



INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL

2012 – 2014 CODE
DEVELOPMENT CYCLE
Group C (2014)

2014 REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING
ON THE 2012 EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL
GREEN CONSTRUCTION CODE®

- General
- Energy/Water

HELD IN MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE
APRIL 27 – MAY 3, 2014

PUBLIC COMMENT DEADLINE:
JULY 16, 2014



First Printing

Publication Date: June 2014

Copyright © 2014

By

International Code Council, Inc.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. This 2012-2014 Code Development Cycle Report of the Public Hearing on the 2012 Editions of the *International Codes* is a copyrighted work owned by the International Code Council, Inc. Without advanced written permission from the copyright owner, no part of this book may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including, without limitations, electronic, optical or mechanical means (by way of example and not limitation, photocopying, or recording by or in an information storage retrieval system). For information on permission to copy material exceeding fair use, please contact: Publications, 4051 West Flossmoor Road, Country Club Hills, IL 60478 (Phone 1-888-422-7233).

Trademarks: "International Code Council," the "International Code Council" logo are trademarks of the International Code Council, Inc.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS



Introduction	i
cdpACCESS Website	i
ICC Website	i
Committee Action on Code Change Proposals Relative to the Scope and Application of the IgCC	i
Modifications by Public Comment	ii
Public Comment Hearing Consideration	ii
Call for Adoption Information.....	ii
2015-2017 ICC Code Development Schedule	ii
cdpACCESS Updates	ii
2012-2014 ICC Code Development Schedule	iii
ICC Code Development Procedures (Council Policy CP #28).....	iv
Report of Public Hearing Table of Contents	xx

INTRODUCTION

This publication contains the 2014 Report of the Committee Action Hearing (Group C) on the proposed revisions to the 2012 Edition of the *International Green Construction Code* (IgCC). The hearing was held in Memphis, Tennessee, April 27 – May 3, 2014.

This report includes the recommendation of the code development committee and the committee's reason on each proposed item. It also includes successful assembly actions that were voted upon during the online Assembly vote on cdpACCESS subsequent to the hearings, May 19 – 30, 2014, in accordance with Section 5.7 of the *ICC Council Policy CP#28-05 Code Development* (CP #28). Where the committee or assembly action was "Approved as Modified", the proposed change, or a portion thereof, is included herein with the modification indicated in strikeout/underline format. Where this report indicates "Withdrawn by Proponent" the proposed change was withdrawn by the proponent and is not subject to any further consideration.

The text of the original code change proposals is published in the monograph titled 2012-2014 Code Development Cycle Group C Proposed Changes to the 2012 Edition of the *International Green Construction Code*.

Proposals on which there was a successful assembly action will be automatically included on the Public Comment Agenda for Individual Consideration and voting by eligible voting members in accordance with Section 6.1 (2) of CP #28.

Persons who wish to recommend an action other than that taken at the public hearing may submit a public comment in accordance with Section 6.0 of the *ICC CP #28*. **The deadline for receipt of public comments is July 16, 2014.** Proposals which receive a public comment will be included on the Public Comment Hearing Agenda for Individual Consideration and voting by eligible voting members in accordance with Section 7.5 of CP#28. Subsequent to the Public Comment Hearings, the results of the Individual Consideration Agenda will be the basis for the Online Governmental Consensus Vote to determine final action on these proposals. Proposals which do not receive a public comment will be included in the consent agenda.

The Online Governmental Consensus Vote is scheduled to start approximately one week after the conclusion of the Public Comment Hearing.

SUBMIT PUBLIC COMMENTS ONLINE AT THE cdpACCESS WEBSITE: www.cdpACCESS.com

Please note: The word processing software utilized by cdpACCESS, for submittal of public comments, does not permit the use of the "cut and paste" feature from Word documents.

ICC WEBSITE - WWW.ICCSAFE.ORG

While great care has been exercised in the publication of this document, errata may occur. Errata will be posted on the ICC website at www.iccsafe.org. Users are encouraged to review the ICC Website for errata to the 2012-2014 Code Development Cycle Proposed Changes (Group C) and the 2014 Report of the Committee Action Hearing.

COMMITTEE ACTION ON CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS RELATIVE TO THE SCOPE AND APPLICATION OF THE IgCC

Code change proposals which address the scope and application of the *International Green Construction Code* were considered during these hearings. (See Code Change Proposals numbered GG6, GG7, GG9, GG10, GG11, GG12, GG13, GG15, GG16, GG17, GG73, GG74, GG320 and GEW3). The action taken by the applicable IgCC Code Development Committee coupled with the final action taken at the 2014 Public Comment Hearings and subsequent Governmental Consensus Vote will be limited to an advisory recommendation to the ICC Board of Directors who will determine the final disposition on these proposed changes in accordance with Section 1.3 of *ICC CP #28*.

MODIFICATIONS BY PUBLIC COMMENT

Section 6.4.4 of CP #28 allows modifications to be proposed by a public comment to a code change proposal for consideration at the Public Comment Hearing. For the modification to be considered at the Public Comment Hearing, the public comment must request Approval as Modified with the specific modification included in the public comment. The modification must be within the scope of the original proposed code change and relevant to the specific issue in the original code change.

PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING CONSIDERATION

In summary, the items that will be on the agenda for individual consideration and action are:

1. Proposed changes that received a successful Assembly Action (Section 5.7); and
2. Proposed changes that received a public comment (Section 6.0).

CALL FOR ADOPTION INFORMATION

Please take a minute to visit the ICC Code Adoption Maps at www.iccsafe.org/gr/Pages/adoptions.aspx; scroll to the bottom of the page and click on one of the jurisdiction maps and review the information as it relates to your jurisdiction. To see state/jurisdiction in chart form (PDF), go to Related Links (right side of screen) and choose the related file. If your jurisdiction is not listed, or is listed with incorrect information, click on the Code Adoption Resources (left side of screen), and click on Submit Adoption Info and provide correct information.

2015-2017 ICC CODE DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE

The 2015-2017 ICC Code Development Schedule has been posted. [Click here](#) for schedule.

cdpACCESS Update

The development of cdpACCESS continues in support of the new process steps in the 2014 Cycle. To date, the following has been completed and implemented:

- Collaboration features where interested parties can review and “discuss” potential code change submittals.
- The online submittal process where code change proposals were submitted by the January 10, 2014 deadline.
- The real time posting of Committee Action Hearing results.
- The Online Assembly Floor Motion Voting process which followed the Committee Action Hearing. Over 250 ICC members participated in the online vote during the period of May 19 – May 30 with the votes tallied and reported in this Report of Committee Action Hearing.
- Collaboration features in support of the public comment submittal process.
- The online public comment submittal process with public comments due July 16, 2014. Be sure to [log on](#) to submit a public comment.

Public comment submittal assistance will be provided on the [cdpACCESS webpage](#). We will be posting a video tutorial which outlines the navigation steps as well as holding webinars. A webinar schedule will be posted.

Staff is developing the next process steps:

- The use of electronic voting devices at the Public Comment Hearing which record the vote of the eligible voting member.
- The Online Governmental Consensus Voting process which follows the Public Comment Hearing.

ICC continues to receive feedback from users. It will be reviewed to determine potential process enhancements going forward for the 2015 Cycle. Be sure to visit the “Support Options” on the [cdpACCESS webpage](#) for more information.

2012 - 2014 ICC CODE DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE

STEP IN CODE DEVELOPMENT CYCLE	DATE		
	2012 – Group A Codes IBC, IFGC, IMC, IPC, IPSDC	2013 – Group B Codes Admin, ICCPC, IEBC, IECC, IFC, IPMC, IRC, ISPSC, IWUIC, IZC	2014 – Group C Code IgCC
2012 EDITION OF I-CODES PUBLISHED	April 30, 2011		March 31, 2012
DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS FOR ALL CODE COMMITTEES	June 1, 2011 for the 2012/2013/2014 Cycle (updated to July 1 for IECC and IRC – Energy; August 1 for IgCC and ISPSC) June 2, 2014 for the 2015/2016/2017 Cycle. Call for committee posted January 31, 2014.		
DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS	January 3, 2012	January 3, 2013	January 10, 2014
WEB POSTING OF “PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE I-CODES”	March 12, 2012	March 11, 2013	March 10, 2014
DISTRIBUTION DATE OF “PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE I-CODES” (CD only)	April 2, 2012	April 1, 2013	Online access via the ICC website and cdpACCESS only. Electronic version available at the ICC Bookstore.
COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING (CAH)	April 29 – May 6, 2012 Sheraton Dallas Hotel Dallas, TX	April 21 – 30, 2013 Sheraton Dallas Hotel Dallas, TX	April 27 – May 3, 2014 Memphis Cook Convention Center Memphis, TN
ONLINE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING ASSEMBLY VOTING PERIOD	N/A	N/A	May 19 – 30, 2014
WEB POSTING OF “REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING”	June 8, 2012	May 31, 2013	June 6, 2014
DISTRIBUTION DATE OF “REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING” (CD only)	June 29, 2012	June 21, 2013	Online access via the ICC website and cdpACCESS only. Electronic version available at the ICC Bookstore.
DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	August 1, 2012	July 15, 2013	July 16, 2014
WEB POSTING OF PUBLIC COMMENTS “PUBLIC COMMENT AGENDA”	September 10, 2012	August 28, 2013	August 27, 2014
DISTRIBUTION DATE OF “PUBLIC COMMENT AGENDA” (CD only)	October 1, 2012	September 16, 2013	Online access via the ICC website and cdpACCESS only. Electronic version available at the ICC Bookstore
PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING (PCH) ANNUAL CONFERENCE DATES NOTED BY AC	October 24 – 28, 2012 Oregon Convention Center Portland, OR AC: October 21 - 24	October 2 – 10, 2013 Atlantic City Convention Center Atlantic City, NJ AC: September 29 – October 2	October 1 – 7, 2014 Greater Fort Lauderdale Broward County Convention Center Fort Lauderdale, FL AC: September 28 – October 1
ONLINE GOVERNMENTAL CONSENSUS VOTING PERIOD	N/A	N/A	Starts approximately one week after last day of Public Comment Hearing. Open for two weeks.



CP #28-05 CODE DEVELOPMENT

Approved: 9/24/05
Revised: 9/28/13

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Purpose:** The purpose of this Council Policy is to prescribe the Rules of Procedure utilized in the continued development and maintenance of the International Codes (Codes).
- 1.2 Objectives:** The ICC Code Development Process has the following objectives:
- 1.2.1** The timely evaluation and recognition of technological developments pertaining to construction regulations.
 - 1.2.2** The open discussion of code change proposals by all parties desiring to participate.
 - 1.2.3** The final determination of Code text by public officials actively engaged in the administration, formulation or enforcement of laws, ordinances, rules or regulations relating to the public health, safety and welfare and by honorary members.
 - 1.2.4** The increased participation of all parties desiring to participate through an online submittal and voting process that includes opportunities for online collaboration.
- 1.3 Code Publication:** The ICC Board of Directors (ICC Board) shall determine the title and the general purpose and scope of each Code published by the ICC.
- 1.3.1 Code Correlation:** The provisions of all Codes shall be consistent with one another so that conflicts between the Codes do not occur. A Code Scoping Coordination Matrix shall determine which Code shall be the primary document, and therefore which code development committee shall be responsible for maintenance of the code text where a given subject matter or code text could appear in more than one Code. The Code Scoping Coordination Matrix shall be administered by the Code Correlation Committee as approved by the ICC Board. Duplication of content or text between Codes shall be limited to the minimum extent necessary for practical usability of the Codes, as determined in accordance with Section 4.5.
- 1.4 Process Maintenance:** The review and maintenance of the Code Development Process and these Rules of Procedure shall be by the ICC Board. The manner in which Codes are developed embodies core principles of the organization. One of those principles is that the final content of the Codes is determined by a majority vote of the governmental and honorary members. It is the policy of the ICC Board that there shall be no change to this principle without the affirmation of two-thirds of the governmental and honorary members responding.
- 1.5 Secretariat:** The Chief Executive Officer shall assign a Secretariat for each of the Codes. All correspondence relating to code change proposals and public comments shall be addressed to the Secretariat. The Secretariat shall have the authority to facilitate unforeseen situations which arise in the implementation of this council policy. Staff shall maintain a record of such actions.
- 1.6 Recording:** Individuals requesting permission to record any meeting or hearing, or portion thereof, shall be required to provide the ICC with a release of responsibility disclaimer and shall acknowledge that ICC shall retain sole ownership of the recording, and that they have insurance coverage for liability and misuse of recording materials. Equipment and the process used to record shall, in the judgment of the ICC Secretariat, be conducted in a manner that is not disruptive to the meeting. The ICC shall not be responsible for equipment, personnel or any other provision necessary to accomplish the recording. An unedited copy of the recording shall be forwarded to ICC within 30 days of the meeting. Recordings shall not otherwise be copied, reproduced or distributed in any manner. Recordings shall be returned to ICC or destroyed upon

the request of ICC.

2.0 Code Development Cycle

2.1 Intent: The code development cycle shall consist of the complete consideration of code change proposals in accordance with the procedures herein specified, commencing with the deadline for submission of code change proposals (see Section 3.5) and ending with publication of the Final Action on the code change proposals (see Section 10.4).

2.2 New Editions: The ICC Board shall determine the schedule for publishing new editions of the Codes. Each new edition shall incorporate the results of the code development activity since the previous edition.

2.3 Supplements: The results of code development activity between editions may be published.

2.4 Emergency Action Procedures:

2.4.1 Scope: Emergency actions are limited to those issues representing an immediate threat to health and safety that warrant a more timely response than allowed by the Code Development Process schedule.

2.4.2 Initial Request: A request for an emergency action shall be based upon perceived threats to health and safety and shall be reviewed by the Codes and Standards Council for referral to the ICC Board for action with their analysis and recommendation.

2.4.3 Board and Member Action: In the event that the ICC Board determines that an emergency amendment to any Code or supplement thereto is warranted, the same may be adopted by the ICC Board. Such action shall require an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the ICC Board.

The ICC membership shall be notified within ten days after the ICC Boards' official action of any emergency amendment. At the next Annual Business Meeting, any emergency amendment shall be presented to the members for ratification by a majority of the Governmental Member Voting Representatives and Honorary Members present and voting.

All code revisions pursuant to these emergency procedures and the reasons for such corrective action shall be published as soon as practicable after ICC Board action. Such revisions shall be identified as an emergency amendment.

Emergency amendments to any Code shall not be considered as a retro-active requirement to the Code. Incorporation of the emergency amendment into the adopted Code shall be subjected to the process established by the adopting authority.

2.5 Code Development Record. The code development record shall include the official documents and records developed in support of the given code development cycle. This includes the following:

1. Code Change Agenda (Section 4.8)
2. Audio and video recording of the Committee Action Hearing (Section 5.1)
3. The Online Assembly Floor Motion Ballot (Section 5.7.3)
4. Report of the Committee Action Hearing (Section 5.8)
5. Public Comment Agenda (Section 6.6)
6. Public Comment Hearing results (Section 7.5.8.10)
7. Audio and video recording of the Public Comment Hearing (Section 7.1)
8. The Online Governmental Consensus Ballot (Section 8.2)
9. Final Action results (Section 10.4)
10. Errata to the documents noted above

The information resulting from online collaboration between interested parties shall not be part of the code development record.

3.0 Submittal of Code Change Proposals

- 3.1 Intent:** Any interested person, persons or group may submit a code change proposal which will be duly considered when in conformance to these Rules of Procedure.
- 3.2 Withdrawal of Proposal:** A code change proposal may be withdrawn by the proponent (WP) at any time prior to public comment consideration of that proposal. All actions on the code change proposal shall cease immediately upon the withdrawal of the code change proposal.
- 3.3 Form and Content of Code Change Submittals:** Each code change proposal shall be submitted separately and shall be complete in itself. Each submittal shall contain the following information:
- 3.3.1 Proponent:** Each code change proposal shall include the name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address of the proponent. Email addresses shall be published with the code change proposals unless the proponent otherwise requests on the submittal form.
- 3.3.1.1** If a group, organization or committee submits a code change proposal, an individual with prime responsibility shall be indicated.
- 3.3.1.2** If a proponent submits a code change proposal on behalf of a client, group, organization or committee, the name and mailing address of the client, group, organization or committee shall be indicated.
- 3.3.2 Code Reference:** Each code change proposal shall relate to the applicable code sections(s) in the latest edition of the Code.
- 3.3.2.1** If more than one section in the Code is affected by a code change proposal, appropriate proposals shall be included for all such affected sections.
- 3.3.2.2** If more than one Code is affected by a code change proposal, appropriate proposals shall be included for all such affected Codes and appropriate cross referencing shall be included in the supporting information.
- 3.3.3 Multiple Code Change Proposals to a Code Section.** A proponent shall not submit multiple code change proposals to the same code section. When a proponent submits multiple code change proposals to the same section, the proposals shall be considered as incomplete proposals and processed in accordance with Section 4.3. This restriction shall not apply to code change proposals that attempt to address differing subject matter within a code section.
- 3.3.4 Text Presentation:** The text of the code change proposal shall be presented in the specific wording desired with deletions shown struck out with a single line and additions shown underlined with a single line.
- 3.3.4.1** A charging statement shall indicate the referenced code section(s) and whether the code change proposal is intended to be an addition, a deletion or a revision to existing Code text.
- 3.3.4.2** Whenever practical, the existing wording of the text shall be preserved with only such deletions and additions as necessary to accomplish the desired change.
- 3.3.4.3** Each code change proposal shall be in proper code format and terminology.
- 3.3.4.4** Each code change proposal shall be complete and specific in the text to eliminate unnecessary confusion or misinterpretation.
- 3.3.4.5** The proposed text shall be in mandatory terms.
- 3.3.5 Supporting Information:** Each code change proposal shall include sufficient supporting information to indicate how the code change proposal is intended to affect the intent and application of the Code.
- 3.3.5.1 Purpose:** The proponent shall clearly state the purpose of the code change proposal (e.g. clarify the Code; revise outdated material; substitute new or

revised material for current provisions of the Code; add new requirements to the Code; delete current requirements, etc.)

- 3.3.5.2 Reasons:** The proponent shall justify changing the current Code provisions, stating why the code change proposal is superior to the current provisions of the Code. Code change proposals which add or delete requirements shall be supported by a logical explanation which clearly shows why the current Code provisions are inadequate or overly restrictive, specifies the shortcomings of the current Code provisions and explains how such code change proposals will improve the Code.
- 3.3.5.3 Substantiation:** The proponent shall substantiate the code change proposal based on technical information and substantiation. Substantiation provided which is reviewed in accordance with Section 4.2 and determined as not germane to the technical issues addressed in the code change proposal may be identified as such. The proponent shall be notified that the code change proposal is considered an incomplete proposal in accordance with Section 4.3 and the proposal shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected. The proponent shall have the right to appeal this action in accordance with the policy of the ICC Board. The burden of providing substantiating material lies with the proponent of the code change proposal. All substantiating material published by ICC is material that has been provided by the proponent and in so publishing ICC makes no representations or warranties about its quality or accuracy.
- 3.3.5.4 Bibliography:** The proponent shall submit a bibliography of any substantiating material submitted with the code change proposal. The bibliography shall be published with the code change proposal and the proponent shall make the substantiating materials available for review at the appropriate ICC office and during the public hearing.
- 3.3.5.5 Copyright Release:** The proponent of code change proposals, floor modifications and public comments shall sign a copyright release reading: "I hereby grant and assign to ICC all rights in copyright I may have in any authorship contributions I make to ICC in connection with any proposal and public comment, in its original form submitted or revised form, including written and verbal modifications submitted in accordance Section 5.5.2. I understand that I will have no rights in any ICC publications that use such contributions in the form submitted by me or another similar form and certify that such contributions are not protected by the copyright of any other person or entity."
- 3.3.5.6 Cost Impact:** The proponent shall indicate one of the following regarding the cost impact of the code change proposal: 1) the code change proposal will increase the cost of construction; or 2) the code change proposal will not increase the cost of construction. The proponent should submit information to support either assertion. Any such information will be considered by the code development committee. This information will be included in the bibliography of the published code change proposal.

3.4 Online Submittal: Each code change proposal and all substantiating information shall be submitted online at the website designated by ICC. Two copies of each proposed new referenced standard in hard copy or one copy in electronic form shall be submitted. Additional copies may be requested when determined necessary by the Secretariat to allow such information to be distributed to the code development committee. Where such additional copies are requested, it shall be the responsibility of the proponent to send such copies to the respective code development committee.

3.5 Submittal Deadline: ICC shall establish and post the submittal deadline for each cycle. The posting of the deadline shall occur no later than 120 days prior to the code change deadline. Each code change proposal shall be submitted online at the website designated by ICC by the posted deadline. The submitter of a code change proposal is responsible for the proper and

timely receipt of all pertinent materials by the Secretariat.

3.6 Referenced Standards: In order for a standard to be considered for reference or to continue to be referenced by the Codes, a standard shall meet the following criteria:

3.6.1 Code References:

- 3.6.1.1** The standard, including title and date, and the manner in which it is to be utilized shall be specifically referenced in the Code text.
- 3.6.1.2** The need for the standard to be referenced shall be established.

3.6.2 Standard Content:

- 3.6.2.1** A standard or portions of a standard intended to be enforced shall be written in mandatory language.
- 3.6.2.2** The standard shall be appropriate for the subject covered.
- 3.6.2.3** All terms shall be defined when they deviate from an ordinarily accepted meaning or a dictionary definition.
- 3.6.2.4** The scope or application of a standard shall be clearly described.
- 3.6.2.5** The standard shall not have the effect of requiring proprietary materials.
- 3.6.2.6** The standard shall not prescribe a proprietary agency for quality control or testing.
- 3.6.2.7** The test standard shall describe, in detail, preparation of the test sample, sample selection or both.
- 3.6.2.8** The test standard shall prescribe the reporting format for the test results. The format shall identify the key performance criteria for the element(s) tested.
- 3.6.2.9** The measure of performance for which the test is conducted shall be clearly defined in either the test standard or in Code text.
- 3.6.2.10** The standard shall not state that its provisions shall govern whenever the referenced standard is in conflict with the requirements of the referencing Code.
- 3.6.2.11** The preface to the standard shall announce that the standard is promulgated according to a consensus procedure.

