

**International Code Council  
IECC Residential Consistency and  
Administration Subcommittee**

February 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022

**Committee Member**

**Email**

	rhodes.michael@us.sika.com
Maureen Guttman	mguttpgh@gmail.com
Rich Truitt, Vice Chair	rctrutt@harfordcountymd.gov
<del>Cliff Davis</del>	<del>edavis1@tollbrothers.com</del>
<b>Non-member Participants</b>	<b>Email</b>
Paul Messplay, Secretary	paul.messplayiv@dhcd.virginia.gov
Amy Boyce, IMT	amy.boyce@imt.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 18<sup>th</sup> minutes
    - i. Motion for approval: Andrea
    - ii. Second: Maureen
    - iii. Minutes approved unanimously
  - b. February 1<sup>st</sup> 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

know what date they approved this at the modeling

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 23<sup>rd</sup> 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,

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.

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.