spaces	1 Dimmers installed in living spaces 2 cocupancy sensor in non-living spaces 3 Oct sensor cost \$28.10 CEF report	ed in living spaces or in non-living spaces	ing spaces n-living spaces	ed in living spaces or in non-living spaces ng only	ing spaces n-living spaces	1 Dimmer installed in living spaces 2 occupancy sensor in non-living spaces 3 occ sensor cost 4 Dimmer cost 5 Using LED lighting only 5 Using LED lighting only 6 LED wattage(2 Dimmer or occ (Using CFU/LED dimmers are used) 7 Installation costs same for switch vs. dimmer or occ (Using CFU/LED dimmers are used)	Ing spaces 728.10 CEE re \$21.99 CEE re \$21.99 CEE re 15 Ave. fi for switch vs. dimmer or occ (Using CFI/ED dimmers are us	\$21. \$21.dimmer or occ (Using CFL/LED dimm	living spaces \$28.10 CEE re \$21.99 CEE re by 15 Ave. fi re for switch vs. dimmer or occ (Using CFL/LED dimmers are us set reslonge value 0.13	\$28.10 CEE re \$21.99 CEE re 15 Ave fi immer or occ (Using CFL/LED dimmers are us	paces \$28.10 CEE re \$21.99 CEE re \$21.99 CEE re \$1.00 CEE re \$21.00 CEE re \$1.00 CE	\$28.10 CEE re \$21.99 CEE re \$21.90 CEE re immer or occ (Using CFL/LED dimmers are us 0.13 50% \$150	\$28.10 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report 15 Ave. from a 15 Ave. from a 13 \$7 50% \$15 \$15 \$15	\$28.10 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report 15 Ave. from a 15 Ave. from a 113 57 57 50% \$115 515 515 515	\$28.10 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report 15 Ave. from a 16 Ave. from a 17 Ave. from a 18 Ave. from a 19 Ave. from	\$28.10 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report 15 Ave. from a 15 Ave. from a 10.13 \$71 50% \$150 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15	\$28.10 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report 15 Ave. from a 15 Ave. from a 10.13 50.8 5150 \$150 \$150 \$150 \$150 \$150 \$150 \$150	\$28.10 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report 15 Ave. from a 16 Ave. 17 J 50% 5150 515 515 618 7 J 618	\$28.10 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report 15 Ave. from a 15 Ave. from a 16 Ave. 11% 11% 11% 11% 11% 11% 11% 11% 11% 11	\$28.10 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report 15 Ave. from a 15 Ave. 0.13 5.0% \$150 \$150 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15	\$28.10 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report 15 Ave. from a 16 Ave. 18 Ave. 19 Ave. 11 Ave. 12 Ave. 13 Ave. 14 Ave. 15 Ave. 16 Ave. 17 Ave. 18 Ave. 18 Ave. 19 Ave. 10 Ave. 11 Ave. 11 Ave. 11 Ave. 11 Ave. 11 Ave. 12 Ave. 13 Ave. 14 Ave. 15 Ave. 16 Ave. 17 Ave. 18 Ave. 18 Ave. 19 Ave. 19 Ave. 10 Ave. 10 Ave. 11 Ave. 11 Ave. 11 Ave. 11 Ave. 11 Ave. 12 Ave. 13 Ave. 14 Ave. 15 Ave. 16 Ave. 17 Ave. 17 Ave. 18 Ave. 18 Ave. 18 Ave. 19 Ave. 10 Ave. 10 Ave. 11 Ave. 11 Ave. 11 Ave. 11 Ave. 12 Ave. 13 Ave. 14 Ave. 15 Ave. 16 Ave. 17 Ave. 18 Ave	\$28.10 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report 15 Ave. from a 16 Ave. 11% Ave. number Assumed num. of control of lamps rooms for test CEE CEE CEE 11% Ave.	