3.6.3 Standard Promulgation:

- 3.6.3.1** Code change proposals with corresponding changes to the code text which include a reference to a proposed new standard or a proposed update of an existing referenced standard shall comply with this section. The standard shall be completed and readily available prior to the Public Comment Hearing based on the cycle of code development which includes the code change proposal. In order for a new standard to be considered for reference by the Code, such standard shall be submitted in at least a consensus draft form in accordance with Section 3.4. If a new standard is not submitted in at least draft form, the code change proposal shall be considered incomplete and shall not be processed. Updating of standards without corresponding code text changes shall be accomplished administratively in accordance with Section 4.6.
- 3.6.3.2** The standard shall be developed and maintained through a consensus process such as ASTM or ANSI.

4.0 Processing of Code Change Proposals

- 4.1 Intent:** The processing of code change proposals is intended to ensure that each proposal complies with these Rules of Procedure and that the resulting published code change proposal accurately reflects that proponent's intent.
- 4.2 Review:** Upon receipt in the Secretariat's office, the code change proposals will be checked for compliance with these Rules of Procedure as to division, separation, number of copies, form, language, terminology, supporting statements and substantiating data. Where a code change proposal consists of multiple parts which fall under the maintenance responsibilities of different

code committees, the Secretariat shall determine the code committee responsible for determining the committee action in accordance with Section 5.6 and the Code Scoping Coordination Matrix (see Section 1.3.1).

- 4.3 Incomplete Code Change Proposals:** When a code change proposal is submitted with incorrect format, without the required information or judged as not in compliance with these Rules of Procedure, the Secretariat shall notify the proponent of the specific deficiencies and the proposal shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected, with a final date set for receipt of a corrected submittal. If the Secretariat receives the corrected code change proposal after the final date, the proposal shall be held over until the next code development cycle. Where there are otherwise no deficiencies addressed by this section, a code change proposal that incorporates a new referenced standard shall be processed with an analysis of the referenced standard's compliance with the criteria set forth in Section 3.6.
- 4.4 Editorial Code Change Proposals.** When a code change proposal is submitted that proposes an editorial or format change that, in the opinion of the Secretariat, does not affect the scope or application of the code, the proposal shall be submitted to the Code Correlation Committee who shall deem the code change proposal as editorial or send the proposal back to the Secretariat to be considered by the appropriate code development committee. To be deemed editorial, such proposal shall require a majority vote of the Code Correlation Committee. Editorial proposals shall be published in the Code Change Agenda. Such proposals shall be added to the hearing agenda for consideration by the appropriate code development committee upon written request to ICC by any individual. The deadline to submit such requests shall be 14 days prior to the first day of the Committee Action Hearing. Code Correlation Committee proposals that are not added to a code development committee hearing agenda shall be published in the next edition of the code with no further consideration.
- 4.5 Copy Editing Code Text:** The Chief Executive Officer shall have the authority at all times to make editorial style and format changes to the Code text, or any approved changes, consistent with the intent, provisions and style of the Code. Such editorial style or format changes shall not affect the scope or application of the Code requirements.
- 4.6 Updating Standards Referenced in the Codes:** The updating of standards referenced by the Codes shall be accomplished administratively by the Administrative Code Development Committee in accordance with these full procedures except that the deadline for availability of the updated standard and receipt by the Secretariat shall be December 1 of the third year of each code cycle. The published version of the new edition of the Code which references the standard will refer to the updated edition of the standard. If the standard is not available by the deadline, the edition of the standard as referenced by the newly published Code shall revert back to the reference contained in the previous edition and an errata to the Code issued. Multiple standards to be updated may be included in a single proposal.
- 4.7 Preparation:** All code change proposals in compliance with these procedures shall be prepared in a standard manner by the Secretariat and be assigned separate, distinct and consecutive numbers. The Secretariat shall coordinate related proposals submitted in accordance with Section 3.3.2 to facilitate the hearing process.
- 4.8 Code Change Agenda:** All code change proposals shall be posted on the ICC website at least 30 days prior to the Committee Action Hearing on those proposals and shall constitute the agenda for the Committee Action Hearing. Any errata to the Code Change Agenda shall be posted on the ICC website as soon as possible. Code change proposals which have not been published in the original posting or subsequent errata shall not be considered.

5.0 Committee Action Hearing

- 5.1 Intent:** The intent of the Committee Action Hearing is to permit interested parties to present their views including the cost and benefits on the code change proposals on the published agenda. The code development committee will consider such comments as may be presented in the development of their action on the disposition of such code change proposals. At the conclusion of the code development committee deliberations, the committee action on each code change proposal shall be placed before the hearing assembly for consideration in accordance with

Section 5.7.

- 5.2 Committee:** The Codes and Standards Council shall review all applications and make committee appointment recommendations to the ICC Board. The Code Development Committees shall be appointed by the ICC Board.
- 5.2.1 Chairman/Moderator:** The Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall be appointed by the Codes and Standards Council from the appointed members of the committee. The ICC President shall appoint one or more Moderators who shall act as presiding officer for the Committee Action_Hearing.
- 5.2.2 Conflict of Interest:** A committee member shall withdraw from and take no part in those matters with which the committee member has an undisclosed financial, business or property interest. The committee member shall not participate in any committee discussion or any committee vote on the matter in which they have an undisclosed interest. A committee member who is a proponent of a code change proposal shall not participate in any committee discussion on the matter or any committee vote. Such committee member shall be permitted to participate in the floor discussion in accordance with Section 5.5 by stepping down from the dais.
- 5.2.3 Representation of Interest:** Committee members shall not represent themselves as official or unofficial representatives of the ICC except at regularly convened meetings of the committee.
- 5.2.4 Committee Composition:** The committee may consist of representation from multiple interests. A minimum of thirty-three and one-third percent (33.3%) of the committee members shall be regulators.
- 5.3 Date and Location:** The date and location of the Committee Action Hearing shall be announced not less than 60 days prior to the date of the hearing.
- 5.4 General Procedures:** *The Robert's Rules of Order* shall be the formal procedure for the conduct of the Committee Action Hearing except as a specific provision of these Rules of Procedure may otherwise dictate. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting members of the committee.
- 5.4.1 Chair Voting:** The Chairman of the committee shall vote only when the vote cast will break a tie vote of the committee.
- 5.4.2 Open Hearing:** The Committee Action Hearing is an open hearing. Any interested person may attend and participate in the floor discussion and assembly consideration portions of the hearing. Only code development committee members may participate in the committee action portion of the hearings (see Section 5.6). Participants shall not advocate a position on specific code change proposals with committee members other than through the methods provided in this policy.
- 5.4.3 Presentation of Material at the Public Hearing:** Information to be provided at the hearing shall be limited to verbal presentations and modifications submitted in accordance with Section 5.5.2. Each individual presenting information at the hearing shall state their name and affiliation, and shall identify any entities or individuals they are representing in connection with their testimony. Audio-visual presentations are not permitted. Substantiating material submitted in accordance with Section 3.3.5.3 and other material submitted in response to a code change proposal shall be located in a designated area in the hearing room and shall not be distributed to the code development committee at the public hearing.
- 5.4.4 Agenda Order:** The Secretariat shall publish a Code Change Agenda for the Committee Action Hearing, placing individual code change proposals in a logical order to facilitate the hearing. Any public hearing attendee may move to revise the agenda order as the first order of business at the public hearing, or at any time during the hearing except while another code change proposal is being discussed. Preference shall be given to grouping like subjects together, and for moving items back to a later position on the agenda as opposed to moving items forward to an earlier position. A motion to revise the agenda

order is subject to a 2/3 vote of those present and voting.

5.4.5 Reconsideration: There shall be no reconsideration of a code change proposal after it has been voted on by the committee in accordance with Section 5.6.

5.4.6 Time Limits: Time limits shall be established as part of the agenda for testimony on all code change proposals at the beginning of each hearing session. Each person requesting to testify on a code change proposal shall be given equal time. In the interest of time and fairness to all hearing participants, the Moderator shall have limited authority to modify time limitations on debate. The Moderator shall have the authority to adjust time limits as necessary in order to complete the hearing agenda.

5.4.6.1 Time Keeping: Keeping of time for testimony by an individual shall be by an automatic timing device. Remaining time shall be evident to the person testifying. Interruptions during testimony shall not be tolerated. The Moderator shall maintain appropriate decorum during all testimony.

5.4.6.2 Proponent Testimony: The Proponent is permitted to waive an initial statement. The Proponent shall be permitted to have the amount of time that would have been allocated during the initial testimony period plus the amount of time that would be allocated for rebuttal. Where the code change proposal is submitted by multiple proponents, this provision shall permit only one proponent of the joint submittal to be allotted additional time for rebuttal.

5.4.7 Points of Order: Any person participating in the public hearing may challenge a procedural ruling of the Moderator or the Chairman. A majority vote of ICC Members in attendance shall determine the decision.

5.5 Floor Discussion: The Moderator shall place each code change proposal before the hearing for discussion by identifying the proposal and by regulating discussion as follows:

5.5.1 Discussion Order:

1. Proponents. The Moderator shall begin by asking the proponent and then others in support of the code change proposal for their comments.
2. Opponents. After discussion by those in support of a code change proposal, those opposed hereto, if any, shall have the opportunity to present their views.
3. Rebuttal in support. Proponents shall then have the opportunity to rebut points raised by the opponents.
4. Re-rebuttal in opposition. Opponents shall then have the opportunity to respond to the proponent's rebuttal.

5.5.2 Modifications: Modifications to code change proposals may be suggested from the floor by any person participating in the public hearing. The person proposing the modification is deemed to be the proponent of the modification.

5.5.2.1 Submission. All modifications shall be submitted electronically to the ICC Secretariat in a format determined by ICC unless determined by the Chairman to be either editorial or minor in nature. The modification will be forwarded electronically to the members of the code development committee during the hearing and will be projected on the screen in the hearing room.

5.5.2.2 Criteria. The Chairman shall rule proposed modifications in or out of order before they are discussed on the floor. A proposed modification shall be ruled out of order if it:

1. is not legible, unless not required to be written in accordance with Section 5.5.2.1; or
2. changes the scope of the original code change proposal; or
3. is not readily understood to allow a proper assessment of its impact on the original code change proposal or the Code.

The ruling of the Chairman on whether or not the modification is in or out of order shall be final and is not subject to a point of order in accordance with Section 5.4.7.

5.5.2.3 Testimony. When a modification is offered from the floor and ruled in order by the Chairman, a specific floor discussion on that modification is to commence in accordance with the procedures listed in Section 5.5.1.

5.6 Committee Action: Following the floor discussion of each code change proposal, one of the following motions shall be made and seconded by members of the committee:

1. Approve the code change proposal As Submitted (AS) or
2. Approve the code change proposal As Modified with specific modifications (AM), or
3. Disapprove the code change proposal (D)

Discussion on this motion shall be limited to code development committee members. If a committee member proposes a modification which had not been proposed during floor discussion, the Chairman shall rule on the modification in accordance with Section 5.5.2.2. If a committee member raises a matter of issue, including a proposed modification, which has not been proposed or discussed during the floor discussion, the Moderator shall suspend the committee discussion and shall reopen the floor discussion for comments on the specific matter or issue. Upon receipt of all comments from the floor, the Moderator shall resume committee discussion.

The code development committee shall vote on each motion with the majority dictating the committee's action. Committee action on each code change proposal shall be completed when one of the motions noted above has been approved. Each committee vote shall be supported by a reason.

The code development committee shall maintain a record of its proceedings including the action on each code change proposal.

5.7 Assembly Consideration: At the conclusion of the committee's action on a code change proposal and before the next code change proposal is called to the floor, the Moderator shall ask for a motion from the public hearing attendees who may object to the committee's action. If a motion in accordance with Section 5.7.1 is not brought forward on the committee's action, the results of the Committee Action_Hearing shall be established by the committee's action.

5.7.1 Assembly Floor Motion: Any attendee may raise an objection to the committee's action in which case the attendee will be able to make a motion to:

1. Approve the code change proposal As Submitted from the Floor (ASF), or
2. Approve the code change proposal As Modified from the Floor (AMF) with a specific modification that has been previously offered from the floor and ruled in order by the Chairman during floor discussion (see Section 5.5.2) or has been offered by a member of the Committee and ruled in order by the Chairman during committee discussion (see Section 5.6), or
3. Disapprove the code change proposal from the floor (DF).

5.7.2 Assembly Floor Motion Consideration: On receipt of a second to the floor motion, the Moderator shall accept the motion and the second and notify the attendees that the motion will be considered in an online ballot following the hearing in accordance with Section 5.7.3. No additional testimony shall be permitted.

5.7.3 Online Assembly Floor Motion Ballot: Following the Committee Action Hearing, all assembly floor motions which received a second shall be compiled into an online ballot. The ballot will include:

1. The code change proposal as published.
2. The committee action and reason from the Committee Action Hearing.
3. The floor motion, including modifications which are part of the floor motion.
4. Access to the audio and video of the Committee Action Hearing proceedings.

5. Identification of the ballot period for which the online balloting will be open.

5.7.4 Eligible Online Assembly Motion Voters: All members of ICC shall be eligible to vote on online assembly floor motions. Each member is entitled to one vote, except that each Governmental Member Voting Representative may vote on behalf of its Governmental Member. Individuals who represent more than one Governmental Member shall be limited to a single vote. Application, whether new or updated, for ICC membership must be received by the Code Council 30 days prior to the first day of the Committee Action Hearing. The ballot period will not be extended beyond the published period except as approved by the ICC Board.

5.7.5 Assembly Action: A successful assembly action shall be a majority vote of the votes cast by eligible voters (see Section 5.7.4). A successful assembly action results in an automatic public comment to be considered at the Public Comment Hearing (see Section 7.4).

5.8 Report of the Committee Action Hearing: The results of the Committee Action Hearing, including committee action and reason, online assembly floor motion vote results and the total vote count for each assembly floor motion shall be posted on the ICC website not less than 60 days prior to the Public Comment Hearing, except as approved by the ICC Board.

6.0 Public Comments

6.1 Intent: The public comment process gives attendees at the Public Comment Hearing an opportunity to consider specific objections to the results of the Committee Action Hearing and more thoughtfully prepare for the discussion for public comment consideration. The public comment process expedites the Public Comment Hearing by limiting the items discussed to the following:

1. Consideration of items for which a public comment has been submitted; and
2. Consideration of items which received a successful assembly action.

6.2 Deadline: The deadline for receipt of a public comment to the results of the Committee Action Hearing shall be announced at the Committee Action Hearing but shall not be less than 30 days subsequent to the availability of the Report of the Committee Action Hearing (see Section 5.8).

6.3 Withdrawal of Public Comment: A public comment may be withdrawn by the public commenter at any time prior to public comment consideration of that comment. A withdrawn public comment shall not be subject to public comment consideration. If the only public comment to a code change proposal is withdrawn by the public commenter prior to the vote on the consent agenda in accordance with Section 7.5.4, the proposal shall be considered as part of the consent agenda. If the only public comment to a code change proposal is withdrawn by the public commenter after the vote on the consent agenda in accordance with Section 7.5.4, the proposal shall continue as part of the individual consideration agenda in accordance with Section 7.5.5, however the public comment shall not be subject to public comment consideration.

6.4 Form and Content of Public Comments: Any interested person, persons, or group may submit a public comment to the results of the Committee Action Hearing which will be considered when in conformance to these requirements. Each public comment to a code change proposal shall be submitted separately and shall be complete in itself. Each public comment shall contain the following information:

6.4.1 Public comment: Each public comment shall include the name, title, mailing address, telephone number and email address of the public commenter. Email addresses shall be published with the public comments unless the commenter otherwise requests on the submittal form.

If a group, organization, or committee submits a public comment, an individual with prime responsibility shall be indicated. If a public comment is submitted on behalf a client, group, organization or committee, the name and mailing address of the client, group, organization or committee shall be indicated. The scope of the public comment shall be consistent with the scope of the original code change proposal, committee action or

successful assembly action. Public comments which are determined as not within the scope of the code change proposal, committee action or successful assembly action shall be identified as such. The public commenter shall be notified that the public comment is considered an incomplete public comment in accordance with Section 6.5.1 and the public comment shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected. A copyright release in accordance with Section 3.3.5.5 shall be provided with the public comment.

6.4.2 Code Reference: Each public comment shall include the code change proposal number.

6.4.3 Multiple public comments to a code change proposal. A proponent shall not submit multiple public comments to the same code change proposal. When a proponent submits multiple public comments to the same code change proposal, the public comments shall be considered as incomplete public comments and processed in accordance with Section 6.5.1. This restriction shall not apply to public comments that attempt to address differing subject matter within a code section.

6.4.4 Desired Final Action: In order for a public comment to be considered, the public comment shall indicate the desired Final Action as one of the following:

1. Approve the code change proposal As Submitted (AS), or
2. Approve the code change proposal As Modified by the committee modification published in the Report of the Committee Action Hearing (AM) or published in a public comment in the Public Comment Agenda (AMPC), or
3. Disapprove the code change proposal (D)

6.4.5 Supporting Information: The public comment shall include a statement containing a reason and justification for the desired Final Action on the code change proposal. Reasons and justification which are reviewed in accordance with Section 6.5 and determined as not germane to the technical issues addressed in the code change proposal or committee action may be identified as such. The public commenter shall be notified that the public comment is considered an incomplete public comment in accordance with Section 6.5.1 and the public comment shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected. The public commenter shall have the right to appeal this action in accordance with the policy of the ICC Board. A bibliography of any substantiating material submitted with a public comment shall be published with the public comment and the substantiating material shall be made available at the Public Comment Hearing. All substantiating material published by ICC is material that has been provided by the proponent and in so publishing ICC makes no representations or warranties about its quality or accuracy.

6.4.6 Online submittal: Each public comment and substantiating information shall be submitted online at the website designated by ICC. Additional copies may be requested when determined necessary by the Secretariat.

6.4.7 Submittal Deadline: ICC shall establish and post the submittal deadline for each cycle. The posting of the deadline shall occur no later than 120 days prior to the public comment deadline. Each public comment shall be submitted online at the website designated by ICC by the posted deadline. The submitter of a public comment is responsible for the proper and timely receipt of all pertinent materials by the Secretariat.

6.5 Review: The Secretariat shall be responsible for reviewing all submitted public comments from an editorial and technical viewpoint similar to the review of code change proposals (see Section 4.2).

6.5.1 Incomplete Public Comment: When a public comment is submitted with incorrect format, without the required information or judged as not in compliance with these Rules of Procedure, the public comment shall not be processed. The Secretariat shall notify the public commenter of the specific deficiencies and the public comment shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected, or the public comment shall be returned to the public commenter with instructions to correct the deficiencies with a final date set for receipt of the corrected public comment.

6.5.2 Duplications: On receipt of duplicate or parallel public comments, the Secretariat may consolidate such public comments for public comment consideration. Each public commenter shall be notified of this action when it occurs.

6.5.3 Deadline: Public comments received by the Secretariat after the deadline set for receipt shall not be published and shall not be considered as part of the public comment consideration. This deadline shall not apply to public comments submitted by the Code Correlation Committee. In order to correlate submitted public comments with action taken at the Committee Action Hearing on code change proposals that did receive a public comment, the Code Correlation Committee, in conjunction with staff processing of public comments, shall review the submitted public comments and submit the necessary public comments in order to facilitate the coordination of code change proposals. Such review and submittal shall not delay the posting of the Public Comment Agenda as required in Section 6.6.

6.6 Public Comment Agenda: The Committee Action Hearing results on code change proposals that have not received a public comment and code change proposals which received public comments or successful assembly actions shall constitute the Public Comment Agenda. The Public Comment Agenda shall be posted on the ICC website at least 30 days prior the Public Comment Hearing. Any errata to the Public Comment Agenda shall be posted on the ICC website as soon as possible. Code change proposals and public comments which have not been published in the original posting or subsequent errata shall not be considered.

7.0 Public Comment Hearing

7.1 Intent: The Public Comment Hearing is the first of two steps to make a final determination on all code change proposals which have been considered in a code development cycle by a vote cast by eligible voters (see Section 9.0). The second step, which follows the Public Comment Hearing, is the Online Governmental Consensus Vote that is conducted in accordance with Section 8.0.

7.2 Date and Location: The date and location of the Public Comment Hearing shall be announced not less than 60 days prior to the date of the hearing.

7.3 Moderator: The ICC President shall appoint one or more Moderators who shall act as presiding officer for the Public Comment Hearing.

7.4 Public Comment Agenda: The Public Comment Consent Agenda shall be comprised of code change proposals which have neither a successful assembly action nor public comment. The agenda for public testimony and individual consideration shall be comprised of proposals which have a successful assembly action or public comment (see Section 6.1).

7.5 Procedure: *The Robert's Rules of Order* shall be the formal procedure for the conduct of the Public Comment Hearing except as these Rules of Procedure may otherwise dictate.

7.5.1 Open Hearing: The Public Comment Hearing is an open hearing. Any interested person may attend and participate in the floor discussion.

7.5.2 Agenda Order: The Secretariat shall publish a Public Comment Agenda for the Public Comment Hearing, placing individual code change proposals and public comments in a logical order to facilitate the hearing. The proponents or opponents of any code change proposal or public comment may move to revise the agenda order as the first order of business at the public hearing, or at any time during the hearing except while another proposal is being discussed. Preference shall be given to grouping like subjects together and for moving items back to a later position on the agenda as opposed to moving items forward to an earlier position. A motion to revise the agenda order is subject to a 2/3 vote of those present and voting.

7.5.3 Presentation of Material at the Public Comment Hearing: Information to be provided at the hearing shall be limited to verbal presentations. Each individual presenting information at the hearing shall state their name and affiliation, and shall identify any entities or individuals they are representing in connection with their testimony. Audio-visual presentations are not permitted. Substantiating material submitted in accordance with Section 6.4.5 and other material submitted in response to a code change proposal or

public comment shall be located in a designated area in the hearing room.

