2006/2007 CODE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
INTERNATIONAL ENERGY CONSERVATION CODE

James H. Jorgensen, PE, CBO — Chair
Building Codes Administrator
City of Lenexa
Lenexa, KS

R. Christopher Mathis – Vice Chair
President
M C Squared
Asheville, NC

Chuck Anderson, PE
Code and Regulatory Affairs Manager
Simonton Windows
Pennsboro, WV

Robert S. Austin
Code Specialist
NJ Dept. of Community Affairs
Division of Codes and Standards
Trenton, NJ

James D. Bowman
Regional Manager
American Forest & Paper Association
Kirkland, WA

Gary L. Curtis
President
The West Wall Group
Salem, OR

Maureen Guttman, AIA
Facilities Architect
Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission
Harrisburg, PA

Eric Makela
President
Britt/Makela Group Inc.
Greenleaf, ID

Bill Mattinson
President
SOLDATA Energy Consulting
Santa Rosa, CA

Shirley Muns, CBO
Codes Specialist
Energy Systems Laboratory, Texas A & M
University System
College Station, TX

Robert T. Pierce, Jr.
Inspection Services Supervisor
City of Plano
Plano, TX

Gary Pringey
Plans Consultant
Rep: City of Cherry Hills Village
Frisco, CO

Robert Ross
G&R Construction Services LLC
Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Granger, TX

Stephen J. Turchen
Engineer II
Fairfax County Department of Public Works and
Environmental Services
Fairfax, VA

David Weitz
Director, Applied Building Sciences Division
Conservation Services Group
Westborough, MA

Staff Secretary
David Bowman
Manager, Codes
International Code Council
Chicago District Office
Country Club Hills, IL

INTERNATIONAL ENERGY CONSERVATION CODE HEARING RESULTS

EC1-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code change proposal was denied because the committee reasoned that, given that the ICC EC has just been recently revamped to simply address residential and commercial buildings, it would be undesirable to include this new distinction for buildings by sizes, and blurring this simplification by bringing residential buildings into Chapter 5. In addition, this change does not include other ASHRAE trade-offs that appear in ASHRAE 90.1, so there was concern over the inconsistency of the resulting requirements with ASHRAE.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC2-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language provides a necessary clarification of the relationship between different provisions of the code that might conflict. This helps enforcement of the provisions of this code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC3-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the committee understands the general logic of this code change proposal, that certain equipment such as lighting and HVAC systems should not be exempt from the Energy Code requirements, this code change proposal would give discretion to the code official with no guidelines as to what should or should not be brought within the code. Therefore, this broad language could have the effect of creating non-uniform application of the code, and lead to undesirable decisions made regarding the preservation of historic buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC4-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language reflects the requirements of the Energy Code, and is redundant language to clearly underscore how to deal with additions. The committee agreed with proponents that this redundancy in the code was desirable to make enforcement easier.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC5-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

101.4.3 Additions, alterations, renovations or repairs. Additions, alterations, renovations or repairs to an existing buildings system or portion thereof shall conform to the provisions of this code as they relate to new construction without requiring the unaltered portion(s) of the existing building or building system to comply with this code. Additions, alterations, renovations, or repairs shall not create an unsafe or hazardous condition or overload existing building systems.

Exceptions: The following need not comply provided the energy use of the building is not increased.

1. Storm windows installed over existing fenestration.
2. Glass only replacements in an existing sash and frame ~~provided the U-factor and solar heat gain coefficient (SHGC) will be equal to or lower than before the glass replacement~~.
3. Existing ceiling, wall or floor cavities exposed during construction provided that these cavities are filled with insulation.
4. Construction where the existing <u>roof</u>, wall or floor cavity is not exposed, provided that any new cavities that are created are insulated.
5. Reroofing for roofs where neither the sheathing nor the insulation are exposed. Roofs without insulation in the cavity and where the sheathing or insulation is exposed during reroofing shall be insulated either above or below the sheathing.
6. Replacement of existing doors that separate conditioned space from the exterior shall not require the installation of a vestibule or revolving door, provided, however, that an existing vestibule that separates a conditioned space from the exterior shall not be removed,
7. Alterations that replace less than 50% of the luminaries in a space provided that such alterations do not increase the installed interior lighting power.
8. Alterations that replace only the bulb and ballast within the existing luminaries in a space provided that the alteration does not increase the installed interior lighting power.

