

International Code Council
IECC Residential Consistency and
Administration Subcommittee

March 1st, 2022

| Committee Member | Email |
|--|---|
| Richard PottsChair | 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 Gttman | 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 | |

, Solar Energy Industry

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 REPI156. 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 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. REPI156-21– 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 definition is basically this calculation. It's a term that is defined by the equation. A definition would basically just repeat that equation.

- xii. Patricia– There are three other co proposals for the ~~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 ~~can~~ 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

requirements identified in Table R405.2 and the proposed total building thermal envelope UA, which is the sum of UFactor times assembly area, shall be less than or equal to the building thermal envelope UA as the prescriptive U-Factors from Table R402.1.2 multiplied by 1.15 in accordance with Equation 4-1. The areaweighted 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.

1.

1. None

xiii.

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 3:05 p.m. EST.