- 7.5.4 Public Comment Consent Agenda:** The Public Comment Consent Agenda (see Section 7.4) shall be placed before the assembly with a single motion for Final Action in accordance with the results of the Committee Action Hearing. When the motion has been seconded, the vote shall be taken with no testimony being allowed. A simple majority (50% plus one) based on the number of votes cast by eligible voters shall decide the motion. This action shall not be subject to the Online Governmental Consensus Vote following the Public Comment Hearing (see Section 8.0).
- 7.5.5 Public Comment Individual Consideration Agenda:** Upon completion of the Public Comment Consent Agenda vote, all code change proposals not on the Public Comment Consent Agenda shall be placed before the assembly for individual consideration of each item (see Section 7.4).
- 7.5.6 Reconsideration:** There shall be no reconsideration of a code change proposal after it has been voted on in accordance with Section 7.5.8.
- 7.5.7 Time Limits:** Time limits shall be established as part of the agenda for testimony on all code change proposals at the beginning of each hearing session. Each person requesting to testify on a code change proposal shall be given equal time. In the interest of time and fairness to all hearing participants, the Moderator shall have limited authority to modify time limitations on debate. The Moderator shall have the authority to adjust time limits as necessary in order to complete the hearing agenda.
 - 7.5.7.1 Time Keeping:** Keeping of time for testimony by an individual shall be by an automatic timing device. Remaining time shall be evident to the person testifying. Interruptions during testimony shall not be tolerated. The Moderator shall maintain appropriate decorum during all testimony.
- 7.5.8 Discussion and Voting:** Discussion and voting on code change proposals being individually considered shall be in accordance with the following procedures and the voting majorities in Section 7.6:
 - 7.5.8.1 Proponent testimony:** The Proponent of a public comment is permitted to waive an initial statement. The Proponent of the public comment shall be permitted to have the amount of time that would have been allocated during the initial testimony period plus the amount of time that would be allocated for rebuttal. Where a public comment is submitted by multiple proponents, this provision shall permit only one proponent of the joint submittal to waive an initial statement.
 - 7.5.8.2 Points of Order:** Any person participating in the public hearing may challenge a procedural ruling of the Moderator. A majority vote of ICC Members in attendance shall determine the decision.
 - 7.5.8.3 Eligible voters:** Voting shall be limited to eligible voters in accordance with Section 9.0.
 - 7.5.8.4 Allowable Final Action Motions:** The only allowable motions for Final Action are Approval as Submitted (AS), Approval as Modified by the committee (AM) or by one or more modifications published in the Public Comment Agenda (AMPC), and Disapproval (D).
 - 7.5.8.5 Initial Motion:** The code development committee action shall be the initial motion considered.
 - 7.5.8.6 Motions for Modifications:** Whenever a motion under consideration is for Approval as Submitted or Approval as Modified, a subsequent motion and second for a modification published in the Public Comment Agenda may be made (see Section 6.4.4). Each subsequent motion for modification, if any, shall be individually discussed and voted before returning to the main motion. A two-thirds majority based on the number of votes cast by eligible voters

shall be required for a successful motion on all modifications.

7.5.8.7 Voting: After dispensing with all motions for modifications, if any, and upon completion of discussion on the main motion, the Moderator shall then ask for the vote on the main motion. The vote on the main motion shall be taken electronically with the vote recorded and each vote assigned to the eligible voting member. If the motion fails to receive the majority required in Section 7.6, the Moderator shall ask for a new motion.

7.5.8.8 Subsequent Motion: If the initial motion is unsuccessful, a motion for either Approval as Submitted or Approval as Modified by one or more published modifications is in order. A motion for Disapproval is not in order. The vote on the main motion shall be taken electronically with the vote recorded and each vote assigned to the eligible voting member. If a successful vote is not achieved, Section 7.5.8.9 shall apply.

7.5.8.9 Failure to Achieve Majority Vote at the Public Comment Hearing. In the event that a code change proposal does not receive any of the required majorities in Section 7.6, the results of the Public Comment Hearing for the code change proposal in question shall be Disapproval. The vote count that will be reported as the Public Comment Hearing result will be the vote count on the main motion in accordance with Section 7.5.8.7.

7.5.8.10 Public Comment Hearing Results: The result and vote count on each code change proposal considered at the Public Comment Hearing shall be announced at the hearing. The results shall be posted and included in the Online Governmental Consensus Ballot (see Section 8.2).

7.6 Majorities for Final Action: The required voting majority for code change proposals individually considered shall be based on the number of votes cast of eligible voters at the Public Comment Hearing shall be in accordance with the following table:

Committee Action	Desired Final Action		
	AS	AM/AMPC	D
AS	Simple Majority	2/3 Majority	Simple Majority
AM	2/3 Majority	Simple Majority to sustain the Committee Action or; 2/3 Majority on each additional modification and 2/3 Majority on entire code change proposal for AMPC	Simple Majority
D	2/3 Majority	2/3 Majority	Simple Majority

8.0 Online Governmental Consensus Vote

8.1 Public Comment Hearing Results: The results from the Individual Consideration Agenda at the Public Comment Hearing (see Sections 7.5.5 and 7.5.8.10) shall be the basis for the Online Governmental Consensus Vote. The ballot shall include the voting options in accordance with the following table:

Committee Action	Public Comment Hearing result and Voting Majority	Online Governmental Consensus Ballot and Voting Majority	
AS	AS: Simple Majority	AS: Simple Majority	D: Simple Majority
	AMPC: 2/3 Majority	AMPC: 2/3 Majority	D: Simple Majority
	D: Simple Majority	AS: Simple Majority	D: Simple Majority
AM	AS: 2/3 Majority	AS: 2/3 Majority	D: Simple Majority
	AM: Simple Majority	AM: Simple Majority	D: Simple Majority
	AMPC: 2/3 Majority	AMPC: 2/3 Majority	D: Simple Majority
	D: Simple Majority	AM: Simple Majority	D: Simple Majority
D	AS: 2/3 Majority	AS: 2/3 Majority	D: Simple Majority

Committee Action	Public Comment Hearing result and Voting Majority	Online Governmental Consensus Ballot and Voting Majority	
	AMPC: 2/3 Majority	AMPC: 2/3 Majority	D: Simple Majority
	D: Simple Majority	AS: 2/3 Majority	D: Simple Majority

8.2 Online Governmental Consensus Ballot: The ballot for each code change proposal considered at the Public Comment Hearing will include:

1. The Public Comment Hearing result and vote count.
2. The allowable Online Governmental Consensus Vote actions in accordance with Section 8.1.
3. Where the Public Comment Hearing result is As Submitted (AS) or Disapproval (D), the original code change proposal will be presented.
4. Where the Public Comment Hearing result is As Modified by the committee (AM) or As Modified by one or more Public Comments (AMPC), the original code change and approved modification(s) will be presented.
5. The committee action taken at the Committee Action Hearing.
6. ICC staff identification of correlation issues.
7. For those who voted at the Public Comment Hearing, the ballot will indicate how they voted.
8. An optional comment box to provide comments.
9. Access to the Public Comment Agenda which includes: the original code change, the report of the committee action and the submitted public comments.
10. Access to the audio and video of the Committee Action and Public Comment Hearing proceedings.
11. Identification of the ballot period for which the online balloting will be open.

8.3 Voting process: Voting shall be limited to eligible voters in accordance with Section 9.0. Eligible voters are authorized to vote during the Public Comment Hearing and during the Online Governmental Consensus Vote; however, only the last vote cast will be included in the final vote tabulation. The ballot period will not be extended beyond the published period except as approved by the ICC Board.

9.0 Eligible Final Action Voters

9.1 Eligible Final Action Voters: Eligible Final Action voters include ICC Governmental Member Voting Representatives and Honorary Members in good standing who have been confirmed by ICC in accordance with the Electronic Voter Validation System. Such confirmations are required to be revalidated annually. Eligible Final Action voters in attendance at the Public Comment Hearing and those participating in the Online Governmental Consensus Vote shall have one vote per eligible voter on all Codes. Individuals who represent more than one Governmental Member shall be limited to a single vote.

9.2 Applications: Applications for Governmental Membership must be received by the ICC at least 30 days prior to the Committee Action Hearing in order for its designated representatives to be eligible to vote at the Public Comment Hearing or Online Governmental Consensus Vote. Applications, whether new or updated, for Governmental Member Voting Representative status must be received by the Code Council 30 days prior to the commencement of the first day of the Public Comment Hearing in order for any designated representative to be eligible to vote. An individual designated as a Governmental Member Voting Representative shall provide sufficient information to establish eligibility as defined in the ICC Bylaws. The Executive Committee of the ICC Board, in its discretion, shall have the authority to address questions related to eligibility.

10.0 Tabulation, certification and posting of results

10.1 Tabulation and Validation: Following the closing of the online ballot period, the votes received will be combined with the vote tally at the Public Comment Hearing to determine the final vote on the code change proposal. ICC shall retain a record of the votes cast and the results shall be certified by a validation committee appointed by the ICC Board. The validation committee shall report the results to the ICC Board, either confirming a valid voting process and result or citing irregularities in accordance with Section 10.2.

10.2 Voting Irregularities: Where voting irregularities or other concerns with the Online Governmental

Consensus Voting process which are material to the outcome or the disposition of a code change proposal(s) are identified by the validation committee, such irregularities or concerns shall be immediately brought to the attention of the ICC Board. The ICC Board shall take whatever action necessary to ensure a fair and impartial Final Action vote on all code change proposals, including but not limited to:

1. Set aside the results of the Online Governmental Consensus Vote and have the vote taken again.
2. Set aside the results of the Online Governmental Consensus Vote and declare the Final Action on all code change proposals to be in accordance with the results of the Public Comment Hearing.
3. Other actions as determined by the ICC Board.

10.3 Failure to Achieve Majority Vote: In the event a code change proposal does not receive any of the required majorities for Final Action in Section 8.0, Final Action on the code change proposal in question shall be Disapproval.

10.4 Final Action Results: The Final Action on all code change proposals shall be published as soon as practicable after certification of the results. The results shall include the Final Action taken, including the vote tallies from both the Public Comment Hearing and Online Governmental Consensus Vote, as well the required majority in accordance with Section 8.0. ICC shall maintain a record of individual votes for auditing purposes, however, the record shall not be made public. The exact wording of any resulting text modifications shall be made available to any interested party.

11.0 Code Publication

11.1 Next Edition of the Codes: The Final Action results on code change proposals shall be the basis for the subsequent edition of the respective Code.

11.2 Code Correlation: The Code Correlation Committee is authorized to resolve technical or editorial inconsistencies resulting from actions taken during the code development process by making appropriate changes to the text of the affected code. Any such changes to a Code shall require a 2/3 vote of the Code Correlation Committee. Technical or editorial inconsistencies not resolved by the Code Correlation Committee shall be forwarded to the ICC Board for resolution.

12.0 Appeals

12.1 Right to Appeal: Any person may appeal an action or inaction in accordance with Council Policy 1 Appeals. Any appeal made regarding voter eligibility, voter fraud, voter misrepresentation or breach of ethical conduct must be supported by credible evidence and must be material to the outcome of the final disposition of a code change proposal(s).

The following actions are not appealable:

1. Variations of the results of the Public Comment Hearing compared to the Final Action result in accordance with Section 10.4.
2. Denied requests to extend the voter balloting period in accordance with Sections 5.7.4 or 8.3.
3. Lack of access to the internet based online collaboration and voting platform to submit a code change proposal, to submit a public comment or to vote.
4. Code Correlation Committee changes made in accordance with Section 11.2.

13.0 Violations

13.1 ICC Board Action on Violations: Violations of the policies and procedures contained in this Council Policy shall be brought to the immediate attention of the ICC Board for response and resolution. Additionally, the ICC Board may take any actions it deems necessary to maintain the integrity of the code development process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS



International Green Construction Code

General	1
Energy/Water	65

INTERNATIONAL GREEN CONSTRUCTION CODE (GENERAL COMMITTEE)



Medard Kopczynski, CBO - Chair

Assistant City Manager
City of Keene
Keene, NH

Dennis A. Andrejko, FAIA – Vice Chair

Chairman, Master of Architecture Program
Rochester Institute of Technology
Golisano Institute for Sustainability
Rochester, NY

Becky Baker, CBO, MCP

Director of Building Safety
Jefferson County Division of Building Safety
Golden, CO

Nicholas N. Carver

Assistant Building Official/Green Building
Manager
City of Maplewood
Maplewood, MN

Carl Chretien

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
President
Chretien Construction Inc.
Saco, MN

James A. Fania

Construction Official
Chester Township
Chester, NJ

Anthony C. Floyd, FAIA, LEED AP

Senior Green Building Consultant
City of Scottsdale
Scottsdale, AZ

Gary R. Goodell, CBO

Chief Building Official
Boulder County Land Use Dept.
Bldg Safety & Inspection Services
Boulder, CO

Robert James, CFPS

Program Manager – Regulatory Services
Underwriters Laboratories, Inc.
Tampa, FL

Dennis McCabe

Chairman- Committee on Green Codes,
Standards and Certification NYSBOC
Data Visualization & Management Services,
LLC.
Freeport, NY

Brent Q. Mecham, CID

Industry Development Director
Irrigation Association
Falls Church, VA

Darren S. Port

Northwest Energy Efficiency Partnerships
Lexington, MA

Bill Whiteford, AICP

Principal
Team Plan Inc.
North Palm Beach, FL

Staff Secretariat:

Allan Bilka, RA

Senior Staff Architect
International Code Council
4051 West Flossmoor
Country Club Hill, IL 60478
888-422-7233 ext. 4326; Fax: 708/799-0320
abilka@iccsafe.org

INTERNATIONAL GREEN CONSTRUCTION CODE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

GG 1-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal creates confusion by attempting to combine 2 code sections. The code text is more clear as it is.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 2-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal for disapproval because the overlay concept is common and is appropriate for this code. The existing text should be retained to clarify that the IgCC is an overlay code.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 4-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Anytime you repeat something in the code there is a chance that the requirements might diverge in the future. One location is preferred. The "intended to be used as" language which this proposal deletes provides important context.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 5-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This section needs to stay in the beginning of the code to continue to make it clear that this code is intended to be an overlay code for the other I-codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 6-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: As it is an overlay code, it is important that the IgCC incorporate references to underlying codes. The action to disapprove is coordinated with prior committee action on GG2-14. This proposal does not clarify the code. It adds confusion.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 7-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Scoping should start in the International Building Code, not the International Energy Conservation Code.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 8-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal as submitted based upon the proponents published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 9-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal be disapproved in order to preserve flexibility for owners and designers regarding the option to use ASHRAE 189.1 instead of the IgCC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 10-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal because it would undercut other requirements in the code, creates confusion and does not improve the code. In addition, it is important to retain the reference to Exceptions 1 through 3 in Exception number 4. Without the references to Exceptions 1 through 3, the scope of the IgCC and ASHRAE 189.1 might be confused with regard to low-rise residential structures.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 11-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 12-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code already contains a long list of exceptions. This proposal adds requirements in the exceptions, which is not consistent with ICC style and formatting conventions. ASHRAE 189.1 is a stand-alone standard which has its own energy provisions. Providing more conditions could conflict with the requirements of ASHRAE 189.1. This proposal would require compliance with both the IgCC zEPI provisions and the ASHRAE 189.1 energy provisions, which is inconsistent.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 13-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal for disapproval at the proponent's request. This action is consistent with prior committee action on GG12-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 14-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 15-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is a big difference between transient and non-transient use, especially with regards to the familiarity of the occupants with regards to the use of thermostats, lighting and water. Buildings containing R-1 occupancies also often contain other occupancies and that complicate analysis.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 16-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this code change at the request of the proponent. The proponent indicated that the proposal is incomplete in cdpACCESS.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 17-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal adds confusion. There are problems with some of the items on the list. This may be a good idea, but it needs work. The proposal changes the scope of the IgCC and modifies ICC 700 to remove the Bronze performance level.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM E2921-13 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>.

GG 18-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because they felt that it was unreasonable and because the term "reasonable," as used in the proposal, is not an enforceable term.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 19-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because the term "safety" includes "fire safety."

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 20-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal removes unnecessary duplication in the code.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 21-14

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval in order to come back in the public comment period with improvements.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 22-14

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed information is already addressed by Section 102.5.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 23-14

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed list is too complicated and creates confusion.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 24-14

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: "Practical" may be a subjective term, but "restrictive" may not be the right word either.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 25-14

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The existing section addresses the IgCC and the requirements within it only. The proposal goes beyond the scope of this section and addresses information that is redundant with other provisions in the IgCC.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 26-14

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The concepts of codes and standards need to be treated separately. The proposed change becomes a reason *not* to adopt the IgCC.

Assembly Motion: As Submitted

Online Vote Results: Successful - Support: 62.57% (117) Oppose: 37.43% (70)

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

GG 27-14

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because it requires the jurisdiction to adopt all International Codes. Where they have not, it requires them to amend the IgCC and remove the references to the International Codes. This proposal does not adequately address site related issues. The intent of this proposal is already addressed in Section 101.2.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASHRAE 62.2 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandard-042314.pdf>.

GG 28-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language lacks clarity and is unnecessary. The committee prefers the existing language. This action is consistent with prior committee action on GG27-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 29-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal is convoluted and would not improve the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 31-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The existing language is clearer.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**
Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 46.88% (75) Oppose: 53.13% (85)
Assembly Action: **None**

GG 32-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal brings clarity to the code and consistency to the ICC family of codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 33-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal facilitates improved communication with the building official regarding novel and innovative ideas.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 34-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed changes are unnecessary. Provisions for approval of alternative materials and methods are already addressed in the code. The use of the word "sustainability" in the proposal is problematic.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 35-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language does not clarify, enhance or simplify the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 36-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Since permits are not required by the IgCC, fees are not necessary either.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 37-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal as submitted based upon the proponents published reason statement. The authority having jurisdiction needs to authorize the process.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 38-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Permits for the IgCC are issued under the codes that the IgCC overlays. The authority is there for those codes. This expands the authority to this code, which is beneficial. There are many portions of the IgCC that need to be validated and inspected, which this proposal recognizes.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 39-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

SECTION 202 DEFINITIONS

Acidification potential. The dissolved acid from fossil fuel combustion used in electricity production, heating and transportation and deposited by rain into ecosystems.

Eutrophication potential. The process by which a body of water acquires a high concentration of nutrients, especially phosphates and nitrates.

Ozone depletion potential. Destruction of the ozone gas in the upper atmospheric layer, caused by substances formed from breakdown of ozone depleting substances.

Smog potential. Emissions from industry and fossil-fueled transportation trapped at ground level reacting with sunlight producing photochemical smog.

Committee Reason: This proposal provides definitions that clarify and enhance the code's life cycle assessment provisions. As the definitions do not address "potential," the term "potential" was deleted from each definition title by

the modification.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 40-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The International Building Code is the proper benchmark for this definition and the IgCC should be aligned with it. That is the basis for the current text.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 41-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal for approval based upon the proponent's published reason statement. This proposal creates consistency between the codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 42-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is the wrong code to begin to address these principles in. It would create conflicts with the International Building Code, the International Energy Conservation Code and ADM57. This proposal would prevent owner's authorized agents in responsible charge from serving as an approved agency.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 43-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal creates consistency, accuracy and improves clarity. However, the proponent should come back in the public comment period and delete the existing definition for "asbestos containing products" that will no longer be used.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 44-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*
The change provides consistency with revisions in the 2015 IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 45-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

The committee disapproved the proposed change at the proponent's suggestion. The definition is a key definition in the IECC and any amendment should start with the IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 46-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

The Committee approved the proposal to provide a definition of climate zone in the IgCC that is consistent with the other ICC codes.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 47-14

The following is errata that was not posted on the ICC website:

DAYLIGHT RESPONSIVE CONTROL. A device or system that provides automatic control of electric light levels based on the amount of daylight in a space.

(The balance of the proposal is not modified.)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy and Water Committee.*

The proposal provides consistency with the IECC with the proper definition and use of the term "Daylight Responsive Control."

Assembly Action:

None

GG 48-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy and Water Committee.*

The proposal aligns the IgCC with the IECC where these revisions to these definitions are already incorporated for 2015.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 49-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal be disapproved because the proposed language would be in conflict with FEMA's definition.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 50-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 51-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

The committee agreed with the proposal as it simplifies the definition and removes excess information which is commentary in nature.

Assembly Motion: **Disapprove**

Online Vote Results: **Successful** - Support: 53.85% (84) Oppose: 46.15% (72)

Assembly Action: **Disapproved**

GG 52-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal simplifies the code text and clarifies that paved areas and not building areas are addressed.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 53-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Integrated design is truly the root of green building and it is appropriate that it be addressed and encouraged in the International Green Construction Code my means of a project elective.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 54-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 55-14

The following is errata that was posted on the ICC website:

Section 202

Definitions

INVASIVE PLANT SPECIES. Species that are not native to the ecosystem under consideration and that course, or are likely to cause, economic or environmental harm to human, animal or plant health, defined by using the best scientific knowledge of that region. Consideration for inclusion as an invasive species shall include, but shall not be limited to, those non-native species identified on:

1. Approved city, county or regional lists.
2. State noxious weeds laws,
3. Federal noxious weeds laws.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal adds clarification by adding the term "non-native.".

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 56-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal adds clarification to the definition and expands the basis for native plants.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 57-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the committee appreciates the concept of the proposal the committee recommended that it be disapproved because the standard referenced is not yet complete.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM WK40773-XXXX with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 58-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There are errors in the referenced list. State lists may be more responsive. A website reference is not a good idea.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service PLANTS Database relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 59-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

The change provides consistency in the definition of the term Occupant Sensor Control for the IECC and the IgCC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 60-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval in order to bring the proposal back with improvements in the public comment period. It may not be necessary to define what plastic is. In the reason statement, 2 of the 3 sections cited do not mention plastics and the third only mentions plastics as related to tinting.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 61-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is a much needed definition that clarifies what a repair really is and specifically its relationship to damage. This proposal is consistent with other International Codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 62-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy and Water Committee.*

The definition is a key definition of the IECC. At the proponent's suggestion, the committee disapproved this proposal in order that any change be first approved for the IECC. The definition is currently consistent with the IECC.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 63-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy and Water Committee.*

The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement. Lighting systems and controls also have sequencing which need to be addressed.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 64-14

The following is errata that was posted to the ICC website:

SITE DISTURBANCE. Site preparation or construction which negatively affects the native soils, native vegetation, or native animal life of the site.