Committee Reason: The additional proposed exceptions were considered to be reasonable exemptions that would have a small impact on energy use. The modification was to leave Exceptions no. 2 and 4 unchanged. In the case of Exception 2, such a determination of existing values would be very difficult at best. In the case of Exception 4, the committee felt that there was no compelling reason to eliminate roofs from this exception.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC6-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposed language clarifies that the required compliance should be to the space that is changing occupancy, rather than the entire building.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC7-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposed language would prevent the possible "game playing" where one builds a building with a non-conditioned room or space, and then decides shortly afterwards to provide heating or cooling to that space. While the Energy Code requires this, the redundant language provides clear direction.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal could have an adverse impact on existing equipment and building. This could require removal of adequate operating equipment just to comply with the Energy Code. Also, may require the removal of existing finish material.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC8-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This enables the possibility of confused application of the code requirements, where the new building would be designed in accordance with Chapter 5, and later modifications, etc. would apply the provisions of Chapter 4.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC9-06/07

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published in the "Errata to the 2006/2007 Proposed Changes to the International Codes and Analysis of Proposed Reference Standards" provided at the code development hearings:

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed AAMA standard does not require third-party certification of manufacturers. While the standard does require laboratories to be accredited by NFRC, the committee questioned what they would be accredited for–the AAMA standard or the NFRC standard. In addition, there is still some concern as to whether the values determined in the AAMA standard always match the values determined from the NFRC standard.

The proponent's point about the lack of enforcement of the NFRC requirements was noted and the committee acknowledged was a concern. However, the lack of enforcement of the NFRC method is not completely the fault of the standard, and therefore the additon of the proposed new standard does not necessarily assure better enforcement.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC10-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language contradicts the code. If the subject is not regulated by the code, then language addressing subjects not regulated is contradictory. In addition, the language gives jurisdictions too much authority to impose restrictive requirements beyond the scope and intent of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC11-06/07

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published in the "Errata to the 2006/2007 Proposed Changes to the International Codes and Analysis of Proposed Reference Standards" provided at the code development hearings:

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Even though this reference is Federal Law and therefore applicable, it is desirable to reference this specific method for determination of R-Values to assure compliance and assure a level playing field.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Federal regulations should not be in a building code. The proposed referenced standard does not comply with the ICC criteria.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC12-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee's concern related to the proposed Section 102.2.2, which addresses used material and equipment. The concern was whether used equipment, with a shorter service life, would truly be able to be considered equivalent to new materials. In addition, it is difficult to rate existing equipment without re-commissioning.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC13-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee voted disapproval for the following reasons:

1. The alternative materials section does not mention energy efficiency.
2. The proposed section on modifications, based upon "practical difficulties" could be a license to allow anything, because "practical difficulties" is not narrowly defined.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC14-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Energy efficiency is not mentioned in the proposed text addressing alternative materials and methods.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal introduces the terms "security of the occupants" and "equivalency of quality", which are not quantified in the code and will be difficult to enforce. The list of criteria may be incomplete and this would create problems This change only requires the items to be considered and this will weaken the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC15-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This language, which is unique to the Energy Code, provides jurisdictions a validation of the concept that they can choose to recognize a program for their jurisdiction that results in more stringent energy efficiency requirements. Even though this is allowed on a individual basis through alternative approval, this language allows the above code program to be adopted for all projects in the jurisdiction.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistent with the IECC Committee's action on Part I of the proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC16-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

104.5 Retention of construction documents. One set of approved construction documents shall be retained by the code official for a period of not less than 180 days from date of completion of the permitted work, or as required by state or local laws.