\$28.10 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report \$21.99 CEE report 15 Ave. from a 15 Ave. from a 57 _ 0.13 5.0% \$150 \$150 \$150 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15 \$15	1 Dimmers installed in living spaces 3 Oct sensor cost 528.10 CEE report 4 Dimmer cost 521.99 CEE report 5 Using LED lighting only 6 LED wattage/Jamp 7 Installation costs same for switch vs. dimmer or coc (Using CFL/LED dimmers are used) 8 Toggle light switch cost 9 No maintainer costs or salvage value 10 energy cost per kwh 11 Test home is 3 bed, 2 bethroom home 11 Cest home is 3 bed, 2 bethroom home 12 Dericard foll unimairers controlled 13 Cost of control-based HEMS 14 Cost of swenge LED bulb 15 Cost of swenge LED bulb 16 Savings from connected lighting controls 17 Ave. Ave. Ave. Aumber Assumed num. of control of lamps of lamps occ or Dimmer or Switch 0 Cost or Dimmer or Switch	1 Dimmers intalled in living spaces 3 Occarioancy serior in non-living spaces 3 Occarioancy serior in non-living spaces 4 Dimmer cost 4 Dimmer cost 5 Using LD lighting only 6 LED wastage/lamp 7 Installation costs same for switch vs. dimmer or occ (Using CFL/LED dimmers are used) 8 Toggel light switch cost 10 No maintaince costs or salvage value 11 Test home 8 bed, 2 bathroom home 12 percent of luminaires controlled 12 percent of luminaires controlled 13 Socios of control-based HEMS 14 Cost of saverage LED bulb 15 Cost of saverage LED bulb 16 Savings from connected lighting controls 17 Ave. Number 18 Ave. Ave. Ave. Anumber 19 Occ or Dimmer or Switch 10 Occ or Dimmer or Switch 11 Report CEE 11 Socious 12 Socious 13 Socious 14 Cost of saverage LED bulb 15 Savings from connected lighting controls 16 Savings from connected lighting controls 17 Socious 18 Socious 1	1 Dimmers intalled in living spaces 3 Occ or Dimmer or Switch 1 Dimmers intalled in living spaces 3 Occ or Dimmer or cot	1 Dimmers installed in living spaces 3 Occ sensor cost 4 Dimmers or cost occupancy servor in non-living spaces 3 Occ sensor cost 4 Dimmer cost 4 Status of EE report 4 Dimmer cost 5 Using CEE report 6 Using CEE report 7 Installation costs same for salvage value 0.13 ST 10 No maintainers costs or salvage value 0.13 ST 10 No maintainers costs or salvage value 0.13 ST 10 ST	1 Dimmers installed in living spaces 3 Occarbancy sersor in non-living spaces 3 Occarbancy sersor in non-living spaces 4 Dimmer cost 4 Dimmer cost 5 Using LED lighting only 5 Lish LED lighting only 7 Installation costs same for switch vs. dimmer or occ (Using CFL/LED dimmers are used) 8 Toggel light switch cost 9 No maintaince costs or salvage value 11 Test home 8 shed; 2 bathroom home 12 percent of luminaires controlled 13 Cost of saveage LED builds 14 Cost of saveage LED builds 15 Cost of saveage LED builds 16 Savings from connected lighting controls 16 Savings from connected lighting controls 17 Occ or Dimmer or Switch 18 Occ or Dimmer or Switch 19 Assumed num. of control of lamps 19 Occ or Dimmer or Switch 20 0 0 1 1 3 4 4 4 6 8 34 3 0 1 2 9 2 9 2 9	1 Dimmers sintablied in living spaces 2 a Occasion control country in the propert of the propert	1 Dimmers sintablied in living spaces 3 28.10 CEE report 3 0.00 ceeport 4 Dimmers ords 4 Dimmers cost 4 Dimmer cost 5 21.99 CEE report 4 Dimmer cost 5 Using LED lighting only 5 Installation costs same for switch vs. dimmer or occ (Using CFL/LED dimmers are used) 8 Toggle light switch cost salvage value 11 Test home is 3 bed, 2 bathroom home 12 percent followinaires controlled 5 Social formation controlled 5 Social formation costs something controlled 5 Social formation costs switch to salvage value 12 percent followinaires controlled 5 Social formation controlled 6 Soci	Dimmers installed in living spaces \$28.10 CEF report	Dimmers installed in living spaces \$28.10 CEF report	Dimmers in stabled in living spaces \$28.10 CEE report	Coccord or Swinger from the Control of House from the Coccord or Swinger from control or Swinger fro	Country from the country of spaces \$78.10 CEF report