(Portions of table and proposal not shown do not have errata.)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 65-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

SITE DISTURBANCE. Site preparation or construction which affects the native soils, native vegetation, or native animal life of the site. ~~Normal maintenance of soils or vegetation shall not be construed as site preparation or construction.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown are not modified.)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Reason: The modification was approved because the original proposed language concerning site maintenance had nothing to do with the use of site disturbance during construction activities. The overall proposal was approved as modified because the term "negatively" is too ambiguous to be enforceable.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 66-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee. The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.*

Assembly Action:

None

GG 67-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee. Based on Committee's action of Approved as Submitted on GG66-14.*

Assembly Action:

None

GG 68-14

The following is errata that was not posted to the ICC website:

VEGETATIVE ROOF. ~~An assembly of Interacting components on or integral to the roof designed to waterproof and normally insulate a building's top surface that includes, by design, vegetation, gardens and related landscaping elements.~~

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The existing definition is more inclusive to all components that make up a vegetative roof.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 69-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee. The committee preferred the revisions provided by GG70-14.*

Assembly Action:

None

GG 70-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

ZERO ENERGY PERFORMANCE INDEX (zEPI). A scalar representing the ratio of the energy performance of a proposed design or an existing building compared to the mean energy performance of the buildings stock from the benchmark year of 2000 as represented by the data in the Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey by the United States Department of Energy

Chapter 12

DOE

Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey by the United States Department of Energy

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

The modification removes the proposed reference to DOE Energy Consumption Survey which is simply a collection of data and does not meet the ICC policies regarding referenced standards. The revision adds a benchmark year to the

definition, which provides clarity regarding the establishment and scale of zEPI.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of DOE Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey by the United States Department of Energy - relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 71-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval so that they may come back with fixes in the public comment period.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 72-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal does not clarify the code and is unnecessary. The language proposed belongs in Chapter 1, not in Chapter 3.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 73-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal to be consistent with prior committee action on GG16-14. The proposal removes the choice of ICC 700, which should be retained. The committee believes that the jurisdiction should have the ability to make the choices afforded by the existing code text.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 74-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal is contrary to the intent, structure and purpose of this code. The code already has three levels: mandatory requirements, jurisdictional requirements and project electives. This proposal would create inconsistencies in the IgCC between jurisdictions, which adds unnecessary complexity and will create confusion for designers and builders. This would make the code less adoptable.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 75-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal contains redundant information that is already in the code and, therefore, is unnecessary. This requires a reach back to ICC 700, while the scope of the IgCC clearly delineates the two.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 76-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*
The committee believes that zEPI needs to remain as the scale for the determination of compliance under this

approach in Chapter 6. This proposal among its many actions would remove zEPI. The various pieces of this proposal don't seem to work together. Sections proposed for deletion are still referenced in other text that is retained.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 77-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Choice is a good thing in this situation. This is a good pointer to discuss the code locally. It is important to have a choice in a jurisdiction to opt in or opt out.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 78-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

The committee felt that the code should state an overall minimum for increasing envelope stringency. Turning this provision into a jurisdiction option loses this minimum as a part of clear statement that the IgCC should be an improvement over the IECC. By transferring the decision to the jurisdiction on this issue, sends the wrong message on this core component of the IgCC. If jurisdictions are unhappy with the envelop provisions, they can amend them out, and such probably easier than adding them into their code.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 42.35% (72) Oppose: 57.65% (98)

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 79-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Does 2 vehicles mean 1 space and they drive in and out? Does it mean 2 parking spaces? The proposal is not clear. This should be the choice of the building owner and should not become mandated in the body of the code when a jurisdiction selects the option in Table 302.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 80-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The Committee preferred the language of GG83-14 over the language of this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 81-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Life cycle assessment (LCA) is ready to move forward and is being used by many communities today globally. Life cycle assessment may not be ready for the International Building Code, but it is ready for the IgCC. We have a prescriptive based materials path in the material attributes provisions and we need to retain the performance-based approach that life cycle assessment provides. The IgCC is for the code official, designers, owners and, ultimately, the health and well-being of all of us. LCA is being used and taught at many universities throughout the Unites States and globally. If we deleted the LCA provisions from the IgCC we would be taking a major step in reverse.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 82-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Operational energy is an important part of life cycle assessment and should be retained. The proponent requested disapproval in order that they may come back with improvements in the public comment period that are better aligned with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM D2921-13 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandard-042314.pdf>

GG 83-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The holistic approach in the design process places a responsibility to look at materials in an extensive way and it is best that this requirement be placed in Chapter 5, Materials.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 84-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval because the proponent's GG85-14 proposal, which addressed the same subject, was approved.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM E2921-13 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 85-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal simplifies and clarifies whole building life cycle assessment. The proposed standard is a well-established approach that will give designers options. The proposal allows the code to mature and develop.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM E2921-13 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandard-042314.pdf>

GG 86-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This document needs to set a bar. The 60 year service life bar is important. Higher service life years can still be used.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 87-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The ASHRAE 105 standard referenced is not useable as it is not current.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASHRAE 105 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandard-042314.pdf>

GG 88-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee prefers the life cycle assessment improvements in proposed code changes GG83-14 and GG85-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 89-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There are many uncertainties introduced by this proposal. This does not improve the code. It may be cutting edge, but it is not useable. It is important to address land use, resource use and habitat alteration. However, based on the testimony, standardized tools to measure them are either not available or are not well established. When metrics are established, that would be the time to introduce such a proposal. This is not a requirement; it is an option to the materials section. If we make the option too difficult, it will never get used and will not move the bar for LCA forward.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 90-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Some assessment tools may be better than others or may be deficient. The code official needs to have the power to approve life cycle assessment tools.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 91-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: A specific life cycle assessment for equipment is not necessary at this time. The E 2921 component is already covered by other proposals.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 92-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal in favor of GG85-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 93-14

The following is errata that was posted on the ICC website:

Revise as follows:

303.1 Whole building life cycle assessment. Where a whole building life cycle assessment is performed in accordance with Section 303.1, compliance with Section 505 shall not be required. The requirements of the execution of a whole building life cycle assessment shall be performed in accordance with the following:

1. The assessment shall demonstrate that the building project achieves not less than a 20 percent improvement in environmental performance for global warming potential and at least two of the following impact measures, as compared to a reference design as specified in Section 303.1. of similar usable floor area, function and configuration that meets the minimum energy requirements of this code and the structural requirements of the International Building Code. For relocatable buildings, their reference design shall be comprised of the number of reference buildings equal to the estimated number of uses of the relocatable building.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

(This errata has already been incorporated into cdpACCESS)

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is overly complicated and adds unnecessary volume to the code. A reference to ASTM E 2921, as in GG85-14, is enough as it addresses this information sufficiently.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 94-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal to be consistent with prior committee action on GG85-14 and GG93-14. Referencing existing building stock from the last 15 years makes no sense.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 95-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Life Cycle Assessment is the wave of the future.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 40.76% (75) Oppose: 59.24% (109)

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 96-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval in favor of GG85-14. This text was already struck by the committee's approval of GG85-14. The driver needs to be the new ASTM standard, which already references the ISO standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM E2921 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandard-042314.pdf>

GG 97-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal for disapproval because the proponent requested disapproval in favor of the prior committee approval of GG85-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM E2921 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandard-042314.pdf>

GG 98-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The EPA is better suited to determine what toxicity is and to regulate what types of compounds building materials are composed of. Going from 2 to 3 required selections may present difficulties and the reason statement does not qualify the need for this.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 100-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Is important to identify all site features in order that certain features might be preserved. This proposal identifies specific features on sites as part of the "inventory."

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 101-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval so that they may come back with improvements in the public comment period.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 102-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: In the committee's experience, even in communities that go back to the pilgrims, there is not a problem going back and figuring what has been altered. While the committee understands the proponent's concerns regarding the "previous use and development" language in Item 2, the prior portions of Item 2 should remain as part of the inventory necessary to evaluate native soils and hydrological conditions. In fact, the committee feels that the current language may not go far enough.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 103-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There are good items in this proposal, but there are numerous problems with the definition for "site disturbance" and there are better definitions in other proposals. Definitions are key in the application of this code.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 104-14

The following is errata that was posted on the ICC website:

TABLE 302.1

REQUIREMENTS DETERMINED BY THE JURISDICTION

402.3	Protection of high-risk buildings and structures	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
-------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

(This errata has already been incorporated into cdpACCESS)

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The hazard categories in the International Building Code require buildings to be constructed to a higher standard, which already address some of these issues. The proposed title is misleading. It is not "protection," it is "prevention" of high risk buildings. According to this proposal, if you are building a fire station, you cannot build it in a 500 year flood plain. In other codes, there are special means or specific more restrictive measures that must be taken when constructing buildings in high risk areas. There will be communities that need to have such buildings in 500 year flood plains. Telling these communities that they cannot have these types of buildings in 500 year flood plains is too restrictive.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 105-14

The following is errata that was posted on the ICC website:

TABLE 302.1

REQUIREMENTS DETERMINED BY THE JURISDICTION

402.2.3	Flood hazard area preservation, limitation on fill	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
---------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

(This errata has already been incorporated into cdpACCESS)

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is a design and resiliency issue, not a structural issue, and belongs in the IgCC.

Assembly Motion: **Disapprove**
Online Vote Results: **Successful** - Support: 50.29% (86) Oppose: 49.71% (85)
Assembly Action: **Disapproved**

GG 106-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This requires an engineer to be hired to perform analysis even for a small addition in the hydraulic shadow of a larger structure or for a substantial improvement that does not change the footprint of a structure. A perceived flaw in the National Flood Insurance Program and flood regulations should not be fixed by inserting language in the International Green Building Code.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 107-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This topic is a city ordinance issue. There are too many variables that cannot be covered by a code.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 108-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: If there are problems, they should be fixed rather than deleting this section. Jurisdictions should be allowed to set buffer sizes. This section is important and needs to remain part of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 109-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Although the Committee appreciates the attempt at providing guidance on this topic to the code official, this code is not the place for such guidance. Also, the minimum number of feet might conflict with what many jurisdictions have already established.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 110-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: There is often development in public parks, but this is already regulated as a local issue and should not be regulated by the IgCC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 111-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM WK31423-XXXX relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 112-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 113-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed requirements should be left to the local jurisdiction. It is up to the county or city as to whether they would want to promote these types of arrangements at highway interchanges.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 114-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Items 4.1 and 4.2 of Section 402.8 are dependent upon each other. Splitting them up does not meet the intent of this section.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 115-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval in order that they may come back with improvements in the public comment period.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 116-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The current language is more flexible and less restrictive and maintains 2 options. The proposal restricts it to just one option. It is going to cost something to prepare a report and that is not reflected in the cost statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 117-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Putting regulations in a definition is inappropriate. Although the language is questionable, the idea is credible and may be worthy of further development.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 118-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal provides direction and relevant information to the stormwater management engineer. Adding the metrics is a good idea. The supporting information is valid.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 119-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Attempting to strike the brownfield requirements is not acceptable.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 120-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The reason statement uses supporting information about water usage of single family homes but the IgCC does not cover single family homes. The established period of one year might not be appropriate for all circumstances.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 121-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The standard is not yet completed at this time. The formula in the proposal is not correct according to opposing testimony.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ANSI/ASABE S623-XXXX relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 122-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal because it references a standard that is not yet published.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASABE/ICC 802-XXXX with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 123-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There are good things in this proposal, but the standard referenced is not yet complete. The committee recommended that the proponent make a public comment and come back in the Public Comment Hearings.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASABE/ICC 802 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandard-042314.pdf>

GG 124-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal provides clarity by making a distinction between fire sprinklers and irrigation sprinklers.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 125-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: It makes sense not to irrigate beyond the perimeter of a lot. In the design of irrigation systems, neighbors may inadvertently overwater overlapping areas along lot lines. This will help address that issue and conserve water.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 126-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: "Watersense" should not be referenced in the code. Instead, the code should contain similar requirements. The proponents requested disapproval so that they may come back with improvements in the public comment period.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 127-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: GG122-14 has better language. The standard referenced in this proposal is not yet published. Item 7 needs some work on the language.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASABE/ICC 802-201X with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 128-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the proponents published reason statement. This proposal simplifies and clarifies the code.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 129-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Not all counties are covered by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service soil survey. This proposal takes choices away from jurisdictions. This language does not address international use of the IgCC. This proposal takes the determination of what is farmland away from local jurisdictions, which they are well able to deal with. The "appropriate state agency" language is questionable. If this proposal is brought back, when referencing a website, consider indicating "or other approved source."

Assembly Action:

None

GG 130-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

405.1.4 Soil reuse and restoration. Soils that are being placed on a building site shall be prepared and placed in a manner that establishes the ability of the soil to support the vegetation that has been retained and that will be planted. Soil reuse and restoration shall be in accordance with Sections 405.1.4.1 and 405.1.4.2.

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be approved based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification was approved because there are occasions where there are soils that might be desirable to retain, but that the soils might not support in the future, and that added soils must be brought in.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 131-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The code should not reference a source such as the National Soil Conservation Surveys, and there is not a definition for undisturbed soils.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ANSI Z60.1-2004 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 132-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: A qualified professional should continue to be one of options for providing recommendations for providing a management plan for invasive plant species.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 133-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The Committee doesn't agree with reducing the amount of native vegetation from 75 percent to 25 percent. There needs to be a better term for Appropriate Plant Species that is more descriptive of native and non-native plant species. However, the introduction of the ANSI standard into the IgCC is good.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ANSI Z60.1-2004 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 134-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Instead of deleting the text, the text should be fixed. This is an important item. Perhaps the 75 percent figure should be reduced. Adaptive plants should also be addressed. This section could be better, but omitting it would be a mistake. This section makes us aware that these concepts should be considered.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 135-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal goes too far by eliminating the requirement for a site waste management plan and removing discussion of what to do with removed invasive plant species.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 136-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal is too limiting for the disposal of site waste.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 137-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The increase from 75 to 90 percent is very difficult. Removing wood, especially stumps from a site requires special permits in some cases. Contrary to the reason statement, there will be a cost increase if the materials cannot be reused on site.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 138-14

The following is errata that was not posted to the ICC website:

406-1 503.1 Building-site Waste management plan for land clearing debris and excavated soils. A building site waste management plan shall be developed and implemented to divert not less than 75 percent of the land-clearing debris and excavated soils. Land-clearing debris includes rock, trees, stumps and associated vegetation. The plan shall include provisions that address all of the following:

1. Materials to be diverted from disposal by efficient usage, recycling or reuse on the building site shall be specified.
2. Diverted materials shall not be sent to sites that are agricultural land, *flood hazard areas* or *greenfield* sites where

- development is prohibited by Section 402.1 except where *approved* by the *code official*.
3. The effective destruction and disposal of *invasive plant species*.
 4. Where contaminated soils are removed, the methods of removal and location where the soils are to be treated and disposed.
 5. The amount of materials to be diverted shall be specified and shall be calculated by weight or volume, but not both.
 6. Where the site is located in a federal or state designated quarantine zone for invasive insect species, building site vegetation management shall comply with the quarantine rules.
 7. Receipts or other documentation related to diversion shall be maintained through the course of construction. When requested by the *code official*, evidence of diversion shall be provided.

(Portions of proposal not shown do not have errata.)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The Committee disapproved this proposal based on the Committee's action on GG137-14 and furthermore, because of the removal of the sections indicated.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 139-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Contrary to the reason statement, this proposal will increase the cost of construction. There is no reasonable way to control the method by which the cleaning of tools and equipment would occur. There is also strong concern about how this could be deposited in a landfill. Paint washout stations have worked well in the state of New Jersey. This is good practice and the concept may be worthy of further development.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 140-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Section 407.2.1 includes multiple buildings by including "building site" but Section 407.2.3 requires that the bike rack be located within 100 feet of the building. This seems inconsistent because you don't know in which building on a building site having multiple buildings, the bike rack is required. There is no justification for removal of a number of the sections that are deleted by this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 141-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The current building site characteristics are important. The proposed language is too restrictive. The building official can interpret the existing language.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 142-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal for approval based upon the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 143-14

The following is errata that is posted to the ICC website:

**TABLE 407.3
BICYCLE PARKING³**

E	Schools	None <u>Not less than 2 spaces</u>	1 per 250 square feet of classroom area
E, I-4	Day care	None <u>Not less than 2 spaces</u>	2 spaces
F, H	All	None <u>Not less than 2 spaces</u>	1 per 25,000 square feet; not less than 2 spaces
I-1	All	None <u>Not less than 2 spaces</u>	2 spaces
I-2	All	1 per 25,000 square feet; not less than 2 spaces	1 per 50,000 square feet; not less than 2 spaces
M	All	1 per 25,000 square feet; not less than 2 spaces	1 per 50,000 square feet; not less than 2 spaces
R-1	Hotels, motels, boarding houses	None <u>Not less than 2 spaces</u>	1 per 25,000 square feet; not less than 2 spaces
R-2, R-3, R-4	All	None <u>Not less than 2 spaces</u>	None

(Portions of table not shown do not have errata.)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Facilities that offer visits in a multi-modal fashion is a good idea, however, for R occupancies, a minimum of 2 spaces doesn't seem to be enough. A minimum of 2 for each unit might be more appropriate.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 144-14

The following is errata that was not posted on the ICC website:

407.3.2 Long-term bicycle parking. Long-term bicycle parking shall comply with all of the following:

3. It shall have an area of not less than 18 inches (457mm) by ~~60-72~~ inches (1524-1829mm) for each bicycle; and

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS)

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed table is more complete. This action is compatible with prior committee action on GG142-14.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 145-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The existing requirement of 100 feet is close enough because making it closer might create conflicts with accessibility access requirements for the building. Perhaps there needs to be some consideration of differences for whether the building is in an urban area or not.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 146-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The increase in space is appropriate considering the size of some bicycles such as those of recumbent design. This aligns with the standards of another organization indicated in the bibliography of the proposal.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 147-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The criteria for 2 points of contact for the bicycle is important and is consistent with the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals. This proposal makes it more convenient for lockability. This encourages design opportunities for bicycle racks.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 148-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal for approval to be consistent with prior committee action on GG146-14, and because the proposal addresses both horizontal and vertical storage, thereby providing clarity for those types of storage and flexibility.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 149-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal creates confusion and offers no clarity. The existing text is preferred as it is clearer.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 150-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Restrictions on travel distance for bicycle parking is unnecessary. It doesn't make any difference whether you ride a bicycle to the site or you drive a car to the site. You park the bicycle or the car in the same location and have to walk 500 feet to the building. This arrangement seems to work well without any problems at many locations in many jurisdictions.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 151-14

The following is errata that was not posted to the ICC website:

407.4.2 Low-emission, hybrid, and electric vehicle parking. Where parking is provided for a building that has a *total building floor area* greater than 10,000 square feet (929 m²) and that has an building occupant load greater than 100, at least 5 percent, but not less than two, of the parking spaces provided shall be designated as preferred parking for low emission, hybrid, and electric vehicles.

(Portions of proposal not shown do not have errata.)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The current language is intended to be an encouragement for people to use "greener" vehicle transportation if they drive to a building site. There doesn't seem to be any significant additional cost for building owners to offer this encouragement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 152-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language further complicates enforcement of this code section.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 153-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal gives preference to one type of vehicle. It does not account for hydrogen fuel cell vehicles and other alternative vehicles. Who pays for the cost of the electricity? At some point, this must be an owner decision rather than a jurisdictional decision. It is not clear whether this proposal applies to existing buildings and retrofits.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 154-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Although the definition allows many alternative fuel types, the only one readily available is electric. Other alternative fuels should have also been addressed. Who pays for the fuel?

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 155-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The ratio is too high. The proposal should also address other alternative fuel vehicles.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 40.37% (65) Oppose: 59.63% (96)

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 156-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The existing language needs to remain in the code to help mitigate the problem of heat island effect.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 157-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The exception for pervious and permeable pavements is important and should be retained.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 158-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved based upon the proponent's testimony that it needs additional work.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 159-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed concept of air voids is too complicated to understand and will be unenforceable. The existing requirement for a minimum flow rate of 2 gallons per minute is easy to understand and enforce.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 160-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There too many terms that are undefined that do not allow the intent of this proposal to be understood. The industry uses both pervious and permeable and the code should not introduce industry confusion by eliminating the term pervious.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 161-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal clears up most of the problems that GG160-14 and GG161-14 had and introduces appropriate standards for testing that will provide guidance to the code official on various products.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM C1701/C1701M-09 and C1781/C1781M-13 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>.

GG 162-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

408.3 Pervious and permeable pavement. Not less than 75 percent of the roof surfaces of buildings and covered parking located in climate zones 1 through 3, as established in the *International Energy Conservation Code*, shall be a roof complying with Section 408.3.1; shall be covered with a vegetative roof complying with Section 408.3.2; or a combination of these requirements. The provisions of this section shall apply to roofs of structures providing shade to parking in accordance with Section 408.2.2 where located in climate zones 1 through 6.

Exception: Portions of roof surfaces occupied by the following shall be permitted to be deducted from the roof surface area required to comply with this section:

1. Solar thermal collectors.
2. Solar photovoltaic systems.
3. Roof penetrations and associated equipment.
4. Portions of the roof used to capture heat for building energy technologies.
5. Rooftop decks and rooftop walkways.
6. ~~Portions of roofs that are ballasted roofs~~ with a minimum stone ballast of 17 ~~pounds per square foot (psf)~~ ~~lb/ft²~~ (74 kg/m²) or 23 ~~psf~~ ~~lb/ft²~~ (117 kg/m²) ~~for pavers.~~

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be approved based upon the proponent's published reason statement. The modification adds flexibility.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 163-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the testimony at the hearings, there is a lack of support to apply these requirements above Climate Zone 3.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**
Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 36.67% (66) Oppose: 63.33% (114)
Assembly Action: **None**

GG 164-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal ignores the benefits of cool roofs as related to heat island mitigation. It is well documented by Lawrence Berkley Laboratories and Arizona State University studies that roof surfaces contribute to heat island mitigation. This proposal eliminates choices and, after these choices are eliminated, would require that all structures that provide shade to parking would have to be provided with vegetative roofs. That is too extreme. Cool roof technology is an affordable and effective technology.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 165-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Cool roofs in cold climates are a liability in the winter.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 166-14

The following is errata that was posted to the ICC website:

**TABLE 408.3.1
REFLECTANCE AND EMITTANCE**

ROOF SLOPE	MINIMUM AGED SOLAR REFLECTANCE	MINIMUM AGED THERMAL EMITTANCE	MINIMUM AGED SRI
2:12 or less	0.55 0.65	0.75	60-78

(Portions of table and proposal not shown do not have errata.)
 (Errata already incorporated in cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Because this is limited to Climate Zones 1 thru 3 and based on the information in the testimony given and the information available on the subject, this proposed language is going to help the IgCC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 167-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This could actually reduce energy efficiencies and create enforcement issues. It is unclear how interpolation should be applied. This proposal adds unnecessary complexity. The footnote is problematic.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 168-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There are issues with this code change as submitted that should be corrected in the public comment period.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 169-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The certification and testing language should be in certification documents, not in the code. This proposal overcomplicates the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM G7/G7M-13 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 170-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Paragraph 1.4 goes too far to make this code section much too complicated for enforcement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 171-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

408.3.2 Vegetative roofs.

2. The soil medium shall be designed for the physical conditions and local climate to support the plants and shall consist of nonsynthetic materials. The planting design shall include measures to protect the engineered soil medium until the plants are established. Protection measures include, but are not limited to, installation of pregrown vegetated mats or modules, tackifying agents, fiber blankets and reinforcing mesh. The maximum wet weight and water holding capacity of an engineered a soil medium shall be determined in accordance with ASTM E 2399.