~~One set of approved construction documents shall be returned to the applicant, and said set shall be kept on the site of the building or work at all times during which the work authorized thereby is in progress.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal would provide clear information regarding requirements for construction documents. This will aid the plan reviewer as well as the inspector in enforcement of this code. The modification eliminates proposed requirements that are not germane to the Energy Code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC17-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

104.2 Information on construction documents. Construction documents shall be drawn to scale upon suitable material. Electronic media documents are permitted to be submitted when approved by the code official. Construction documents shall be of sufficient clarity to indicate the location, nature and extent of the work proposed, and show in sufficient detail pertinent data and features of the building, systems and equipment as herein governed. Details shall include, but are not limited to, as applicable, insulation materials and their *R*-values; fenestration *U*-factors and SHGCs; area-weighted *U*-factor and SHGC calculations; mechanical system design criteria; mechanical and service water heating system and equipment types, sizes and efficiencies; economizer description; equipment and systems controls; fan motor hp and controls; duct sealing, duct and pipe insulation and location; lighting fixture schedule with wattages and control narrative; and air sealing details.

Committee Reason: The proposal gives clearer direction and better details for designers requirements for construction documents. The modification added the phrase "as applicable" because everything on the laundry list provided might not be required in every case.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC18-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed text would give clearer direction to inspection agencies and to the code official regarding appropriate notification, and continuing work after successive inspections.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC19-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

107.1 General. The codes and standards referenced in this code shall be those listed in Chapter 6, and such codes and standards shall be considered as part of the requirements of this code to the prescribed extent of each such reference.

~~**Exception:** Where enforcement of a code provision would violate the conditions of the listing of the equipment or appliance, the conditions of the listing and manufacturer's instructions shall apply.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposed text will provide clarity to the requirement regarding referenced standards. This text is proposed for uniform use in all I-codes. The modification removes an exception that the committee felt was not appropriate for the context of the proposed Section 107.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC20-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This language provides a clarification regarding fees and issuance of a permit. The language is proposed to be uniformly applied in all of the I-codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC21-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval in order to make modifications to the text.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC22-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason : This adds a much needed provision to allow the code official to issue a stop work order when necessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC23-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This adds an appropriate provision to allow for due process that is consistent with provisions in other I-codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC24-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned primarily with the language proposed for "gross roof area" which used the terminology regarding fenestration "in the plane of the roof", which would be inaccurate, and cause confusion.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC25-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The text proposed for deletion is not appropriate for the definition of storefront because it implies that all storefronts have a high degree of resistance to debris impact.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC26-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The primary concern with the proposed definitions was the definition of permanent shading device. The committee felt that the definition was too broad in the possible scope, and would allow for items not intended to be treated as permanent shading devices.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC27-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed definition would conflict with the definition of residential building in the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC28-06/07

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published in the "Errata to the 2006/2007 Proposed Changes to the International Codes and Analysis of Proposed Reference Standards" provided at the code development hearings:

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

VAPOR RETARDER CLASS. A measure of a material or assembly's ability to limit the amount of moisture that passes through that material or assembly. Vapor retarder class shall be defined using the desiccant method <u>with Procedure A</u> of ASTM E-96 as follows:

Class I: 0.1 perm or less
Class II: 0.1 < perm <= 1.0 perm
Class III: 1.0 < perm <= 10 perm
~~Class IV: Greater than 10 perm~~

402.5 Vapor retarders. Class I or II vapor retarders are required on the interior side of <u>frame</u> walls in zones 5, 6, 7, 8 and Marine 4.

Exceptions:

1. Basement walls.
2. Below grade portion of any wall.
3. Construction where moisture or its freezing will not damage the materials.

402.5.2 Material vapor retarder class. The vapor retarder class shall be based on the manufacturer's certified testing or a tested assembly. The following shall be deemed to meet the class specified:

Class I: Sheet polyethylene, non-perforated aluminum foil
Class II: Kraft faced fiberglass batts
Class III: Latex paint
~~Class IV: House wrap, building paper.~~

402.5.3 Minimum clear air spaces and vented openings for vented cladding. For the purposes of this section vented cladding shall include the following minimum clear air spaces. Other openings with the equivalent ~~net free~~ vent area shall be permitted.