Proposal #	REPI-102-21 Part I Lighting efficacy
CDP ID #	460
Code	IECC RE
Code Section(s)	R404.1 New Section n
Location	base
Proponent	Michael Jouaneh mjouaneh@lutron.com
Proposal Status	SC rev
Subcommittee	RE Elec, Light
Subcommittee Notes	
Recommendation	
Vote	Approve 11-0-1
Recommendation Date	2/14/22
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus CommitteeX
Consensus Committee	
Committee Response	
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee
Date	



Proposal #	REPI-102-21 Part II Lighting efficacy
CDP ID #	579
Code	IRC
Code Section(s)	N1104.1 New Section n
Location	base
Proponent	Michael Jouaneh mjouaneh@lutron.com
Proposal Status	SC rev
Subcommittee	RE Elec, Light
Subcommittee Notes	
Recommendation	
Vote	Approve 11-0-1
Recommendation Date	2/14/22
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus CommitteeX
Consensus Committee	
Committee Response	
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee
Date	



Proposal #	REPI-100-21 High Efficacy light definition and equipment
CDP ID #	314
Code	IECC RE
Code Section(s)	R404.1 New Section n
Location	base
Proponent	Steven Rosenstock srosenstock@eei.org
Proposal Status	SC rev
Subcommittee	RE Elec, Light
Subcommittee Notes	
Recommendation	Disapprove In favor of language in REPI-102 Part I
Vote	Disapproval 11-0-1
Recommendation Date	2/14/22
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus CommitteeX
Consensus Committee	
Committee Response	
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee
Date	



Proposal #	REPI-103-21 Lighting high efficacy light sources
CDP ID #	140
Code	IECC RE
Code Section(s)	R404.1 New Section n
Location	base
Proponent	Megan Hayes Megan.Hayes@nema.org
Proposal Status	SC rev
Subcommittee	RE Elec, Light
Subcommittee Notes	
Recommendation	Disapprove In favor of language in REPI-102 Part I
Vote	Disapprove 11-0-1
Recommendation Date	2/14/22
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus CommitteeX
Consensus Committee	
Committee Response	
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee
Date	



Proposal #	REPI-024-21 Certificate					
CDP ID #	502					
Code	IECC RE					
Code Section(s)	R401.3 New Section n					
Location	base					
Proponent	Joe Cain JoeCainPE@gmail.com					
Proposal Status	SC rev					
Subcommittee	RE Admin					
Subcommittee Notes	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.					
Recommendation	Disapproval					
Vote	6-0					
Recommendation Date	4/15/22					
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus Committee X					
Consensus Committee						
Committee Response						
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee					
Date						



Proposal #	REPI-069-21 Multi-family alignment
CDP ID #	290
Code	IECC RE
Code Section(s)	R403.1 (New), R403.1, R403.6.1, R403.8, R404.2 (New), R404.2, R404.3 (New), R404.3, R404.4 (New) New Section y
Location	base
Proponent	Kim Cheslak kim@newbuildings.org
Proposal Status	SC rev
Subcommittee	RE Admin
Subcommittee Notes	
Recommendation	
Vote	Approve 6-0
Recommendation Date	2/15/22
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus CommitteeX
Consensus Committee	
Committee Response	
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee
Date	



Proposal #	REPI-118-21 Performance Path backstop							
CDP ID #	315							
Code	IECC RE							
Code Section(s)	R405.2 New Section n							
Location	base							
Proponent	Amy Boyce amy.boyce@imt.org							
Proposal Status	SC rev							
Subcommittee	RE Econ, Model, Metric							
Subcommittee Notes	The only modification is to adjust the equals sign to a less than or equals sign to align with REPI-004-21 previously approved by the full committee.							
Recommendation	Motion to approve as modified to add a less that or equals sign by Gayathri Vijaykumar, 2 nd by Ben Edwards							
Vote	13-3 for approve as modified (3 not present)							
Recommendation Date	2-9-22							
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus Committee Motion to approve as modified							
Consensus Committee								
Committee Response								
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee							
Date								



Proposal #	REPI-129-21 ERI On-site renewable backstop								
CDP ID#	313								
Code	IECC RE								
Code Section(s)	R406.3, R406.3.1, R406.3.2 New Section n								
Location	base								
Proponent	William Fay bill@energyefficientcodes.org								
Proposal Status	SC rev								
Subcommittee	RE Econ, Model, Metric								
Subcommittee Notes	Considered alongside REPI-128-21 – competing backstop approaches for R406. Straw poll support from 10 (higher support than 128)								
Recommendation	Approve								
Vote	Approve 11-7								
Recommendation Date	2/9/22								
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus CommitteeX								
Consensus Committee									
Committee Response									
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee								
Date									



Proposal #	REPI-128-21 ERI envelope backstop
CDP ID #	490
Code	IECC RE
Code Section(s)	R406.3, R406.3.1, R406.3.2 New Section n
Location	base
Proponent	Joe Cain JoeCainPE@gmail.com
Proposal Status	SC rev
Subcommittee	RE Econ, Model, Metric
Subcommittee Notes	Considered alongside REPI-129-21 – competing backstop approaches for R406. Straw poll – support from 7 members
Recommendation	Motion to disapprove Jay Crandell, 2 nd Jerry Phelan consistent with subcommittee action on REPI-129-21 and removal of on-site renewable backstop is not appropriate.
Vote	Disapproved 11-7 (1 not present)
Recommendation Date	2/9/22
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus Committee X
Consensus Committee	
Committee Response	
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee
Date	