(Portions of the proposal not shown are not modified.)

Committee Reason: The proposal was modified because "engineered" should have been struck out and not underlined. The proposal was approved as modified because the term engineered is not necessary for the understanding and intent of this code section.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 172-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 173-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This language would be better suited for a proposal to the IBC as this is about roof integrity. The ASTM D7877 standard is still in draft phase.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM D 5957-98(2013), D 7186-12, ASTM D 7877-14 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

The following is information that was not posted to the ICC website:

The proposed standard ASTM D7877 in draft form, was reviewed by ICC Staff after the Staff Analysis of proposed standards was posted on the ICC Website. The document states that it is a guide. As such, it is written throughout with unenforceable language.

GG 174-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The inclusion of spas into the exception is a necessary correction for continuity of the overall intent of this section.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 175-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 176-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is a needed improvement to better align the light pollution requirements of the IgCC with the IES/IDA Model Lighting Ordinance that was used as the original basis for development of this section.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 177-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Night sky lighting is a problem that needs to be addressed in the IgCC. There is no statistical justification for deletion of the section. Controlling night illumination could be an overall operating cost savings.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 178-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because it is being proposed in the wrong code and the wrong section of the code. The plumbing code may be more appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 179-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal does not provide justification for deleting the requirement for recycling areas at buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 180-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that his proposal be approved as it is a simple but a good clarification as we increase the use of electronic media for plans and specifications.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 181-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The biomass language seems to be incongruent with the existing section language.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 182-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal creates opportunities for material reuse in buildings that are being demolished. This is doable and is good value added for the IgCC. Some committee members have experience with demolition related provisions that have yielded positive results.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 183-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved based on prior committee action on GG187-14.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 184-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is uncertainty on how the specified size credit would be applied. The differences in the definition having structural member and the application of 503.1 needs to be resolved in a public comment.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 185-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal be disapproved because the term "unit" is not adequately defined. Otherwise this is a good proposal. The committee recommended that work be done in the public comment period to improve the proposal.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 186-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal be approved as submitted because it clarifies the code.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 187-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that a limitation on distance to a disposal site is needed for the reasons stated. The limitation of having a disposal site within 75 miles seems reasonable.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis.

GG 188-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because it does not add clarity or enhance the code. It may be a good idea, but the language is confusing.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 189-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is an admirable idea and needs to be addressed. Resiliency is within the domain of the

green code and should be considered in the future. However, the life cycle assessment changes and the lack of metrics and definitions to support the proposal are troubling.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 190-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be approved as submitted because the language that is proposed to be deleted is addressed in great detail other portions of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 191-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because the proposed information belongs in a different document or code.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 192-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While this is an aspirational code, this proposal perhaps takes us too far down the road. It is inconsistent with previous committee actions and cuts too deep by eliminating some of the single attribute categories that have been retained by the committee's prior actions. This exempts buildings under 10,000 square feet and does not provide for an exception for electrical, plumbing and mechanical equipment. If 55 percent is too easy to comply with, higher percentages and other options to strengthen the provisions might be considered, and jurisdictions always have the option to do that upon adoption.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 193-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is unnecessary as the other I-codes are referenced in the Chapter 1.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 194-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal provides good criteria for fully understanding a product's impact on the environment.

Assembly Motion: **Disapprove**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 43.21% (70) Oppose: 56.79% (92)

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ISO 14025:2006, 14040:2006 and 21930:2007 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

The following is additional information that was not posted to the ICC website:

Standard 21930:2007 was received and reviewed by ICC Staff after the ICC website posting of staff analysis of standards. The standard contains language that could affect enforceability. See Section 5.

GG 195-14

The following is errata that was posted on the ICC website:

505.2.6 Certified wood products. *Wood and wood products used to comply with this section, other than salvaged or reused wood products, shall be labeled in accordance with the SFI Standard, FSC STD-40-004 V2-1 EN, PEFC Council Technical Document or equivalent fiber procurement stem. As an alternative to an on-product label, a Certificate of Compliance indicating compliance with the fiber procurement system shall be permitted. Manufacturer's fiber procurement systems shall be audited by an accredited third-party.*

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

(This errata has already been incorporated into cdpACCESS)

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because the proposed text does not align with the proponent's published reason. In addition, the proposal creates an opportunity for wood to double dip as a bio-based and as a certified wood product.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 196-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The Committee wanted to maintain continuity with the disapproval of proposals G200-14 and G201-14. The reason statement is of circular logic concerning the term regional.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 197-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal is headed in the right direction, but is very limited in its application and should to be more neutral. This waters down the 55 percent figure. The concept is good, but it is misleading in its current form. More work needs to be done on Item 6 to eliminate confusion and prevent it from becoming a never-ending list.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 198-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is a challenging issue. Application of this provision on actual projects in Scottsdale, Arizona has proven that it is not difficult to meet the first 5 attributes. Wood could meet Environmental Product Declaration requirements and not be certified, and that is one of the challenges with this proposal. The requirement of the proposal for third party operation and accreditation would invalidate the application of the ISO standards, which is also problematic.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ISO 14025:2006 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 199-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Volume is a necessary attribute for determining how much product there is.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 200-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The Committee wants to keep the language consistent with similar sections of the IgCC and retain the flexibility to choose different methods of measuring materials.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 201-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This existing section is a good, flexible tool for code officials and the proposal limits the flexibility of the section.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 202-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The Committee prefers the percentage or sliding scale as a metric versus the arbitrary threshold that has been suggested as a new basis of measurement.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of CAN/CSA-ISO 14025:07(R2012) and ISO 21930:2007 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 203-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal favors a particular product category, discourages manufacturer responsibility for reuse and recycling and has a considerably low threshold of post-consumer content material in plastics.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 204-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because it is incomplete, needs to be further defined and contains conflicts.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 205-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be approved based upon the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 206-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Deleting "National" from the language does not necessarily exclude national programs from application in this section. This proposal actually expands the recognition of national and local take-back programs.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 207-14

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of FSC-No Edition Date, PEFC-No Edition date, and SFI-No Edition Date relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit:

<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 208-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There are many desirable bio-based products that would not be encouraged if this proposal was approved.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 29.71% (52) Oppose: 70.29% (123)

Assembly Action:

None

GG 209-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The change from "and" to "or" is inappropriate. The "regional" aspect may have been more palatable if it was accompanied by a definition.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 210-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved to be consistent with prior committee action on GG209-14. Adding the word "or" instead of "and" would add confusion.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 211-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because the proponent requested disapproval in order to come back with improved language in the public comment period.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of UL 2218-10 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:

<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 212-14

The following is errata that was posted to the ICC website:

Replace code change proposal with the following:

Add new definitions as follows:

SECTION 202

DEFINITIONS

PROGRAM OPERATOR. Body or bodies that conduct a Type III environmental declaration program. A program operator can be a company or a group of companies, industrial sector or trade association, public authorities or agencies, or an independent scientific body or other organization.

TYPE III ENVIRONMENTAL PRODUCT DECLARATION. A product declaration that provides quantified environmental data using predetermined parameters and, where relevant, additional environmental information. For either brand-specific or industry-wide environmental product declaration.

Revise as follows:

505.1 Material selection and properties. Building materials shall conform to Section 505.2 or Section 505.3.

Exceptions:

1. Electrical, mechanical, plumbing, security and fire detection, and alarm equipment and controls, automatic fire sprinkler systems, elevators and conveying systems shall not be required to comply with Section 505.2.
2. Where a whole building life cycle assessment is performed in accordance with Section 303.1, compliance with Section 505.2 shall not be required.

Add new text as follows:

505.3 Multi-attribute material declaration and certification. Not less than 55 percent of the total building materials used in the project, based on mass, volume or cost, shall comply with Section 505.3.1 or 505.3.2. Where a material complies with both 505.3.1 and 505.3.2 the material value shall be multiplied by two.

505.3.1 Environmental product declaration. A building material with a *Type III environmental product declaration* that is verified by a *program operator*. The environmental product declaration shall comply with the provisions of ISO 14025 and ISO 21930 and be externally verified.

505.3.2 Multi-attribute standard. A material specific assessment that is verified by an *approved agency* shall be submitted for each product in accordance with the following items, as applicable. The assessment shall be verified as meeting the minimum performance level specified in each standard, which focuses on the life-cycle stages from development to end of life. These stages shall include material selection, energy and water use during development, performance, human and environmental impact, and end of life.

1. NSF/ANSI 140 for carpet
2. NSF/ANSI 332 for resilient floor coverings
3. NSF/ANSI 336 for commercial furnishings fabric
4. NSF/ANSI 342 for wallcoverings
5. NSF/ANSI 347 for single ply roofing membranes
6. NSC 373 for natural dimension stone
7. TCNA ANSI/A138.1 or ceramic tiles, glass tiles, and tile installation materials
8. UL 100 for gypsum boards and panels
9. UL 102 for door leafs

Add new standards as follows:

ISO:

ISO 14025 – 2006 Environmental labels and declarations – Type III environmental declarations – Principles and procedures

ISO 21930 – 2007 Sustainability in building construction – Environmental declaration of building products

NSF:

- [NSF/ANSI 140-2013 Sustainability Assessment for Carpet](#)
- [NSF/ANSI 332-2012 Sustainability Assessment for Resilient Floor Coverings](#)
- [NSF/ANSI 336-2011 Sustainability Assessment for Commercial Furnishings Fabric](#)
- [NSF/ANSI 342-2012 Sustainability Assessment for Wallcoverings](#)
- [NSF/ANSI 347-2012 Sustainability Assessment for Single Ply Roofing Membranes](#)

UL:

- [UL 100-2012 Sustainability for Gypsum Boards and Panels](#)
- [UL 102-2012 Sustainability for Door Leafs](#)
- Natural Stone Council, P.O. Box 539, Hollis, New Hampshire 03049
- [NSC 373-2013 Sustainability Assessment for Natural Dimension Stone](#)

[Tile Council of North America, 100 Clemson Research Boulevard, Anderson, SC 29625](#)
[TCNA ANSI/A138.1-2012 Standard Specification for Sustainable Ceramic Tiles, Glass Tiles, and Tile Installation Materials](#)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Multi-attribute assessment is what Europe has been doing for quite awhile. No longer can there be just a claim that a product is bio-degradable or has a recycled content.

Assembly Motion: **Disapprove**
Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 47.06% (80) Oppose: 52.94% (90)
Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ISO 14025:2006 , 21930:2007, NSC 373-2013, NSF 140-2013, 332-2012, 336-2011, 342-2012 & 347-2012, TCNA A138.1-2012, UL 100-2012 & 102-2012 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 213-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is subject matter that should be in an electrical code, a code that ICC is not involved with. The terminology "in good operating condition and with no visible defects" is subject to a wide range of interpretation and would be difficult to enforce.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 214-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 215-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The reduction of mercury in lamps is a good thing for the environment.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 216-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 217-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the proponent's reason statement and because all building should have moisture preventative measures, not just green buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 218-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the proponent's published reason statement and the committee's prior action on GG217-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 219-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal addresses an important omission in the code's moisture control preventative measures. The option of a vapor retarder will assist. One of the questions was whether this will impede the efficiency of scheduling in the application of any of roofing materials. That may be true, and this list may be better placed in the International Building Code (IBC). The proponent should propose a similar change to the IBC as well. It is important that concrete be properly cured.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content ASTM F2170-11 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandard-042314.pdf>

GG 220-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This change would bring everything into the same box, meaning it attempts to oversimplify moisture controls. The applications listed are for frame assemblies. Other wall assemblies are not included.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM E2273-03(2011) and ASTM WK-39491-XXXX relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 221-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It is vitally important to disclose the presence of potentially harmful chemicals, and health product declarations are important. However, this proposal creates mandatory requirements and offers no options, as the material attributes do. The standards referenced in the proposal are not consensus based. The concerns expressed by the proponents are worthwhile, but it does not seem to be appropriate for the IgCC. This type of information is more appropriate as a Federal requirement, but not for a code. The proponents should pursue their

concerns with the federal agencies such as Consumer Product Safety Commission or the EPA.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 222-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This subject belongs in the International Building Code. The language proposed is unenforceable.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 223-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It is not clear what "finished building area" is or what "finishes" are addressed. The proposal is ambiguous and arbitrary. This action is consistent with prior committee action on GG179-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 224-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There will difficulty in finding out who the owner is and then getting information from the approved source will be even more difficult. Because of this, these sections need to stay in the appendix.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 225-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Termites are primarily an issue for wood-constructed residential buildings. Other types of construction such as Types I and II should be addressed.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 226-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal for approval as submitted because it clarifies and updates the code and improves the performance of air handling and HVAC air filters.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 227-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is an unnecessary cross reference to an I-code. The other I-codes already apply.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 228-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 229-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Garages and hangars are not discussed in the subsections of the sections so these terms need to be removed.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 230-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 231-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is requiring compliance to I-codes that cannot be complied with.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 232-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 233-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The air quality of I-2 occupancies is already taken care of by the nature of what is required for health care occupancies.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 234-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal removes control of some pollutants from the code that need to be controlled.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 235-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Requiring pre-occupancy testing will create problems if it is found that something needs to be done after construction. It is unclear as to what needs to happen if high levels are found. The term qualified is a problem as it is unclear as to how to determine who is qualified.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 236-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because, although carbon monoxide detectors save lives, this information does not belong in the IgCC.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of NFPA 720-15 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 237-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because the standard referenced in the proposal is not available for review.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of EN13986 – 2004 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandard-042314.pdf>

GG 238-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be approved because it removes a nonexistent reference.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 239-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Two of the standards do not appear to have been developed by a consensus process and problems with other documents that don't even appear to be standards.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ISO 11890-1 (2007), ISO 11890-2 (2013), European Decopaint Directive, Canadian VOC Concentration Limits for Architectural Coatings and Hong Kong Air Pollution Control Regulation relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 240-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal contains inaccuracies. Some of the documents referenced are not consensus based. One of the referenced documents is not a standard, but rather is a testing method. The European standards referenced are not in conformance with ICC criteria.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of BS PD CEN/TS 16516:2013, DIBT Testing Method (2010), France Decree No. 2011-321 of 23 March 2011, German AgBB Testing and Evaluation Scheme (2013), ISO 16000-3:2011, 16000-6:2011, 16000-9:2006 and 16000-11:2006 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 241-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The Committee liked the concept of materials absorbing pollutants but the proponent requested disapproval so that the proposal could be reworked and brought back in a public comment.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ISO 16000-23 - 2009 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 242-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This change makes Sections 806.6.1 and 806.6.2 required because of the use of the word "and." Those sections do not seem to function well together. The proposed information may be better suited to a separate chapter or major section. This issue caused individuals in the fire service to contact one of the committee members. They say that they continue to monitor this, as well as other risks that they have as fire fighters, but they do not feel that loosing this opportunity for the protection of buildings will ultimately benefit them at this time. The chapter to which this proposal is made is concerned with indoor environmental quality. However, most of these foam products are located on the outside of the building envelope and are encapsulated in an Exterior Insulated Finish System or are encapsulated between a roof membrane and a metal or concrete deck. As such, they are not likely to affect the interior environment.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 243-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because the information is contained in standards that are already referenced in the code.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM D5116-10 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 244-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There are many inconsistencies in this proposal, from what it covers to errors in the list. There are some areas that are included but that should not be included, and other areas that are not included that should be included. It is difficult to create a list that is all inclusive. The ASTM D3273 standard referenced in the proposal contains language that could affect enforceability. Contrary to the statement in the proposal, this proposal could increase the cost of construction.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM D3273-12 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 245-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

807.1 Sound transmission and sound levels. Where.....

Exceptions: The following buildings and spaces need not comply with this section:

1. Building.....
2. Parking.....
3. Concession.....
4. Group I-2 ~~Condition 2~~ occupancies that comply with the sound transmission class and sound level requirement in 2010 FGI-ASHE Guidelines for Design and Construction of Healthcare Facilities.

807.2.1 Interior sound transmission. Wall.....

Exceptions: This section shall not apply to wall and floor-ceiling assemblies enclosing:

1. Public.....
2. Concession.....
3. Spaces.....
4. Group I-2 ~~Condition 2~~ occupancies that comply with the 2010 FGI-ASHE Guidelines for Design and Construction of Healthcare Facilities.

(Portions of proposal not shown are not modified)

Committee Reason: This proposal strengthens and improves the code in a logical and reasonable manner. This action is consistent with prior committee action on GG233-14. The ASHRAE guidelines referenced in the proposal address sound transmission in I-2 occupancies in a more than adequate fashion. The modification further coordinates Group I-2 occupancies with the requirements of Section 807.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 246-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There are flaws in the proposal and it does not achieve what was intended. There are issues with the section in ASHRAE that were referred to. One of the documents referenced is a guideline, not a standard. The scoping needs to remain in this code, while this proposal would hand of scoping to ASHRAE.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM E1332-10a and ASTM E966-10e1 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 247-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred GG245-14. One of the problems with GG247-14 is that the committee did not feel there was good reason to require testing specifically on Tuesdays, Wednesdays or Thursdays.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 248-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The distance indicated in the proposal appears to be somewhat arbitrary. The hotel rooms that some of the committee members stayed in were well over the distance specified in the proposal from air and road traffic noise, and it would not likely have made much difference if the distance was much greater.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 249-14

The following is errata that was posted to the ICC website:

**TABLE 807.3.2
MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE INDOOR BACKGROUND SOUND IN ROOMS**

OCCUPANCY TYPE	ROOM	NOISE CRITERIA (NC) LIMITS
Institutional I-2	All areas Wards-Private and semi-private-patient rooms Operating rooms-Corridors and public areas	2010 FGI-ASHE Guidelines for Design and Construction of Healthcare Facilities
	Rooms or suites	25 to 35
	Bathroom, kitchen, utility room	40

(Portions of table and proposal not shown do not have errata.)
(Errata already incorporated in cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 807.3.2

MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE INDOOR BACKGROUND SOUND IN ROOMS

OCCUPANCY TYPE	ROOM	NOISE CRITERIA (NC) LIMITS
Institutional I-2	All areas	2010 FGI-ASHE Guidelines for Design and Construction of Healthcare Facilities

(Portions of proposal not shown are not modified.)

Committee Reason: The Committee modified the proposal because the modification coordinates with the Committee's action on GG245-14. The Committee approved the proposal as modified to coordinate with the Committee's action on GG245-14.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 250-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be approved as submitted based upon the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 251-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 252-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal to be consistent with prior committee action on this subject.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 253-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 254-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended the proposed language for approval because it strengthens the code section and is consistent with the International Building Code and the commissioning chapter of the IgCC. Deficiencies should be brought to the attention of the design professional and the owner and corrections should be made.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 255-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal for approval because it eliminates a great deal of redundancy and confusion in Section 807.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 256-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal for approval to be consistent with prior committee action on GG251-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 257-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

807.6 Special inspections for sound transmission.

2. Group I-2, ~~Condition 2~~-occupancies that comply with 2010 FGI-ASHE [Guidelines for Design and Construction of Healthcare Facilities](#) are not required furnishing a report of test findings of the sound transmission results.

(Portions of proposal not shown are not modified.)

Committee Reason: The Committee modified the proposal to coordinate with previous actions on proposals concerning health care facilities. The Committee approved the proposal as modified to provide consistency throughout the IgCC sections concerning health care facilities.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 258-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Moving the IgCC acoustics provisions to an appendix accomplishes nothing because they are already a jurisdictional choice in Table 302.1. In both cases, the jurisdiction must make a specific choice to enforce the provisions before they become mandatory.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 259-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 260-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 261-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on prior committee action on GG260-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 262-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 263-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee approved the proposal for consistency with what will be in the 2015 IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 264-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

**TABLE 808.3.1.1
MINIMUM EFFECTIVE APERTURE**

SKY TYPE^a
A ^a
B _b
C _c

(Portions of proposal not shown are not modified.)

Committee Reason: The Committee modified to the proposal to correct a proponent error in locating footnote "a" to make the footnote appropriate to all sky types. The Committee approved the proposal as modified because they agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 265-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is a performance issue. Trying to apply this concept to all designs and sites on a prescriptive basis that is severely restrictive is inappropriate. Many exceptions and a more performance based approach is necessary if this concept is to have any chance.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 266-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This does not apply to the scope of what the proponent attended. This proposal inappropriately mandates radon control methods. The proposal should be revised to address radon in the appendices.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of AARST/ANSI #CCAH-2013 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 267-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Requiring all buildings to be equipped with radon systems would be prohibitive. This decision should be left up to the jurisdiction. It may, however, be appropriate as a jurisdictional elective.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 268-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal because it requires a stairway in all buildings, including one story buildings, as well as other excessive requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 269-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal because the proponent requested disapproval of GG269-14 based on GG228-14 being approved and because the committee preferred GG228-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 270-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal based on the proponent's request and to be consistent with prior committee actions on GG271-14, GG276-14 and GEW142-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 271-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement. Timing is important for the permitting process as if the jurisdiction doesn't hold to specific timelines, there could be legal implications.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 272-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal is a major improvement over the existing code. It helps sort out a number of functions. Special inspections are sometimes necessary and this proposal introduces the concept to the IgCC along with the appropriate language.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 273-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the proponent's published reason statement and because the proponent has done a good job of eliminating redundancies.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 274-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The wording of this proposal is unclear and will cause confusion. Inspection would require some destruction.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 275-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

Other actions approved during the hearings have deleted this table. The committee felt that if the table does survive through the public comment phase, this type of text belongs here. There is also Section 611.4 which addresses the commissioning of the building envelope.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 276-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the proponent's published reason statement. This approach to commissioning is sensible and much more reasonable and understandable.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 277-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the proponent's published reason statement and because air barriers are a very important part of the building envelope and it needs to be recognized as part of the record documents.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 278-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 279-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal is unenforceable. Among other things, it requires the code official to constantly check back with the owner to make sure that they have certificates. This may be appropriate for very large projects, but not for the average commercial building.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 280-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal be disapproved because the proponent requested disapproval so that they may come back in the public comment period with improvements.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 281-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 282-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: By listing the IEBC in this context, it makes the user uncertain as to whether or not I-codes that are not listed have to be complied with.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 283-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This language is unnecessary, makes the section more cumbersome and creates a laundry list that may be incomplete.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 284-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 285-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the proponent's published reason statement and because this proposal fixes many of the related provisions that are not deleted.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 286-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 287-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal because it improves the consistency of the language.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 288-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 289-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal because envelope "components" is too broad a term and because the proposed language does not belong in this section of the code and it conflicts with Section 1003.2.6.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 290-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1003.2 Requirements for alterations.