1. Stucco with a 3/8 inch clear airspace with 3/8 inch continuous slot vent openings at the top and bottom of each wall.
2. Brick with a 2 inch clear airspace behind the brick with vents at both the top and bottom of the brick. The vents shall be 3/8 inch x 2.5 inch openings every third brick at both the bottom and top course of each wall.
3. Stone or Masonry Veneer with a 2 inch clear airspace behind the stone with vents at the top and bottom. The vents shall have at least 1 square inch of vent area for every 24 inches of wall.
4. Panel Siding with 3/8 inch clear airspace with 3/8 inch continuous slot vent openings at both the top and bottom of each wall.
5. Wood, Wood Based, or Fiber Cement Siding with either a 1/4 inch clear airspace; or alternatively a 1/4 inch gap between the horizontal siding laps
6. Vinyl lap siding applied directly to a weather resistive barrier.
7. Manufactured Stone Veneer with a 3/8 inch clear airspace with 3/8 inch continuous slot vent openings at both the top and bottom of each wall.

~~6.~~8. Other approved clear air spaces and vented openings.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposed change introduces advances in technology related to vapor retarders, and provides for more flexibility in exterior wall design. The proposal moves the code forward from the "one size fits all" approach that is presently in the code, while at the same time not eliminating any construction that was previously done using the present code. The modification eliminates reference to Class IV, as it is not used in the I-codes anywhere. In addition, the modification adds exceptions regarding clear air space that enable construction of common applications without change to the standard methods for installing vinyl siding and manufactured stone veneer.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed new text, Section N1102.5.3, is confusing, unclear and belongs in the wall covering chapter. The committee likes this concept and this is needed in the code. However, this is a much larger problem and this proposal does not fully solve it. The proponent should work with industry and more research and development is needed in order to find the proper solution.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III — IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal primarily because as proposed the provisions requiring net free ventilating area of not less than 1/150 would never apply. Committee members support deleting the exception in its entirety and revising the main section to use 1/300 instead of 1/150. It should also be noted that the committee felt the proponents proposed modification to the new definition of VAPOR RETARDER CLASS to delete Class IV was appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART IV — IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the approach of FS171-06/07. Instead of simply deleting the reference, the committee preferred to have the provisions brought into the code. That approach will help to provide the requirements within the code so that they are known. See committee reason statement for FS171-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART V — IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was some concern with maintaining the integrity of the vapor retarder under concrete slabs on grade. Also it was unclear whether the 6-mil polyethylene vapor retarder is in fact a class 1 vapor retarder as this proposal would require. Most of this information belongs in the commentary rather than the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART VI — IMC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The definition proposed to be revised was deleted by the action taken on M108-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC29-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent did not provide any data that would justify making these climate zones more restrictive. The fact that a state or region chooses more restrictive requirements is not a compelling reason to apply this on a national scale.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was no technical data submitted to support this change. This is a local issue for Washington State only.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC30-06/07 **Withdrawn By Proponent**

EC31-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal is a good idea for giving occupants of the building some idea of the equipment being used in a building in order to allow them to make appropriate decisions regarding energy use.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The use of efficiencies may be misleading in some cases. This change eliminates the listing of the efficiencies that could be misleading to the consumer.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC32-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language serves to provide an important reminder that there is information that should not be covered up by the certificate required by this code.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Consistent with the IECC Committee's action on Part I of this proposal. The certificate should not obstruct any additional required information posted on the electrical distribution panel.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC33-06/07 **Withdrawn By Proponent**

EC34-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The footnotes to Tables 402.1.1 and 402.1.3 with the text changes to Section 402.2.3 present a much clearer and more logical approach to the presentation of requirements for mass walls.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No technical data was submitted to justify the change for some of the U-factor.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC35-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the committee acknowledges that lower SHGC values should be looked at for these zones, the proponent did not provide any cost/benefit analysis to justify these particular values.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC **Withdrawn By Proponent**