Proposal #	REPI-013-21 Radiant Barrier
CDP ID #	103
Code	IECC RE
Code Section(s)	R303.1.1.2 New Section y
Location	base
Proponent	Amanda Hickman amanda@thehickmangroup.com
Proposal Status	SC rev
Subcommittee	RE Envelope
Subcommittee Notes	Similar proposal to 42 and 141. Similar points made clarifying this is not insulation, since the proponent claims would reduce heat transfer; Suggestion made for a more logical section number; proponent amenable.
Recommendation	Motion to approve with intent to modify (with section number revised to be R303.2.2 and the corresponding N section number) G. Johnson, Drumheller seconded Reason: radiant barriers help reduce heat transfer and installation standard is needed
Vote	9 yes 5 no
Recommendation Date	2/16/22
Next Step	To Subcommittee_X To Advisory Group To Consensus Committee
Consensus Committee	
Committee Response	
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee



Proposal #	REPI-042-21 Radiant Barrier
CDP ID #	105
Code	IECC RE
Code Section(s)	R402.3 (N1102.3) (New), ASTM Chapter 06 (New) New Section y
Location	base
Proponent	Wesley Hall wes.hall@reflectixinc.com
Proposal Status	SC rev
Subcommittee	RE Envelope
Subcommittee Notes	Sets requirements for reflective insulation and emittance; overdue good information; clarification that radiant barriers do not have insulation value they have reflective value; no insulation claims were made by proponent; guidance consistent with DOE; concerns about product integrity under environmental conditions; opinion that a definition was needed.
Recommendation	Motion to approve as submitted by Craig Drumheller and Greg Johnson seconded Reason: provides useful definition on reflective insulation and emittance
Vote	11 yes 5 no
Recommendation Date	2/16/22
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus Committee:X
Consensus Committee	
Committee Response	



Proposal #	REPI-032-21 Low Slope Roof in R U Tables
CDP ID #	393
Code	IECC RE
Code Section(s)	R402.1.2 table, TABLE R402.1.3, R402.2.1, R402.2.2 New Section n
Location	base
Proponent	Darren Meyers dmeyers@ieccode.com
Proposal Status	SC rev
Subcommittee	RE Envelope
Subcommittee Notes	Unintended erratum in table to be corrected. Lessening insulation higher U factors/lower R-values for some roofs sourced from commercial code; point made that the typical configuration of residential buildings is different from large commercial buildings.
Recommendation	Motion to approve with intent to modify (modification adapted based on comments), Amy Schmitt; Charlie Allen seconded (1-14 motion fails) Motion to <u>disapprove</u> by Chris Mathis; Alison Lindberg seconded. Reason: residential and commercial roof provisions are different for a good reason; roofs have greater effect on overall envelope performance on residential buildings. no reason to relax residential to match commercial provision.
Vote	15 yes 1 no motion carries
Recommendation Date	2/16/22
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus CommitteeXX
Consensus Committee	
Committee Response	



Proposal #	REPI-067-21 air barrier boxes
CDP ID #	20
Code	IECC RE
Code Section(s)	R402.4.6 New Section n
Location	base
Proponent	Robert DeVries rdevries@nuwool.com
Proposal Status	SC rev
Subcommittee	RE Envelope
Subcommittee Notes	
Recommendation	
Vote	Disapproval 15-1
Recommendation Date	2/16/22
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus CommitteeX
Consensus Committee	
Committee Response	
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee
Date	



Proposal #	REPI-146-21 Roof replacement
CDP ID #	356
Code	IECC RE
Code Section(s)	R503.1 New Section n
Location	base
Proponent	Darren Meyers dmeyers@ieccode.com
Proposal Status	SC rev
Subcommittee	RE Existing Building
Subcommittee Notes	Reason; the accompany code change for commercial was disapproved and the proponent asked the sub-committee to disapproved
Recommendation	Paul Demers – Made the motion to disapprove Jim Zengal - Second
Vote	Unanimous, motion passes
Recommendation Date	
Next Step	To Subcommittee To Advisory Group To Consensus Committee X
Consensus Committee	
Committee Response	
Vote	Affirmative Negative Table To Subcommittee
Date	