Exceptions:

1. The total cost of improvements required by Sections 1003.2.1 through 1003.2.87 shall not.....
3. Materials, assemblies and components regulated by Sections 1003.2.1 through 1003 2.87 that.....
4. Alterations are not required to comply with the requirements of Sections 1003.2.1 through 1003.2.87 where.....

(Portions of proposal not shown are not modified)

Committee Reason: This makes the IgCC consistent with the IECC.

Assembly Motion: **Disapprove**
Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 48.21% (81) Oppose: 51.79% (87)
Assembly Action: **None**

GG 291-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 292-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal because it contains changes that are too drastic and restrictive and because they preferred the language in GG293-14. Titles are not enforceable, and some of the proposed text does not work without language similar to the title language in them.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 293-14

The following is errata that was not posted on the ICC website:

1003.2.1 Metering devices. Dedicated individual utility or private metering devices that measure and verify energy and/or water use within the building or space shall be provided for at least one of the following for each type of energy used in the building:

1. Electrical energy consumption for individual tenant spaces.
2. Water consumption for individual tenant spaces.
3. Natural gas, propane, or fuel oil consumption for individual tenant spaces.
4. Lighting loads.
5. Motors and drives loads.
6. Chiller part-load efficiency.
7.

(Portions of proposal not shown do not have errata.)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Metering is a very important concept for saving resources. Often there are requirements for new construction but, by far, the bulk of building stock is existing thus it is important to address existing buildings. The exception allows the proposal to be a lot less onerous so that we get the best bang for the buck in only requiring metering in larger buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 294-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1003.2.2 Heating, ventilating and air-conditioning.

Exception: A time clock or automatic time switch controls shall not be required for spaces where any of the following conditions exist:

1. Group I-2, ~~Condition 2~~ occupancies.

(Portions of proposal not shown are not modified)

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the proponent's published reason statement and further modified the proposal for clarity and consistency.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 295-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language is proposed to the wrong code. It should have been proposed to the International Fuel Gas Code or NFPA chimney related provisions.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 296-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal for approval based upon the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 297-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal be disapproved because the exception that the proposal strikes is important for older existing buildings without much insulation that need to be brought up to code.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 298-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 299-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the addition of 2 beneficial definitions and the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 300-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 301-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal for Disapproval because the proponent requested that the proposal be disapproved.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 302-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because it would create conflicts with the energy code. This proposal is essentially requiring that, when a roof is replaced, it must comply with the energy code. That is already required.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 303-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be approved as submitted based on the proponents published reason and because the definition is much clearer.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 304-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because, in demolition, for example, we may not be addressing everything sufficiently when we change the referenced sections.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 305-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because the proposed language is very loose and difficult to interpret. Non-registered historic building could apply to any existing building. There are other proposals that address the same subject matter in a more complete and accurate manner.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 306-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides consistency between the IgCC and IECC for historic buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 308-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 309-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved because the proponent requested disapproval so that they can make improvements in the public comment period.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 310-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal for approval based upon the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 311-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be approved as submitted because it provides a broader platform for energy reporting. zEPI can be used for broad platform energy reporting, such as Energy Star and Portfolio Manager.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 312-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Requiring re-commissioning of a building under the IgCC after the certificate of occupancy is issued is a challenge from a code enforcement viewpoint. Re-commissioning is a good idea for some buildings but these requirements should be in the appendix.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 313-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommends that this proposal be disapproved because tying requirements to the sale of a building may inhibit adoptability. This proposal may be more reasonable as a jurisdictional choice in Table 302.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 314-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be disapproved. While the proposal may have admirable goals, it is not enforceable as written. It is unlikely that a jurisdiction will want to enforce these requirements after occupancy.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 315-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal be disapproved because the proponent requested disapproval so that they may come back in the public comment period with improvements.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 316-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 317-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal aligns the IgCC with the same requirements found in the other I-codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 318-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is a good approach for existing buildings where accessible parking spaces need to be installed.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 319-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 320-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal creates a contradiction to what is considered "green" in the body of the IgCC. It acts as a mask to what is considered "green" in the IgCC.

The code already offers a great deal of flexibility. That makes this alternative unnecessary.

Important information, such as that related to Chapter 8 and various requirements in Chapter 5 are not addressed by this proposal.

Assembly Motion: **As Modified**

Online Vote Results: **Successful** - Support: 56.7% (127) Oppose: 43.3% (97)

Assembly Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

A101.3 Scope.

Exceptions:

3. Detached one- and two-family dwellings and multiple single-family dwellings (townhouses) not more than three stories in height above grade plane with a separate means of egress; Group R-3; as well as group R-2, R-3 and R-4 buildings three stories or less in height above grade plane.

(Portions of the proposal not shown are not modified)

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of CAN/CSA-ISO 14025:07(R2012), ISO 21930:2007, ASHRAE 193-2020, and UL 391-2006 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 321-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It is a jurisdictional choice whether to adopt Appendix A. This is a worthwhile choice to provide to jurisdictions. The green building realm is changing every day. Innovations are gaining every day. This appendix allows jurisdictions to encourage and recognize innovations. This appendix gives an opportunity for owners and designers to have a voice.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 322-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal simplifies and offers more choices for compliance.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 323-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal be approved as submitted based upon the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 324-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed table has owner choices, which is good. However, more performance based requirements and options are desirable. Other films and coatings should be included. Other improvements should also be made.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 325-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 326-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal creates an opportunity to increase flexibility by creating a project elective. This proposal works in harmony with other material resource related project electives.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 327-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

The committee earlier approved related provisions for the main part of Chapter 6 as part of the Auto DR system. This project elective would build on the earlier standard and provides for increased efficiency when using renewable energy sources.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 328-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

A106.2.2.1 Heating equipment. For heating equipment, the part-load, the full load, annual, or season efficiency of the equipment shall be not less than 5 percent greater than the part-load, full-load, annual, or seasonal efficiencies shown in the applicable tables of the *International Energy Conservation Code*, or ASHRAE 90.1, or the equipment shall be ENERGY STAR qualified, as applicable.

A106.2.2.2 Cooling equipment. For cooling equipment, the part-load, full load, annual, or seasonal efficiency of the equipment shall be not less than 5 percent greater than the part-load, full load, annual, or seasonal efficiencies shown in the applicable tables of the *International Energy Conservation Code*, or ASHRAE 90.1, or the equipment shall be ENERGY STAR qualified.

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

The modifications were approved to result in editorial consistency through the sections. The overall proposal is an adjustment to the project electives reflecting the substantial increases established for HVAC equipment. These increases are reflected in the 2015 IECC. In addition, many equipment types do not have a part load metric available to evaluate against. This provides other metrics.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 329-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 330-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

The change removes redundancy with the primary requirements of Chapter 6.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 331-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

The Committee approved the proposal to provide consistency with the IgCC, the IFC and the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 332-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

The change is necessary for consistency between the IgCC, the IBC, the IFC and the Approved as Submitted proposal GG331-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 333-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recommended that this proposal be approved as submitted based upon the proponents published reason statement. This proposal encourages performance beyond that required in the body of code.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 334-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: There is no need to have duplicated code text between codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 335-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This ordinance provides more options for the jurisdiction if they don't want to adopt the ordinance in the prefaces pages of the IgCC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 336-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The section duplicates some of the administrative functions found in the IBC and is therefore unnecessary to have in the IgCC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GG 337-14

The following is errata that was not posted to the ICC Website:

Add new standards to this Appendix E only:

ASTM

D 1785—06 Specification for Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Plastic Pipe, Schedules 40, 80 and

120

D 2239—03 Specification for Polyethylene (PE) Plastic Pipe (SIDR-PR) Based on

Controlled Inside Diameter	
D 2241—05	Specification for Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Pressure-rated Pipe (SDR-Series)
D 2665—09	Specification for Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Plastic Drain, Waste, and Vent Pipe and Fittings
D 2729—03	Specification for Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Sewer Pipe and Fittings
D 2737—03	Specification for Polyethylene (PE) Plastic Tubing
D 2846/D 2846M—09	Specification for Chlorinated Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (CPVC) Plastic Hot and Cold Water Distribution Systems
D 2949—01a(2008)	Specification for 3.25-in Outside Diameter Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Plastic Drain, Waste, and Vent Pipe and Fittings
D 3034—08	Specification for Type PSM Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Sewer Pipe and Fittings
D 3035—08	Standard Specification for Polyethylene (PE) Plastic Pipe (DR-PR) Based on Controlled Outside Diameter
F 405—05	Specification for Corrugated Polyethylene (PE) Pipe and Fittings
F 441/F 441M—02 (2008)	Specification for Chlorinated Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (CPVC) Plastic Pipe, Schedules 40 and 80
F 442/F 442M—99(2005) e1	Specification for Chlorinated Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (CPVC) Plastic Pipe (SDR-PR)
F 628—08	Specification for Acrylonitrile-Butadiene-Styrene (ABS) Schedule 40 Plastic Drain, Waste, and Vent Pipe with a Cellular Core
F 876—08b	Specification for Cross-linked Polyethylene (PEX) Tubing
F 891—07	Specification for Coextruded Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Plastic Pipe with a Cellular Core
F 1281—07	Specification for Cross-linked Polyethylene/Aluminum/ Cross-linked Polyethylene (PEX-AL-PEX) Pressure Pipe
F 1282—06	Specification for Polyethylene/Aluminum/Polyethylene (PE-AL-PE) Composite Pressure Pipe
F1760-01(2011)	Standard Specification for Coextruded Poly(Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Non-Pressure Plastic Pipe Having Reprocessed-Recycled Content
F1901-10	Standard Specification for Polyethylene (PE) Pipe and Fittings for Roof Drain Systems
F2158-08	Standard Specification for Residential Central-Vacuum Tube and Fittings
F2306-08	12" to 60" Annular Corrugated Profile-wall Polyethylene (PE) Pipe and Fittings for Gravity Flow Storm Sewer and Subsurface Drainage Applications
F2623-08	Standard Specification for Polyethylene of Raised Temperature (PE-RT) SDR 9 Tubing
F 2389—07e1	Specification for Pressure-rated Polypropylene (PP) Piping Systems
F 2769—09	Polyethylene or Raised Temperature (PE-RT) Plastic Hot and Cold Water Tubing and Distribution Systems
F2855-12	Standard Specification for Chlorinated Poly(Vinyl Chloride)/Aluminum/Chlorinated Poly(Vinyl Chloride) (CPVC-AL-CPVC) Composite Pressure Tubing

AWWA

900-07	Polyvinyl chloride (PVC) Pressure Pipe and Fabricated Fittings, 4 in. through 12 in. (100 mm through 300mm), for Water transmission and Distribution
C901—08	Polyethylene (PE) Pressure Pipe and Tubing 1/2 inch (13 mm) Through 3 inch (76 mm) for Water Service
C904—08	Cross-linked Polyethylene (PEX) Pressure Pipe 1/2 inch (13 mm) Through 3 inch (76 mm) for Water Service
905-10	Polyvinyl chloride (PVC) Pressure Pipe and Fabricated Fittings, 14 in. through 48 in. (350mm through 1200mm), for Water transmission and Distribution

CSA

B137.1—05	Polyethylene (PE) Pipe, Tubing and Fittings for Cold Water Pressure Services
B137.3—05	Rigid Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Pipe for Pressure Applications
B137.5—05	Cross-linked Polyethylene (PEX) Tubing Systems for Pressure Applications
B137.6—05	CPVC Pipe, Tubing and Fittings for Hot and Cold Water Distribution Systems
B137.11—05	Polypropylene (PP-R) Pipe and Fittings for Pressure Applications

NSF

UL

1821-2011 Standard for Thermoplastic Sprinkler Pipe and Fittings for Fire Protection Service

(Portions of proposal and table not shown do not have errata.)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

This is not an appropriate proposal for the IgCC as the subject of suggested pipe standards for various applications is better suited for inclusion in the Appendices of the IPC, the IMC and maybe the IBC.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. Analysis: A review of the standards new to the I-Code family and proposed for inclusion in the code, ASTM F1760-01(2011), ASTM F1901-10, F2158-08, F2855-12, F2855-12, AWWA C900-07, C905-10, NSF358-1-2012 and UL 1821-11 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP#28), will be posted on the ICC website on or before April 1, 2014. All other standards proposed for inclusion into the IgCC code are already referenced in other codes of the 2012 I-code family or will be referenced in other codes of the 2015 I-code family.

GG 338-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal is in conflict with the IBC. As the IgCC is intended to be an overlay code to the other I-codes, this code should not circumvent the requirements of other I-Codes. Resiliency is a part of sustainability, however, that needs to be considered in the base I-codes, not in the IgCC.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASCE/SEI 24-13, ASTM D4226-11, E108-11, D5206-13, FM 4473-11, NFPA 13-13, NFPA 13R-13, NFPA 221-15, UL 790-04 and UL 2218-2010 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GG 339-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recommended this proposal for disapproval based on the proponent's request.

Assembly Action:

None

GG 340-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC Energy/Water Committee.*

The committee felt that the proposal would be overly restrictive. Issues of site security and adequate light for worker safety needs to be in the hands of the contractors. Some of this may be in conflict with OSHA requirements.

Assembly Action:

None

INTERNATIONAL GREEN CONSTRUCTION CODE (ENERGY/WATER COMMITTEE)



Christopher J. Green, Chair

Rep: American Institute of Architects
President
Ago Studios, Inc.
Avon, CO

**Thomas Hogarth, PE, CBO, LEED AP –
Vice Chair**

Building Department Director
Palm Beach County School District
Riviera Beach, FL

Stephen V. Abernathy, PE, CEM

Senior Energy Services Engineer
Piedmont Natural Gas
Greenville, SC

Ronald Anstey

Rep: National Association of State Fire Marshals
Investigator/Section Chief, Engineering
& Plans Review
NH State Fire Marshal's Office
Concord, NH

Jack Bailey, IES, LC, LEED AP

Rep: International Association of Lighting
Designers
Partner
One Lux Studio, LLC
New York, NY

Shawn A. Bergeron, LEED AP, PE

Electrical Engineer II
City of Richmond
Richmond, VA

David R. Conover

Senior Technical Advisor
Energy and Environmental Division
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
Great Falls, VA

Winston Huff, CPD, LEED AP

Rep: American Society of Plumbing Engineers
Sr. Project Manager, MEP
TRC Worldwide Engineering Inc.
Nashville, TN

Stephen Kanipe, CBO, LEED AP

Chief Building Official
City of Aspen, Colorado
Aspen, CO

Dominick G. Kasmauskas, CFPS

Associate Director of Regional Operations –
Northern Div.
National Fire Sprinkler Association
Rotterdam, NY

Steve Nordhues

Building Official
City of Norfolk
Norfolk, NE

Thomas E. Pape

Rep: Alliance for Water Efficiency
Principal
Best Management Company
Waterloo, IL

Evan C. Roberts, CBCO

Sr. Plans Examiner
City of Fort Worth
Fort Worth, TX

Dan Wise

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Owner
Wise Construction; Grand Design Group LLC
Boalsburg, PA

Staff Secretariats:

Fred Grable, PE

Senior. Staff Engineer - Plumbing
International Code Council
4051 West Flossmoor
Country Club Hills, IL 60478
888/422-7233; Fax: 708/799-0320
Fgrable@iccsafe.org

Kermit Robinson

Senior Technical Staff
International Code Council
Los Angeles District Office
5360 Workman Mill Road
Whittier, CA 90601
888/422-7233; Fax: (562) 699-4522
krobinson@iccsafe.org

INTERNATIONAL GREEN CONSTRUCTION CODE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

GEW 1-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The Committee was opposed to removal of Chapter 6 regulating energy conservation from the IgCC. Even if jurisdictions choose to not adopt one chapter or another, the IgCC needs to contain the full complement of topics. If the code doesn't contain a chapter on energy conservation, there is no chapter available for adopting jurisdictions to consider. The general topic areas regulated in the IgCC need to remain consistent with the ICC 700

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 50% (97) Oppose: 50% (97)

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 2-14

The following is errata that was posted to the ICC webpage.

1003.2.2 Heating, ventilating and air-conditioning.

3. HVAC piping and ducts, including those located above suspended ceilings, shall comply with Sections 606.3 and 606.4. *International Energy Conservation Code.*

The following is errata that was not posted to the ICC webpage.

1007.3 Post certificate of occupancy zEPI, energy demand, and CO₂e emissions reporting.—Where the jurisdiction indicates in Table 302.1 that ongoing post certificate of occupancy zEPI, energy demand and CO₂e emissions reporting is required, and where the jurisdiction has indicated in Table 302.1 that enhanced energy performance in accordance with Section 302.1 or CO₂e emissions in accordance with Section 602.2 are required, zEPI, energy demand, and CO₂e emissions reporting shall be provided in accordance with this section.

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unmodified.)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistent with the actions on GEW1-14 and GEW4-14, the committee disapproved this proposal. The green code needs to have an energy efficiency chapter. This proposal would force all buildings to be subsection to performance modelling which is very expensive; especially for smaller buildings. It is unclear if this is 15 plus 10 percent savings because of the incomplete reference to IECC Section 407. There is merit to a concept of IECC PLUS. The IgCC is an incubator for new ideas, removing the chapter loses that option.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 3-14

The following is errata that was posted to the ICC webpage.

302.1 Requirements determined by the jurisdiction.

2. Where the jurisdiction requires enhanced energy performance for buildings designed on a performance basis, the jurisdiction shall indicate a zEPI of 46 or less the required improvement compared to ASHRAE

189.1 in Table 302.1 for each occupancy required to have enhanced energy performance.

302.1.1 zEPI or less. Improvement compared to ASHRAE 189.1. Where a zEPI of 46 or less an improvement compared to ASHRAE 189.1 is indicated by the jurisdiction in Table 302.1, buildings shall comply on a performance-basis in accordance with Section 601.3.1.

Exception: Buildings less than 25,000 square feet (2323 m² in total building floor area) pursuing compliance on a prescriptive basis shall be deemed to have a zEPI of 51 comply with ASHRAE 189.1 and shall not be required to comply with the zEPI improvement compared to ASHRAE 189.1 of Jurisdictional Choice indicated by the jurisdiction in Table 302.1.

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unmodified.)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: ASHRAE189.1 was not made available to the committee to allow evaluation as an alternative compliance method for energy conservation requirements. There is already an option to follow 189.1 as an option for the code, there is no reason to allow selective use in this situation.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 4-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistent with its action on GEW1, the committee voted to disapprove this proposal. The IgCC code needs a full compliment of topics to be addressed to be consistent with other green programs and the ICC 700. Without a full Chapter 6 addressing energy conservation, adopting jurisdictions would be left without a model which they can evaluate and decide whether energy regulations should be included in their adoption of the IgCC.

This proposal differs from GEW1, GEW2 and GEW3 in that it would require each building under this code to go through performance modeling. Performance modeling is an expensive analysis process. Imposing such on smaller buildings was not acceptable to the committee. The IECC performance modelling requirement requires buildings to be 15% more efficient than the model, the proposal in GEW4 states a 10% higher efficiency requirement. If the requirement is only 10%, than the IgCC would be less stringent than the IECC when using the performance modeling approach. If the intent of the proposal was accumulative (15% + 10% = 25%), the proposal was not clear.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 45% (81) Oppose: 55% (99)

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 5-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the committee felt that eliminating the multiple references was a good idea, they found the new language in Section 601.3 to be unclear. The phrase 'corresponding requirement' did not provide adequate guidance to the code user.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 6-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal harmonizes the IgCC energy chapter with the IECC. It provides a clear statement of the specific provisions of the IECC that must be met in order for a building to be in compliance with one of the compliance methods of the IgCC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 7-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal is editorial in nature. The inclusion of Section 611 in both sections 601.3.1 and 601.3.2 is redundant because Section 601.4 establishes compliance with Section 611 to be mandatory for all buildings.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 8-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The three sections address topics which should be included in the performance based calculations. Including them in the listing in Section 601.3.1 clarifies that these are mandatory and can not be traded.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 9-14

The following is errata that was not posted to the ICC webpage.

Buildings and their associated building sites shall comply with Section 601.3.1 or Section 601.3.2 and with not less than two of the following sections: C406.2, C406.3, C406.4, C406.6 and C406.7 of the *International Energy Conservation Code*. Tenant spaces shall comply with Section C406.1.1 of the *International Energy Conservation Code*

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee understood the concept of the proposal, which is to require additional energy enhancement provisions from Section C406 of the IECC, but found the language unclear. For example, the IECC requires one of the six enhancements to be used. This provision requires two. Does that mean a total of 3 (1 plus 2) or a total of 2 (1 plus 1)? The structure of the sentence also made it unclear if two enhancements were required for either Section 601.3.1 or Section 601.3.2 compliance - or if it was require for both. The committee hopes the proponent will return with a public comment to clarify the intent.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. The published proposal contained two errata in the form of extra commas. One located after Section 601.3.2 in the first sentence and one located after Section 406.1.1 in the second sentence.

GEW 10-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent acknowledges that a complete deletion of Sections 604 and 611 as shown in this proposal is too sweeping a change and therefore will see to refine it in public comment. The committee preferred other actions which refined these sections.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 11-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent's claim that the provisions were addressed in the IECC were not substantiated by specific IECC references where the equivalent provisions could be found. Barring such evidence, the committee felt that previous approved proposals have improved these sections and they should be retained in the code.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 12-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that changing 'gross' floor area to 'net' floor area was the better value for this provision. The term 'net floor area' is defined in the IgCC. There was concern that even this change may not accurately reflect which building areas should be included in this analysis, but that net was certainly better than gross floor area.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 13-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

602.5.1 Multiple buildings on a site. For building sites with multiple buildings, the energy use associated with the building site shall be assigned on a proportional basis to each building based on total gross floor area of each building in relation to the total gross floor area of all buildings on the building site.

