

03/14/2022

Attendees:

Mike Stone

Mark Rodriguez

Kris Stenger

Amy Martino

Ann Edminster

Bob raymer

Britta Gross

Chris Perry

Courtney Anderson

Craig Conner

David Mann

Diana Burk

2. Meeting Conduct. Staff
 - a. Identification of Representation/Conflict of Interest
 - b. ICC Council Policy 7 Committees: Section 5.1.10 Representation of Interests
 - c.

The cost of gas vs elec. We should avoid this for the future.

Patricia C, this works well for single family, but does not work as well in multifamily.

2. MJ -

a. Vote 10-2-0

e.

Jim Early
Jerry Phelan
Jim Meyers
Joe Cain
Kevin Rose
Lauren Urbanek
Martin Herzfeld
Michael Cunningham
Mary Booth
Michael Jouaneh
Michael Tillou
Noelani Derrickson
Patricia Chawla
Payam Bozorgchami
Sean Denniston
Shane Hoeper
Shannon Corcoran
Sharon Bonesteel
Steven Rosenstock
Tom Paine
Vrushali Mendon

Agenda

Discussion of Zero Net Energy

Up to the committee to determine the glide path

Commercial has a proposal authored by Dwayne J

Action: bring up at the next consensus meeting to form a working group

EV Proposal discussion

Postpone based on Board investigation on mandatory versus optional requirements

Is EV code in scope? The Board of Directors ruled it was out of scope in a previous cycle.

CEPI-12-21 Part II Biomass definition

Passed as modified

REPI-112 Motion to modify approved 11-0-0

Michael J motion, Patricia C 2nd

Amy modify "conditioned floor area" to "living space," not approved

Lighting related code proposals

Vote on REPI-102 proposals regarding lighting efficacy

Passed as submitted

Vote on REPI-100

Denied

Vote on REPI-101 proposal regarding antimicrobial lighting

Tabled until next meeting to align with the proponents

01/24/2022

Attendees:

Mike Stone

Mark Rodriguez

Kris Stenger

Aaron Phillips

Amy Martino

Bob raymer

Ann Edminster

Bruce Swiecicki

Courtney Anderson

Doug Powell

Gary Heikkinen

Howard W

James Earley

Jerry Phelan

Jim Meyers

Joe Cain

Lauren Urbanek

Martin Herzfeld

Michael Cunningham

MJO Tc 0 Tw ()TjEMC /P #MCIh-1 (c)65nger

Commercial facilities more classified as commercial. Not meant for one- and two-family dwellings and townhomes

Branch circuit capacity with EMS changes in C405.13.5.1 Circuit capacity Management

4.1kva per space minimum

2.7kVA for R-2 when 100% of spaces are either EV ready, V capable, or EVSE spaces.

BR: With regards to R-2, apartment complexes, with 100 parking spots, required to have 100% of EV ready.. Going from 0 to 100?

SR: thought process is a high number of folks charging simultaneous in this occupancy

BR: agrees with the use, but this is a lot to expect in a short amount of time. In regards to R-3, some are commercial, but mostly one- and two-family dwellings, but the table says r-3, which includes these. Can we see the cost impact analysis?

SR: Cost info in the original separate proposals

KS: **PROCESS NOTE** - SC proposal comes through, KS will add it to CDPAccess for review. A new proposal number will be generated to indicate that it's a committee proposal.

AE: For R-3, for two dwellings, how do you calculate 2%?

SR: Covered by the exception for fewer than 10 spaces

BR: Production housing, many units over a long period, working in phases, 100 single family homes in the end, how does the table apply if the project is built in phases?

Clarity needed in the table. IN CA < 100% of new homes are EV capable which is incredibly cost effective. The table needs work for clarity.

PC:

SH: Minimum amount of charge stations should apply, ≥ 1 . 208/240vac may be confusing and could lead to discrepancies in the current and wiring.

SR: Minimum of 208/240 single phase level 2 charger is the minimum. Up to 80amps. EV ready spaces allows flexibility in negotiations and could get moved. A single charge with multiple cords could service multiple parking spaces if it meets the electrical requirements

SD: Will bring learnings from this commercial group to the Resi side

MS: Definitions from this proposal can be brought into the Resi side. A new table will be needed with numbers adjusted for Resi for EV Ready and EV capable. R-3 in CA is

JC: Question about countdown timer. Occupant sensor control is a defined term, Occupancy has been changed to Occupant in past code cycles. Vacancy sensor is NOT defined. Should propose a new definition. Are there commercially available systems that satisfy these requirements, is this proposal specific to a certain type of tech?

MJ: There are several options including smart light bulbs.

JMH: The 5% covers the need for another exception regarding scheduled lights. This seems non-controversial.

MJ, we could remove "vacancy sensor" since it isn't defined.

JC: In favor of the changes. Vacancy sensor is manual on and automatic off.

AM: Wants to concur with security lighting and lighting for safety purposes can be quantified in the 5%. Would like to see sources.