EC36-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval to allow time to remove ambiguous and unclear language.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on proponent's request, proponent will revise this and bring it back at another time.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC37-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The trade-offs discussed are available through a performance design in Section 404 of the Code. Over the last code change cycle the ICC Energy Code committee attempted to simplify the code with succinct prescriptive methods, and the opportunity to use the performance method given by Section 404. Adding this trade-off would open the door for more tradeoffs that will make the code more confusing. In addition, there is no definition of the term "airtight", thus leading to undesirable and avoidable variations in code interpretation and enforcement.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no technical justification and there is a lack of clarity. There are no definitions of "AIRTIGHT" and "AN APPROVED PERSON". The proponent and opponents are urged to work together and bring this issue back at another time.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC38-06/07 **Withdrawn By Proponent**

EC39-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The study cited justifies the 0.37 for these two zones. Products are still available to meet this number, which is a reasonable, achievable SHGC rating.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC40-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the committee acknowledges that lower SHGC values should be looked at for these zones, the proponent did not provide any cost/benefit analysis to justify these particular values.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC41-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The trade-off proposed can be achieved by utilizing the performance options given in Section 404. The committee felt that it would be undesirable to add trade-offs such as this to the prescriptive portion of Chapter 4, given that the intent in the revamp of the IECC in 2006 was to simplify the residential requirements. By adding trade-offs the code begins to become increasingly confusing and difficult to apply.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on proponent's request to rework and bring this back at another time. Also, consistent with the IECC Committee's action on Part I of this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC42-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 402.1.3
EQUIVALENT U-FACTORS[a]

CLIMATE ZONE	FENESTRATION U-FACTOR	SKYLIGHT U-FACTOR	CEILING U-FACTOR	FRAME WALL U-FACTOR	MASS WALL U-FACTOR	FLOOR U-FACTOR	BASEMENT WALL U-FACTOR	CRAWL SPACE WALL U-FACTOR
1	1.20	0.75	0.035	0.082	0.197	0.064	0.360	0.477
2	0.75	0.75	0.035	0.082	0.165	0.064	0.360	0.477
3	0.65	0.65	0.035	0.082	0.141	0.047	~~0.360~~ 0.220	0.136

(Portions of table not shown remain unchanged)

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: Providing insulation on basement walls in Zone 3 will provide for significant energy savings, as indicated in the proponent's reason. The modification simply adds a correlating change to the U-factor table.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal does not provide adequate tradeoff for the payback period. The data used is 10 years old and outdated.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC43-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed change would not be cost effective at this time, given that for many types of insulation, the wall stud cavity would need to be increased by using 2 x 8 studs v. 2 x 6 studs. While energy savings and increases in R-values are desirable, the committee felt that this should not be done until there are more options available in insulation products.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no technical data to demonstrate that this is cost effective. R-21 insulation has been shown to be cost effective in cold climates and there is no justification to increase to R-22. The reason stated it is important to increase the R value to 22, but Footnote "h" will allow it to be reduced in some areas.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC44-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Regarding the lowering of SHGC values in Zones 1 and 2, the proponent provides no cost/benefit analysis for lowering these values. Regarding the new concept of introducing minimum SHGC values in northern climates, there are still too many unknown variables to justify this. For one, the orientation of the building will affect how much savings is realized. For another, the change in temperatures over the past few years in northern climates makes it unclear whether we can move to the concept of using windows to save on heating values.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC **Withdrawn By Proponent**

EC45-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: See the reason statement in EC44-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC **Withdrawn By Proponent**

EC46-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed values are necessary corrections to the equivalent U-Factors for ceilings.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC47-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The values presently in the code were the result of a compromise in past code development. The committee felt that it would be appropriate to maintain these values rather than lessen the stringency of the code. The committee felt that it is important to limit the amount of roof area that can be exempted from the insulation requirement.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This change would decrease the energy efficiency. A reduction limit of 500 square feet is adequate.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC48-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that attic access openings need to be addressed, but felt that the approach in EC49-06/07 where insulation equivalent to the insulation used immediately adjacent to the opening would be a more reasonable requirement, v. insulation of the building envelope.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No cost analysis has been provided and this will increase cost. There is no definition of "DURABLY SEALED". This change would increase the cost of pull-down attic stairs.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC49-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposed text addresses a hole in the building envelope that the code presently does not address.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would not be practical to implement. This would be overly restrictive for small access hatches. The second sentence contains confusing language. The third sentence is commentary.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC50-06/07