Where energy is derived from either renewable or waste energy, or both sources located on the building site, on or in individual buildings and delivered to multiple buildings, the energy so derived shall be assigned on a proportional basis to the buildings served based on building gross floor area.

Exception: Where it can be shown that energy to be used at the building site is associated with a specific building, that energy use shall be assigned to that specific building.

Committee Reason: The modification clarifies that the energy source could be both within a building as well as 'on' the building. With the modification, the committee agreed that the proposal brought clarity to the section.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 14-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the limitation that would be imposed by the proposed text limit design flexibility and choice. While there was some support of the concept of the proposal in order to limit 'gaming' of the system, the committee felt the proposal was too simplistic. How someone would do an area weighted average was unclear.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 15-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

602.1.1 zEPI. Performance-based designs shall demonstrate a zEPI of not more than 50 as determined in accordance with Equation 6-1.

$$zEPI = 5752_x (EUIp/EUI) \quad \text{(Equation 6-1)}$$

where:

EUIp = the proposed energy use index in source kBtu/sf-y for the proposed design of hte building and its site calculated in accordance with Seciton 602.1.2.

EUI - the base annual ernergy use index in source kBtu/sf-y for the proposed design of hte building and its site calculated in accordance with Seciton 602.1.2.

57 = a fixed value establishing the relationship between EUI and EUIp and the maximum zEPI.

52 = a fixed value representing the performance of a baseline building designed to comply with ASHRAE Standard 90.1-2013.

(Portions of proposal not shown are not modified.)

Committee Reason: The modification provides the correct update to the 2013 edition of the ASHRAE 90.1 standard. Each cycle the standard reference design needs, and will need, to be updated. zEPI is the current base. Whether zEPI is retained or another factor established, as long as the code employees comparison to a reference design as one of the methods of compliance, that reference design will need to be updated. This change provides the proper update.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 16-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The revision provided by GEW17-14 was preferred.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 17-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies that modeling using Appendix G of ASHRAE 90.1 must be performed for both the proposed and base project designs. This proposal provides the clearest revision as compared to proposals GEW16 and GEW18.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 18-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

602.1.2 Base annual Annual energy use index calculation. ~~The proposed energy use index (EUIp) of the building and building site and EUI shall be calculated in accordance with Equation 6-1 and Appendix G to ASHRAE 90.1, as modified by Sections 602.1.2.1 through 602.1.2.3. The annual energy use shall include all energy used for building functions and its anticipated occupancy.~~

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unmodified.)

Committee Reason: The modification eliminates any changes to Section 602.1.2 and returns the code text to that currently in the IgCC. The committee has approved revisions to Section 602.1.2 in GEW17-14, and prefers that revision to the revision proposed here. With the modification, the remaining changes to Section 602.1.2.2 provide consistent terminology with the revisions approved under GEW17. The two changes - GEW17 and GEW18 provide editorial clarification of these requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 19-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: While the proponent suggests this as an editorial correction, this proposal provides the proper language. The action intended by this section is a 'conversion' to energy units and not an act of multiplication.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 20-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The provision would seem to create a design professional specialty that doesn't exist in practice. The defined term 'registered design professional in responsible charge' is adequate for this purpose.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 21-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal cleans up an error in the equation.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 22-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would set the same CO₂e level for all buildings. As the code allows setting a lower zEPI level, they shouldn't be locked into the CO₂e level. If the intent was to eliminate zEPI, the line defining zEPI should have also been struck out.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 23-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that moving from 'source' energy to 'site' energy was a step backwards in the conservation of energy through construction requirements. The committee sees saving energy as a 'societal' good and this proposal doesn't move the discussion forward. Finally, without a reference to Appendix G or a substitution, the code would be without a model by which to judge comparative energy usage.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 24-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal is a broad attempt to clean up text and titles of the sections. The proposal maintains zEPI. It makes the section more easy to understand and apply. The intent in approving this change does not mean that the other substantive changes approved by the committee are overridden. While other proposals on the agenda also addressed improvements to this section, this proposal was seen as the best of the options.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 25-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee previous actions consistently maintained zEPI in the code and this proposal would go in a different direction. Replacing of the codes tables with a reference to ASHRAE 105 could set up a jurisdiction which fails to notice that the standard doesn't provide a listing of CO₂e rates. We owe adopting jurisdictions guidance for these rates. The reference to IECC C407 is incomplete because no metric for the analysis is provided. C407 is a methodology, not a requirement.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ANSI/ASHRAE 105-2013 - Standard Methods of Determining, Expressing, and Comparing Building Energy Performance and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GEW 26-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal takes the code into a different direction from the previous actions to maintain the use of zEPI. The concern expressed that ASHRAE 90.1 looking future analysis factors can be addressed during the updates for future editions of the IgCC. This is a radical change that would need refinement before it comes into the code. Similar to other proposals, the committee found changing from source energy to site energy unacceptable.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 27-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found that adding a second methodology along side of zEPI would be confusing to the code users. The committee noted that there were inconsistencies between the methodologies that would hamper understanding.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 28-14

The following is errata that was not posted on the ICC website.

602.1.2.1 Modifications to Appendix G of ASHRAE 90.1. Energy units. The performance rating in Section G1.2 of ASHRAE 90.1 shall be based on energy use converted to consistent units in accordance with Sections 602.1.2.2 and 602.1.2.3; instead of energy cost. Energy use shall be converted to consistent units by multiplying the nonrenewable energy fossil fuel use at the utility meter or measured point of delivery to Btu's and multiplying by the conversion factor in Table 602.1.2.2.

602.1.2.2 Site to source electric power conversion. In calculating the annual energy use index, electric energy used at the site shall be consistent units by converting the electric power use at the utility meter or measured point of delivery to Btus and multiplying by the conversion factor in Table 602.1.2.1 based on the geographical location of the building.

TABLE 602.1.2.2

U.S. AVERAGE BUILDING FUELS ENERGY CONVERSION FACTORS BY FUEL TYPE.

FUEL TYPE	ENERGY CONVERSION FACTOR
Natural Gas ^a	1.09
Fuel Oil _a	1.13
LPG _a	1.12
Purchased District Heating - Hot Water	1.35
Purchased District Heating - Steam	1.45
District Cooling	0.33 x value in Table 602.1.2.1
Other	1.1

a. Source: Gas Technology Institute Source Energy and Emissions Analysis Tool.

602.1.2.3 Nonrenewable energy. In calculating the annual energy use index for fuel other than electrical power, energy use shall be converted to consistent units by multiplying the nonrenewable energy fossil fuel use at the utility meter or measured point of delivery to Btu's and multiplying by the conversion factor in Table 602.1.2.2. The

conversion factor for energy sources not included in Table 602.1.2.2 shall be 1.1. Conversion factors for purchased district heating shall be 1.35 for hot water and 1.45 for steam. The conversion factor for district cooling shall be 0.33 times the value in Table 602.1.2.1 based on the EPA eGRID Sub-region in which the building is located.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this change at the request of the proponent. The actions proposed by GEW28-14 were taken care of through the approval of previous actions (GEW24-14).

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 29-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal following the testimony of the proponent that the changes included in GEW29-14 have been taken care of by previous actions (GEW24-14).

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 30-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal which deletes footnotes. The footnotes are commentary in nature and don't belong in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 31-14

The following is errata that was posted on the ICC website:

Table 602.1.2.1

Electricity Generation Energy Conversion Factors by EPA eGrid Sub-region*

eGRID 2007-2010 Subregion Acronym	eGrid 20072010 Sub-region Name	Energy Conversion Factor
SRSO	SERC South	3.083.20
SRTV	SERC Tennessee Valley	3.11 3.30
a. —Sources: EPA eGrid2007 version 1.1, 2005 data; EPA eGrid regional gross grid loss factors; EIA Table 8.4a (Sum tables 8.4b and 8.4c) and Table 8.2c (Breakout of Table 8.2b), 2005 data.		

Table 602.1.2.2

U.S Average Building Fuels Energy Conversion Factors by Fuel Type*

Table 602.2.1

Electricity Emission Rate by EPA eGrid Sub-region*

eGRID 2007 2010 Subregion Acronym	eGrid 20072010 Sub-region Name	2005 CO ₂ e Rate (lbs/MWh) (kg/kWh)
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged.)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: GEW31 relies on the same technology as currently applied in the code, that being the EPA eGRID Subregions. It updates the values from 2007 to 2010.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 32-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes reflected in GEW31-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 33-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes incorporated in GEW31-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 34-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes incorporated in GEW31-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 35-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal tries to address the quickly changing landscape of emission rates and the issuance and potential issuance of new power plant emission standard by EPA. The committee acknowledged the issue, but the proposal doesn't provide the vehicle for resolution. The most current rates have been approved via GEW31-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 36-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 37-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The approved change provides consistency in phrasing throughout the section, therefore clarifying the application of the section.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 38-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 39-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal removes redundant text and provides the correct references in Section 603.5.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 40-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal removes the requirement to monitor the information produced from the meters. Further it removes all submetering of tenants which will eliminate the ability for individual tenants to monitor their energy use.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 41-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee generally viewed the proposal as a positive improvement in the clarity of the section. There was also support for exempting smaller tenant spaces from the submetering requirement, but felt that 5000 square feet was too large an exemption threshold.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 42-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the reasoning provided by the proponent. The change provides an editorial improvement by creating a table for the descriptions of the energy use categories. The current format implies that the descriptors are requirements. There requirement is isolation of load types which should be 'defined'. Those 'definitions' are the descriptors that this proposal puts in a table.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 43-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

603.2 Energy distribution design requirements and load type isolation in buildings.

Exceptions:

1. Unchanged.
2. Within Group I-2, ~~Condition 2~~ occupancies, loads connected to critical, life safety and equipment branches shall be permitted to be monitored in the aggregate.

(The remainder of the proposal is unmodified.)

Committee Reason: The modification changes the exception so that it applies to nursing homes (I-2, Condition 1) as well as hospitals (I-2, Condition 2). Hospitals and nursing homes already break out the delivery of power in the 3 categories. Further breakdowns as would be required by the IgCC does not provide any informational benefit, nor

likely result in further energy savings. The cost of further isolation of energy use is not justifiable.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 44-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee concurred with the proponent's reason. While this is a use of fuel, the use is for the treatment and care of patients and not ancillary to the heating, cooling, lighting of the building or the service water provided in the building. There was a concern that the term 'clinical' is undefined.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 45-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee viewed the section as only requiring the capability of metering to be provided. The fact that this was an exception addressing use of propane. They also viewed the proponent as a fuel for the needs of building regulated by this chapter. They felt the exception was not appropriate, monitoring is still important.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 46-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

603.3.2 Liquid fuels.

Exception: Stationary reciprocating internal combustion engines (RICE) provided only for emergency and standby power are not required to be metered.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unmodified.)

Committee Reason: The committee modified the proposal so that it was clear that the equipment exempted would have the sole purpose of providing emergency and standby power. Inserting the word 'only' would prohibit the exemption from applying to generators used for peak load shaving or other provision of power other than for emergency and standby systems. The intent of the proposal is to exempt from metering the emergency/standby power needs. It is critical that such systems engage. Their use should be of limited duration. Monitoring is not appropriate. There was concern on the committee that the exception applies to all occupancies and could easily be oversized to allow other use of the system.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 47-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The exception provides a cost benefit to the building owner for use of smaller systems. If there is a utility program where energy flows back into the grid, or where a building owner is compensated for the energy used on the site, then in such instances a meter would be needed, but the code doesn't need to have a universal requirement for all systems regardless of the size.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 48-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The standard provides a methodology by which solar collectors can be evaluated for their rated output.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of SRCC 100-2013-11 - Minimum Standards for Solar Thermal Collectors - relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GEW 49-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved GEW136-14 which would have included the various alternative fuels into the renewable energy section. Until such time as they are in the code, there would be no need to provide for their metering and monitoring.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 50-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The change would limit the application of these two sections to electric energy. The committee felt that all energy sources should be retained in these sections.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 51-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

603.5 Minimum energy measurement and verification.

Exception: Stationary reciprocating internal combustion engines (RICE) provided only for emergency and standby power are not required to be connected to a data acquisition and management system.

Portions of proposal not shown remain unmodified.

Committee Reason: .

The proposal was modified to be consistent with GEW46. Both were modified to limit the application of these exceptions for stationary RICE to where they are used exclusively for emergency/standby power. The committee approved this proposal to be consistent with the actions taken on GEW46-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 52-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The added requirements do not appear to add value toward the goals of this code. It was felt that it would be misleading to report some of the CO₂ emissions on a daily basis and not all of such.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 53-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: In other actions the committee has approved significant improvements to the Auto -DR provisions. Such technology should remain in the code.

Assembly Action:

 None

GEW 54-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

604.4 Lighting. Where buildings in Group B office occupancies, Group E occupancies and Group M occupancies have a floor area greater than 10,000 square feet, the Auto-DR system shall be capable of reducing the total connected lighting power by not less than 15 percent. The lighting power shall be determined in accordance with Section C405.5 of the *International Energy Conservation Code*.

Exception: The following buildings and

(The remainder of the proposal remains unmodified.)

Committee Reason: The proposal was modified to limit the application of the lighting requirement to buildings in Groups B, E and M occupancies. This was seen as the appropriate application of these provisions at this time. The committee found the overall proposal a good update and revision to this complex section.

Assembly Action:

 None

GEW 55-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The ability for a local utility to support AUTO-DR systems installed in buildings is something that needs to be evaluated locally. This is the intent of making this a jurisdiction option. The committee was not in agreement that the local option should be removed.

Assembly Action:

 None

GEW 56-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

604.4 Lighting.

In Group B office spaces, the Auto-DR system shall be capable of reducing total connected power of lighting as determined in accordance with Section C405.5 of the *International Energy Conservation Code* by not less than 15 10 percent.

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unmodified.)

Committee Reason: The proposal was modified to return Section 604.4 to as currently in the code. The 15% reduction is consistent with other standards. The action does not override any action taken by the approval of GEW54-14. The proposal clarifies that the peak demand is for the building's peak demand, not that in the community or utility system. The committee concurs with the balance of the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action:

 None

GEW 57-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The original intent of the code in this section is to address electrical demand. The proposal would imply that there is also a requirement imposed on the provision of gas. The resulting code would be confusing.

Assembly Action:

 None

GEW 58-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Deleting the exception would result in requiring an Auto DR system to be installed even in locations where the utility isn't set up to take advantage of such systems. It would also impact small buildings, imposing costs for a system the local utility may never operate. The committee felt this was somewhat of a chicken and egg issue and therefore felt this needed to remain a local option where, locally, the availability of the utility having the infrastructure to utilize Auto DR's systems installed in buildings.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 59-14

The following is errata that was posted on the ICC website:

604.3 Heating, ventilating and air-conditioning (HVAC) systems.

Exception: The Auto-DR strategy is not required to include the following buildings and systems:

1. Hospitals and Group I-2 Condition 2.
2. Critical emergency response facilities.
3. Life safety ventilation for hazardous materials storage.
4. Building smoke exhaust systems
5. Manufacturing process systems.

(The balance of this proposal is not modified.)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason:

The proposal provides proper language to correlate with revisions to the occupancy category designations in the IBC.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 60-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was not convinced that removal of the exception, that being to not have the emergency lights circuits, was appropriate.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 61-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and that the office buildings for such services need not be exempted from being on AUTO-DR systems.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 62-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee found that adding criteria for storage systems to the AUTO DR provisions both timely and appropriate. Such systems are already being installed. This gives the designer of the system more

flexibility. It gives the local official criteria by which to evaluate and approve the system.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 63-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee saw this as a companion proposal with GEW62-14, which they also approved. This proposal provides appropriate definitions for these systems. It is also appropriate to list GETS as one of the strategies appropriate to AUTO-DR systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 64-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was rejected because removal of the section eliminates a key enhanced envelop requirement without replacing it with any other changes to the code. Perhaps if there were other changes which increased envelope efficiency in the IgCC, this broad brush provision could be eliminated. The 10% broad brush approach is acknowledged as problematic in determining and showing compliance, but it just because it's difficult, doesn't justify its removal without some sort of balancing the loss.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 48.63% (89) Oppose: 51.37% (94)

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 65-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal is similar to GEW64, but retains the 10% increase for only the colder climates. Climate zones 1 through 5 would be eliminated from the increased stringency of the envelope; these zones cover the majority of the United States. The committee felt that increased efficiency is achievable in all zones, and these 5 should not be excluded.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 41.34% (74) Oppose: 58.66% (105)

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 66-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal reduces the blanket envelop increased stringency from the current 10% to only 5%. The reduction was considered to be reasonable increase over the increased stringency of the improved IECC. It provides better flexibility for the designer, building owner and contractor to reach the above code goal.

Assembly Motion: **Disapprove**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 48.55% (84) Oppose: 51.45% (89)

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 67-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was seen as editorial in that 10% of zero is still zero. The added text clarifies how the 10% would apply (or in this case not apply). If the intent of the code isn't served by this resolution, the committee urged alternatives to be presented via public comments.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 68-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: While the testimony indicated that the shading and SHGC requirements found in the IECC and the IgCC may not be completely compatible, the committee did not agree that deletion of the requirement was the appropriate action.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 69-14

The following is errata that was not posted on the ICC website:

605.1.1.1 Permanent shading devices for fenestration. Vertical fenestration within 45-135 degrees (785 3316rad) of the nearest west, south, and east cardinal ordinate in buildings located in the northern hemisphere or the nearest north cardinal ordinate in buildings located in the southern hemisphere, shall be shaded by permanent horizontal exterior projections with a projection factor greater than or equal to 0.25. Where different windows or glass doors have different projection factor values, each shall be evaluated separately, or an area-weighted projection factor value shall be calculated and used for all windows and glass doors. Horizontal projections shall extend laterally beyond the edge of the glazing not less than one-half of the height of the glazing, except at building corners.

(Portions of code change not shown remain unmodified.)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement that the revisions simplifies the provision and extends its reach to buildings located in the southern hemisphere.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 70-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Because of the minimum SHGC required in southern climate zones, this proposal would result in eliminating the shading requirement in the climate zones where they would be most effective. The committee felt such an outcome was not appropriate.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 71-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee did not feel a blanket exception was appropriate. There were concerns about a lack of any size limitations; lack of any limitation on use occurring in the vestibule. Perhaps a refinement related to climate zone may be appropriate.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 72-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee considered three nearly identical proposals for introducing automatically controlled shading devices into the code as an optional compliance method. They approved GEW72 because they found it best written to convey the requirement and limitations. There is concern regarding solar reflectance of the shading devices. The committee encouraged a public comment to address how the solar reflectance would be measured or verified.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 73-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred GEW72-14 which it approved.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 74-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred GEW72-14 which it approved.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 75-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval in order to work on issues with the proposal identified outside of the hearing process. The committee also noted that the proposal would be in direct conflict with Section 808 of the code where minimum daylighting is addressed.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 76-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal at the request of the proponent.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of NFRC 100-2010 - Procedure for Determining Fenestration Product U-Factors - relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GEW 77-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: *This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC General Committee.*

As the proposed information addresses existing buildings, it belongs in Chapter 10 of the International Green Construction Code, which also addresses existing buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 78-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved the change as providing a compliance option when the test alone doesn't show compliance. There was concern expressed regarding the vagueness of some of the terms in the text such as the term 'practicable'. Also of concern is there was no upper limit as to how badly a test result might exceed the 0.25 cfm/ft² limit.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 79-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: If someone wished to install an air curtain as an energy savings measure, even when not required by the IECC, the installation should comply with the industry standard. Confusing wording may need to be corrected in the public comment process. The text can be read that there is a physical curtain rather than an air curtain needing to have a minimum velocity.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 80-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The IECC now provides for the option of providing air curtains instead of vestibules. The IECC contains this requirement and it does not need to be repeated in the IgCC.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 81-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Provisions for insulation on roof replacements are now found in the IECC. This IgCC provision is now redundant.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 82-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that the cool roof provisions are found in 2 different chapters of the IgCC with the potential for the requirements to diverge. There is also concern raised regarding the coordination with IECC, especially the exceptions provided in the IECC. It was speculated that the climate zones may not be the best map for determining where sunlight is incident and where the reflective materials would be most effective.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 83-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee heard testimony that raised concerns regarding potential impacts to the roof structure, light reflected onto other buildings and lack of clear connection to the requirements in IECC. The committee felt that there was insufficient information provided regarding the energy savings this change would provide.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 84-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee feels that a Green code needs to address the energy efficiency of the building envelope as well as the mechanical systems. Significant improvements to these provisions have been provided by other approved changes.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 85-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is confusion regarding the terms, and the committee did not find that the change resolved the confusion. There was no testimony addressing the change to the values. There need to resolve that one term is renewable source, others are not and they are both in the same code provision. The committee encouraged the preparation of a public comment to update the table values.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 86-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that this change in text in combination with changes to the IECC would result in there being no efficiency requirements for motors between 1 and 5 horsepower.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 87-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent identified that there were errors in the proposal which needed to be addressed during public comment.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of AHRI 560-00 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GEW 88-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change provides the correct reference to all of the requirements appropriate versus just one subsection currently referenced.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 89-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change coordinates the language with the IECC. The committee express concern that the value of 480,000 Btu/h was not coordinated with the value in the IECC.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 90-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal coordinates the text of the IgCC with new terminology found in the IBC for hospitals.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 91-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal removes unnecessary footnotes.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 92-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved the removal of the text which is redundant with the IECC. The committee suggested that via public comment the two remaining references be further simplified into a single reference.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 93-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The IECC now contains provisions for the efficient kitchen exhaust performance. Similar provisions are not needed in the IgCC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 94-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was unsure of what final approved language contained in the IECC 2015 will be, therefore they felt this deletion to be premature.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 95-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee expressed concerns that the reasons offered by the proponent were not compelling. While the fuels discussed are ones which would be used in HVAC equipment, the committee felt that the proposal did not address energy efficiency and was misplaced in Chapter 6. Finally there was concern that this matter is likely to be overridden by state or local legislation.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 96-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Deleting these sections would eliminate important energy requirements not found anywhere else in the I-codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 97-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

607.5 Drain water heat recovery.

6. Group I-2 occupancy, Condition 12 hospitals, psychiatric hospitals and Condition 21 nursing homes.

(Portions of the proposal not shown are not modified.)