CEPI-12-21 Part 2 Definition of biomass waste for Residential

PC: DEFN - C202 BIOMASS WASTE. Organic non-fossil material of biological origin that is a byproduct or a discarded product. Biomass waste includes municipal solid waste from biogenic sources, landfill gas, sludge waste, agricultural crop byproducts, straw, and other biomass solids, liquids, and biogases; but excludes wood and wood-derived fuels (including black liquor), biofuel, feedstock, biodiesel, and fuel ethanol.

SR: Approved as submitted on the commercial side. There was a controversial discussion.

JC: Trying to recall if there were mods but not sure which SC discussed? There was a discussion of Black liquor(?) We have knowledge of historic PV systems wth data available, but for other renewable measures, we are without history. Hard to justify life-cycle cost analysis. IECC says renewable energy is required but may present challenges to cost effectiveness. At full decarb, we stop burning stuff but for long term...need to stop burning stuff.

SR: Certain states have already defined this term, there40-3.4 (he)-4.7BT0.133 g-0.002 Tw 117 15h

Next proposals this committee would like to discuss

MS: New meeting for Monday at 9am to discuss residential EV proposals.

ASHRAE conflict for Steve R.

JC: Hope to invite the group that worked on the Commercial proposal...Doodle poll?

JM: Second the doodle

KS: We can work it out.

REPI-112-21

CEPI-12-21 Part II

ZNE Glide path

PC: Can we schedule proposals for future meeting?

01/10/2022

Attendees:

Mark Rodriguez

Kris Stenger

Bob raymer

Ann Edminster

Courtney Anderson

Eric Lacey

Gary Heikkinen

James Earley

Howard W

Joe Cain

Michael Cunningham

Patricia Chawla

Shane Hoeper

Tom Paine

Robert Pegues

Amanda

Amy Martino

Martin Herzfeld

Jim Meyers

Michael Jouaneh

Nick Thompson

Lauren Urbanek

Farhad Faramand

Steve Orłowski

Bryan Holland

Vrushali Mendon

1.

- f. BH: The commercial group has scheduled out when proposals will be discussed. Create a chart for discussion at meetings. We should schedule the proposal discussion for this WG.
 - g. PC: There may be an update available to us regarding Resi EV proposals by the next meeting.
- 3. Open forum
 - a. BR: Initiate a discussion of the codes and the direction we are supposed to go. Considering proposals for PV Mandate, ESS ready, EV ready and the like, this

Attendees:

Mike Stone

Mark Rodriguez

Kris Stenger

Bob raymer

Courtney Anderson

Eric Lacey

James Earley

Jim Meyers

Joe Cain

Michael Cunningham

Micheal Jouaneh

JC: Attendees need to know when they are eligible to vote.

MS: Chair does not get a vote in other forums....but does get a vote in the SC. Council policy allows it. In CA CAC's, if you submit a PC, you can't give testimony to the CAC.

AM: Joe raises an important issue. We should talk about it. There are times when you need to recuse yourself from a vote. If you represent, or a member of your Org represents, you should abstain.

KS: The CC can vote to say otherwise.

AM: Motion to discuss giving a recommendation

BR: Second the motion

SH: Thinking along the lines of JC, if the committee modifies the proposal, can the proponent vote? If we modify a proposal, as authors, can everyone vote?

KS: Proponents can refuse the friendly modification, in which case the committee can decide to make a new proposal; Which allows the original proponent to vote.

SR: In other forums, I can vote at both the SC and CC. The proponent or organization, could be multiple people that have to recuse themselves. More if joint proposals.

JC: IMO, this is unworkable. If there are 6 proponents of a proposal, do they all have to abstain if they are all SC members. But then modify it slightly, it becomes a committee proposal and all can vote. Too many ways to game the system.

MS: There are 18 code-making panels.

MJ: Discussed in Commercial SC, too gameable. Proponent may vote against their own proposal in favor of a better option. ZVoting member should be able to vote whether or not listed as a proponent.

JM: When is the next EC?

KS: Next week

JM: Will feel more comfortable after getting direction.

AM: Roll Call vote for who is a proponent or member of an org that is a proponent?

BR: None from us but some will come from other groups.

MS: NBI, NEMA, EEI, DOE, SEIA, ASHRAE are current proponents.

Who are voting members from those orgs?

JC: Anyone from a proponent org can't vote on proposals with their name, but could on others. Fix it!

MR: Are we saying that all members should be able to vote?

Yes

MS: How should we structure this statement?

KS: Go with a more definitive language

AM: Withdraw and amend motion.

BR: agree

AM: Amend motion to be consistent with CP28? Can we get the text?

KS: "finding CP28 for the group."

PC: Can we repost a meeting note link to chat?

MS: Any idea on easy proposals to discuss?

KS:

JM: Concerned that undisclosed interest..

AE: Me too wave. People come in with knowledge and are best equipped to speak on the issues. Silencing them is counter-productive.

AM: Anyone should be part of the discussion. This is a committee conflict of interest which should apply to the CC. Does Not have to be the same for the SC.

MS: Can we agree as an SC?

AM: Support CP28 for the CC, but not the SC. Specifically 5.2.2.

AM - Motion to comply with CP28 for the CC, but for the SC, 5.2.2 should not apply. BR

- b. Next IECC Residential Consensus Committee Meeting (full committee):
Thursday, December 16, 2021, 2:00-4:30 PM EST
- 9. Adjourn.