Committee Reason: The Committee made the modification to correct the Condition numbers for the types of I-2 facilities. The Committee approved the modified proposal because waste heat recovery from drain water is an important source of abundant free energy in these occupancies. The last two sentences in the proposal are really not necessary as these requirements are already required by the 2015 IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of CSA B55.2-2012 and CSA 55.1-2012 - Test method for measuring efficiency and pressure loss of drain water heat recovery units.- relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GEW 98-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the Committee's approved as modified action on GEW101-14, the Committee determined that approval of this proposal was unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 99-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the Committee's approved as modified action on GEW101-14, the Committee determined that approval of this proposal was unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 100-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The addition of the proposed standard was already addressed by the Committee's approval (as modified) of GEW97-14.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of CSA B55.2-2012 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GEW 101-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

607.5 Waste water heat recovery systems.

5. ~~Laundry washing machines that are connected to hot and cold water supplies, patient showers for long-term care patients and staff showers for hospitals, mental hospitals and nursing homes in Group I-2 occupancies.~~

(Portions of the proposal not shown are not modified.)

Committee Reason: The Committee made the modification because the healthcare industry has different requirements for operation and it is not always possible for facilitate the installation of drain water heat exchangers. The Committee approved the modified proposal because they agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 102-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement. Deleting this section in the IgCC will avoid conflicts with the other I-codes.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 103-14

The following is errata that was posted to the ICC website.

607.6.1 Piping insulated with tube or sheet insulation. Service hot water heating system piping installed within a slab or below grade conveying heated water shall be insulated in accordance with Section 607.6 tube or sheet insulation having a thermal conductivity of not greater than 0.29 and Btu per inch/h×ft²×F[0.42 W/(m×K)]. The wall thickness of the insulation shall be placed within a physically protective, waterproof channel or sleeve having internal dimensions large enough so that the piping and insulation can be removed and replaced, and maintain its dimensional integrity during and after construction not less than the diameter of the pipe that is being insulated except that a wall thickness greater than 2 inches (50.8 mm) shall not be required.

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS)

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The requirements in this proposal would be in conflict with the requirements of IECC. With respect to Section 607.6.1, R-values are not allowed to be printed on tubular insulation materials but an equivalent K-value must be provided for those products.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 104-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The Committee's approved as submitted action on GEW107-14 (affecting the same section) makes approval of this proposal unnecessary.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 105-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Section 607.6 was the wrong pointer for finding the insulation requirements for piping. This proposal corrects the reference.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 106-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The Committee's action of approved as submitted on GEW105-14 and GEW107-14 makes approval of this proposal unnecessary.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 107-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 108-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 109-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The IECC already covers the details concerning the controls for circulating hot water systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 110-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The Committee's action of approved as submitted on GEW108-14 for deletion of this section makes approval of the proposal unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 111-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

606.7 Circulating hot water systems.

Exception: Group I-2 ~~Condition 2~~occupancies and ambulatory care facilities shall not be required to comply with this section.

(Portions of the proposal not shown are not modified.)

Committee Reason: The Committee made the modification because all health care facilities operate under different requirements, not just Condition 2 facilities. The Committee approved the modified proposal because health care facilities operate under different requirements so that bacteria in the hot water system can be controlled.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 112-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Other actions, the committee made did significant changes to Section 608. Often the action was to remove provisions now adequately covered in the IECC. However, the committee did not agree that wholesale deletion of the rest of the electrical requirements was appropriate. Specific reasons for deleting each remaining element were not provided.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 113-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal simplifies the text and adds a reference to new provisions in the IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 114-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change provides consistency between the text of the IECC revised provisions and the IgCC. The IgCC provisions are retained because they are more stringent than the IECC. There was a suggestion that the text be revised to say 'master control device or system', in that the installation may be more than a single device. The committee suggested the revision be considered during public comment when it can be better ascertained with the added text was also in the IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 115-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: As storage areas are required to have sensor controls in the IECC, this provision in the IgCC is redundant..

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 116-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The IECC has been amended for 2015 to include very similar requirements as found in the 2012 IgCC, but the text is significantly different. This proposal aligns the text between the two codes and at the same time provides a higher level of stringency in the IgCC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 117-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal removes redundant text from the IgCC. According to IBC, even accessory office space is classified as Group B, therefore there is no reason to restate it.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 118-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Because of broader text applying to historic buildings which will be found in the 2015 IECC, this specific exception is no longer needed, The balance of the changes clarify the equation and allow for a broader reference to the IECC lighting provisions.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 119-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the use of gas lights was not always restricted to 'process' loads. A growing use of such lighting is anticipated.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 120-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee considered the change to be an undesirable change to the scope of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 121-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 122-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Electrical transformers are fully regulated via the IECC. This proposal removes redundant regulation from the IgCC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 123-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides a better connection to the base requirements in the IECC and clarifies that the lighting on the building sites is also regulated in the IgCC - whereas the IECC only regulates lighting powered through the building.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 124-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies that the inspection process should be verifying the installations, and then assigns to commissioning process that the system is functioning properly.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 125-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this was a building code issue and not one that should be addressed in the IgCC. While the proponent stated there would be no construction cost increase as a result of this proposal, members of the committee found that such installations would have definite construction cost implications.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 126-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: In previous actions, the committee has approved deletions of various provisions of Section 609, but not all. There may be appropriate further deletions that could be considered under public comment. A wholesale deletion is not appropriate.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 127-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the action found in approving GEW128-12.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 128-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

609.1 General.

This section provides requirements for appliances and equipment installed in the building or on the building site. Permanent appliances and equipment shall comply with the provisions of Section 609.2, and portable appliances and equipment shall comply with the provisions of Section 609.3.

Exception: Section 609 does not apply to appliances and equipment in compliance with Sections 605 through 608 and those specified in Table 609.1.

Table 609.1

Appliances and Equipment Covered by Federal Efficiency Standards *

RESIDENTIAL PRODUCTS	COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS
Battery chargers ^a	Automatic ice makers
Boilers	Commercial air conditioners and heat pumps
Ceiling fans and ceiling fanlight kits	Commercial clothes washers
Central air conditioners and heat pumps	Commercial packaged boilers
Clothes dryers	Commercial unit heaters
Clothes washers	Commercial refrigerators, refrigerator-freezers, and freezers
Compact fluorescent lamps	Commercial warm air furnaces
Dehumidifiers	Commercial water heaters
Direct heating equipment	Computer-room air conditioners
Dishwashers	Distribution transformers
External power supplies	Electric motors ^a
General service fluorescent and incandescent lamps	HID lamps ^a
Fluorescent lamp ballasts ^a	Illuminated exit signs
Furnaces	Metal halide lamp ballasts and fixtures
Furnace fans	<u>Packaged terminal air conditioners and heat pumps.</u>
Microwave ovens ^a	Refrigerated beverage vending machines ^a
Pool heaters	Small electric motors
Ranges and ovens	Traffic signal and pedestrian modules
Refrigerators, refrigerator-freezers, and freezers	Walk-in coolers and walk-in freezers
Room air conditioners	
Torchieres	
<u>Water heaters</u>	

a. These products currently have no federal standards. NOTE: U.S. Department of Energy rulemakings are underway or scheduled.

(The balance of the proposal remains unmodified.)

Committee Reason: The text of Section 609.1 was modified to remove text referring to a provision which is not found in the 2012 edition of the code. This appears to be a remnant from an earlier edition. The table was also

amended to further adjust the listed products and to completely delete the footnote and all references to it. The footnote is commentary in nature and doesn't belong in the code. With the revisions, the committee concluded that the table will be the most accurate reflection of current federal regulations at this time.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 129-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change provides useful information to the code user by providing notice that there are certain other efficiency requirements that need to be considered for use in the U.S. (namely DOE requirements) that include certain levels of efficiency that may be in addition to those cited in the IEC 60034-30 Standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 130-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This efficiency requirement for escalators is now found in the IECC. This provision is now redundant.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 131-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The provision requiring the slowing of escalators and moving walkways is now in the IECC. This text is now redundant.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 132-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is incomplete. There needs to be some collaborative work with the proponents of GEW133 and return to public comment hearing with better proposal. Exception 1 to Section 610.3 is unclear and may result in double counting. The proposal wouldn't apply to buildings which don't use electricity, and therefore would not be required to address renewables.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 133-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee acknowledged that the provisions of Section 610 need improvement. GEW133 had more committee members feel that it provided the better foundation for the next code. The committee hopes that this proponent will work with the proponents of the related proposals to provide through the public comment process a comprehensive revision to the section. Of concern are provisions which would place the local code official in the middle of contractual relationships between a building owner and the seller of renewable energy credits. There needs to be more information provided regarding the change in the power units. The terms 'demand' and 'power use' seem to be used interchangeably when they are distinct terms.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 37.01% (57) Oppose: 62.99% (97)

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 134-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee did not see that this proposal provided any improvement to the section. It also places the code official in a position over monitoring a post Certificate of Occupancy contract which most local agencies will not want to be involved.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 135-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal revises text which implies in some sections that only electric energy is being addressed versus a variety of fuels discussed in other sections. The proposal also improves the clarity of the metering and monitoring requirements.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 136-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The text of the proposal would require that the 'fuel' for these alternative energy sources be derived on the site. For some of these not enough 'fuel' would be generated on a single site to make the recovery of the energy practical.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 137-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee felt that as the Renewable Energy Credit (REC) are already in the code, they need to be 'defined' carefully. The proposal provides a clear set of standards by which to judge the acceptability of RECs.

Assembly Motion:

Disapprove

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 54.19% (84) Oppose: 45.81% (71)

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

GEW 138-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The term 'elevated' is not defined and therefore application of the provisions would be unclear. The committee was concerned that there was an OSHA overlap being introduced. Since under Section 102.4 the other ICC codes are adopted by reference, the specific pointers shown here are not needed.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 139-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that the provisions conflicted or at the very least overlapped with requirements of the IMC. This is proposed to the wrong code.

Assembly Action:

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of SRCC 300-2013-09 Minimum Standards for Solar Water Heating Systems relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit:

GEW 140-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistent with the reasons for disapproving GEW138-14, the committee disapproved this proposal as well. The term 'elevated' is not defined and therefore application of the provisions would be unclear. The committee was concerned that there was an OSHA overlap being introduced. Since under Section 102.4 the other ICC codes are adopted by reference, the specific pointers shown here are not needed.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 141-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that deletion of the whole section was not appropriate; however selective deletions should be considered.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 142-14

The following is errata that was posted on the ICC website:

611.3.3.1 Occupant sensors.—It shall be verified that the functional testing in accordance with Section C405.2 of the *International Energy Conservation Code* has been performed.

611.3.3.2 Automatic daylight controls.—Automatic *daylight controls* shall be commissioned in accordance with all of the following:

1. It shall be verified that the placement and orientation of each sensor is consistent with the manufacturer's instructions. If not, the sensor shall be relocated or replaced.
2. Control systems shall be initially calibrated to meet settings and design intent established in the construction documents.
3. Prior to calibration of systems controlling dimmable luminaires, all lamps shall be seasoned in accordance with the recommendations of the lamp manufacturer.
4. Where located inside buildings, calibration of open-loop *daylight controls*, which receive illumination from natural light only, shall not occur until fenestration shading devices such as blinds or shades have been installed and commissioned.
5. Calibration of closed-loop *daylight controls*, that receive illumination from both natural and artificial light, shall not occur until furniture systems and interior finishes have been installed, and any fenestration shading devices such as blinds or shades have been installed and commissioned.
6. Calibration procedures shall be in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

611.3.3.3 Time switch and programmable schedule controls.—Lighting controls installed in accordance with Section 608 shall be programmed. Scheduling shall incorporate weekday, weekend and holiday operating times, including leap year and daylight savings time corrections. It shall be verified that system overrides work and are located in compliance with Section C405.2 of the .

611.3.3.4 Dimming systems with preset scenes.—For programmable dimming systems, it shall be verified that automatic shutoff and manual overrides are working and that programming is complete. Prior to programming, the lamps shall be seasoned in accordance with NEMA LSD 23.

611.3.4 Post-commissioning documentation.—The following documentation shall be provided to the building owner in accordance with Section 903.—

1. Settings determined during commissioning activities outlined in Section 611.3.3.
2. A narrative describing the intent and functionality of all controls including any capability for users to override a schedule or master command.
3. Specification sheets for all lighting equipment and controls.
4. Operation manuals for each lighting control device. Required maintenance and maintenance schedules shall be clearly identified. Documentation and instructions necessary for building maintenance personnel to maintain and recalibrate lighting systems and controls.
5. An annual inspection schedule for lighting controls.
6. Troubleshooting information for fluorescent dimming systems and the remediation of switching issues such as

false-ons and false-offs.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

(This errata has already been incorporated into cdpACCESS)

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason:

This code change proposal was heard by the IgCC General Committee.

The committee recommended that this proposal be approved as submitted based upon the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 143-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides an editorial clarification of the section.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 144-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change was approved because it eliminates a redundant requirement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 145-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was somewhat receptive to the concept but felt the proposal would work better as an exception to the general rule. Among the concerns was the possibility that the 'actively' monitored system wasn't monitoring all those things for which commissioning is required. There also needs to be more clarity as to what 'actively monitored' means.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 146-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the option provided by GEW147-14 which they approved. This proposal has linkages between compliance and the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy. C of O issuance is frequently critical to the change of financing from construction loan to permanent loan as well as closing of a designer's contract.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 147-14

The following errata is not posted to the ICC website:

612.1.3 Reference energy use intensity (EUIr). The reference energy use intensity shall be determined utilizing Table 612.1. The EUIr value from Table ~~603.1~~ 612.1 shall be adjusted based on the monthly weighted average percentage of occupied floor area during the 12-month compliance period as documented in accordance with Section

612.3.2. For buildings with multiple use or occupancy designations in Table 612.1, the EUIr shall be adjusted based on the weighted area average of the use or occupancy.

603-2-2 612.2.2 Onsite nonrenewable energy. For the purpose of determining compliance with the provisions of Section 612.2 the CO₂e emissions associated with onsite non-renewable energy use shall be calculated in accordance with Section 602.2.2.

(The errata has been incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

612.2 Annual direct and indirect CO₂e emissions.

CO₂er = emissions associated with the EUIr as determined in accordance with Section 612.1.3 utilizing the same mix of specific energy types used by the actual building in calculation of CO₂ea.

~~**612.3.3 Certificate of occupancy.** Upon compliance with Section 612.3.2, the building shall be issued a Certificate of Occupancy.~~

~~**612.3.4 Non-compliance.** Should the building owner fail to comply with Section 612.3.2, the owner shall be deemed non-compliant and be issued a violation.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unmodified.)

Committee Reason: The proposal is an important step forward in how the energy efficiency of buildings are evaluated and measured. Our existing paths are flawed. The prescriptive path can be too restrictive; the performance path is not actually predicting the expected energy use of the completed building. This method, as another option for compliance, establishes a target for energy use and evaluates the completed building against the target. It makes the building owner as part of the 'team' and make a commitment to operate the building within the parameters of the approved. Designers who participate in this option approach can manage their risk through their contract.

The amendment clarifies how the CO₂er is calculated.

The proposal needs further refinement. At this time, some committee members felt that the best solution may be to place this in the code as a new appendix. There was some discomfort with using a model set in 2000 data, can something more recent be employed. The analysis period of 12 months can be cherry picked out the 36 month period. There is concern a design professional will be held responsible for non-compliance where the designer has not control over what the building owner does in the building for those 36 months. There also seems no control of how tenant spaces are filled out; and if those are or are not within the control of the code official. What is the result of non-compliance? There is discomfort with holding a Certificate of Occupancy hostage for 3 years. Finally there remains concern of trying to impose a 36 observation period on the local code officials.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 148-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Given that this code encourages the use of nonpotable water sources, providing for safe water consumption needs to be a part of the scope of the IgCC.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 149-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed changes are safety related items that are better suited to be proposed to the IPC.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 150-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The reduction of shower head flow will be too much of a sacrifice for users. The current designs of 1.75 gpm showerheads do not offer a reasonable level of comfort for most users.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 151-14

The following is errata that was not posted to the ICC website:

TABLE 702.1

MAXIMUM FIXTURE AND FITTING FLOW RATES AND QUANTITIES FOR REDUCED WATER CONSUMPTION

FIXTURE OR FIXTURE FITTING TYPE	MAXIMUM FLOW RATE
Lavatory faucet—public (nonmetered)	0.5 gpm at 60 psi
Kitchen faucet—private	2.2 gpm 1.8 gpm at 60 psi
Kitchen and bar sink faucets in other than dwelling units and guestrooms	2.2 gpm at 60psi

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The addition of the pressure at which the maximum flow rate can occur is important information for designers of products. Although this proposal was approved as submitted, the Committee requests that the proprietary term "WaterSense" be removed from this table as the code should not refer to proprietary labeling systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 152-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language in the proposal is not correct. The faucet for filling containers is called a water dispenser. The proposal needs reworked to be in alignment with terminology used by other codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 153-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is not an IgCC issue. This proposal would be better suited to for the IPC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 154-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Bottle filling stations should not be a mandatory substitution for drinking fountains.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 155-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This section should not be in the IgCC. Such items, if needed, should be in the IPC.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 156-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Section 702.16 already has limitations for water flow for food waste disposers for commercial food establishments. The proposed language would be inappropriate for residential occupancies that are within the scope of coverage of the IgCC.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 157-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: A decrease in water factor is an improvement in water efficiency for which the majority of modern clothes washing machines can meet.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 158-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Relocating this section into another section that was deleted by the Committee's action on GEW188-14 is inappropriate. A public comment should be submitted to place this section into a Chapter 7 location that is outside the sections that were deleted.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 159-14

The following is errata that was posted to the ICC website:

702.8.1 Maximum allowable pipe length method. ~~For fixtures other than public lavatory faucets, the maximum allowable pipe piping length from the nearest circulation loop pipe or an electrically heat-traced pipe source of hot or tempered water to the termination of the fixture supply pipe shall be in accordance with the maximum pipe length columns in Table 702.8.2. Where the length contains more than one size of pipe, the largest size shall be used for determining the maximum allowable length of the pipe in Table 702.8.2.~~

702.8.2 Maximum allowable pipe volume method. ~~The water volume in the piping shall be calculated in accordance with Section 702.8.2.1. For fixtures other than public lavatory faucets, the maximum volume of heated water in the piping from the nearest hot or tempered water in the piping to public lavatory faucets, metering or nonmetering, shall be 2 ounces (0.06 L). For fixtures other than public lavatory faucets, the maximum volume shall be 64 ounces (1.89 L) for hot or tempered water from a water heater or boiler; and 24 ounces (0.7 L) for hot or tempered water from a circulation loop pipe or an electrically heat-traced pipe shall be 24 ounces (0.7 L).~~

702.8.2.1 Water volume determination. ~~The volume shall be the sum of the internal volumes of pipe, fittings, valves, meters and manifolds between the circulation loop pipe or an electrically heat-traced pipe source of hot water and the termination of the fixture supply pipe. The volume shall be determined from the liquid ounces per foot column of Table 702.8.2. The volume contained within fixture shutoff valves, flexible water supply connectors to a fixture fitting, or within a fixture fitting shall not be included in the water volume determination. Where hot or tempered water is supplied by a circulation loop pipe or an electrically heat-traced pipe, the volume shall include the portion of the fitting on the branch source pipe that supplies water to the fixture.~~

(Errata already incorporated in cdpACCESS)

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The changes in the proposal are necessary to correlate with the language in the 2015 IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 160-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The addition of more tables for piping lengths and volume would be in conflict with the 2015 IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 161-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The IAPMO standard is not a consensus document. Currently, there are no known water-powered sump pumps that can meet the criteria of the proposed standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of IAPMO PS 119-2012ae1 - Water-Powered Sump Pumps - relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit:
<http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2012-2014Cycle/ProposedStandards-042314.pdf>

GEW 162-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is too much water wasted by autoclaves and sterilizers to justify completely removing the current code requirements. Perhaps an exception for health care facilities could be brought forth in a public comment.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 163-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The prohibition against using any water for tempering sanitary drainage water is not feasible. The only option remaining would be to use a chiller system to cool the discharge. This would be more costly in both equipment and energy use.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 164-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 165-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Metering of fire sprinkler system water is a local issue. Section 903.3 of the IFC appropriately covers the requirements for designing a fire sprinkler system.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 166-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed changes result in a better placement of the requirements in Chapter 7 so that the requirements apply to all water sources.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 167-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 168-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 169-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 170-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 171-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 172-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 173-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Although the proposed requirements may be a best practices approach, other items such as phosphates and suspended solids are not addressed. The Committee recommends that a public comment be submitted to address those items and possibly other water quality issues that are related to cooling towers.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 174-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Cycles of concentration depend greatly on the source water used. Holding time index should be considered. LSI is not a good predictor of corrosion issues. The Committee suggests that a public comment be made to make the proposed requirements more technical.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 175-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement. They suggest that a public comment be made to not require a direct digital control system.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 176-14

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal could have far-reaching effects such as prohibiting certain types of systems. It is unclear what qualifies as the standard reference design.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 177-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This will reduce water consumption of water softeners and is compatible with the newer designs of water softener equipment.

Assembly Action:

None

GEW 178-14

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

705.1.1 Metering.

Exception: In Group I-2, Condition 2 occupancies and ambulatory care facilities, water used for patient treatment or to support patient care shall not be required to be individually metered.

(Portions of the proposal not shown are not modified.)

Committee Reason: The proposal was modified to include all hospitals and nursing homes because those health care settings would have just as difficult of problem complying with individual metering. The modified proposal was

approved because individual metering in a health care setting is too difficult to accomplish and is unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 179-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language aligns the IgCC with latest edition of ASHRAE 189.1 for consistency in the industry.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 180-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed requirements are really important to achieve lower water consumption by occupants in tenant spaces.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 181-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 182-14

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal favors a particular product.

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 183-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 184-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 185-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 186-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 187-14

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

GEW 188-14

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The requirements in the deleted sections are covered by the 2015 IPC and do not need to be in IgCC.

Assembly Action: **None**