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published in the "Errata to the 2006/2007 Proposed Changes to the International Codes and Analysis of Proposed Reference Standards" provided at the code development hearings:

Analysis: Review of proposed new standards, ASTM C1371 and C1549, indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standards did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standards, ASTM E408, E903 and E1918, indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standards did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Using trade-offs for high albedo roofs is not a good approach. Rather, high albedo roofs should be a credit in the performance approach. In addition, there is concern that, since the values change based upon the roof surface materials, future maintenance of the roof with replacement roofing covering could change the thermal emittance value and render the building out of compliance.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC51-06/07

PART I — IECC **Withdrawn By Proponent**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal is not in proper code terminology. The proposal contains commentary language.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC52-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Singling out a specific material for an exemption is not desirable. It is possible to achieve both goals for glass block by using the performance path in Section 404.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This change will increase energy loss. There is no technical data to support the 25 square feet allowance. This would have the effect of a product specific exemption.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC53-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The creator of the Canadian standard testified that this equation proposed is only half of the technical requirements, because the equation fails to address different factors for fixed and operable windows. Therefore, the equation is a misuse of the standard. In addition, the committee felt that the concept of higher SHGC coefficients in heating climates is suspect because the benefit in doing this depends upon the orientation of the wall in which the window is located.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed equation is from the Canadian Standard "CSA 440.2" but does not bring in all of the Canadian standard requirements that are needed. The committee was not provided with the CSA 440.2 for review.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC54-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The concept of heat gain windows in heating climates brings concerns as discussed in other code change proposals regarding the dependency on orientation or other factors that could limit solar access to truly gain the advantages from these windows. In addition, many of these climates now have longer cooling seasons due to change in human behavior as well as climate changes.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The "*analysis*", referred to in the proponent's published reason, shows there is equivalency in terms of energy performances. The "*analysis*" assumed equal orientation for all four sides and this is an appropriate assumption. This will give the builder an option without having to use the IECC which would require demonstration of equivalents that are different.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC55-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposed text addresses a hole in the building envelope that the code presently does not address.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Air infiltration around the attic access opening is a problem and this change will provide the sealing requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC56-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The use of recessed luminaries is increasing. The present code requirements are too liberal regarding allowances. This eliminates loopholes for the use of recessed luminaries.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal is not clear and will cause confusion and may cause misinterpretation. It eliminates the option of an airtight sealed box.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC57-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Setting minimum requirements as proposed would limit the use of the performance path given in Section 404.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would place artificial restraints on the homeowners and builders. The proposed text is not in mandatory terms.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC58-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Limits on window factors are important because the impact of the SHGC rating and U-factor for fenestration is dependent upon the season and the time of day. Therefore, the limits are needed to assure that other factors created by windows, such as moisture condensation and creation of hot spots do not cause a need to adjust the thermostat a great degree.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: It has been shown that the market has taken care of this as single-pane glazing is not being installed in cold climates, therefore this code section is no longer needed. Also, this will eliminate the undefined term “area weighted average maximum”.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC59-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: See the committee reason stated in Code Change Proposal EC58-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Based on previous action on EC58-06/07, Part II.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC60-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Since there is no prescriptive SHGC coefficient required in Marine zone 3, there should be no limit on the SHGC. This corrects that error in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC61-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: For the same reasons that the committee voted for disapproval of EC58-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC62-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

403.2.1 Insulation. ~~**(Prescriptive)**~~ Supply ducts in attics shall be insulated to a minimum of R-8. All other ducts shall be insulated to a minimum of R-6.

> **Exception:** Ducts or portions thereof located completely inside the building thermal envelope.

Committee Reason: The insulation requirements for ducts are required in all ducts, not just ducts in floor trusses. The modification removes the parenthetical “(Prescriptive)” because it would be incorrect in this Section 403, which is marked “(Mandatory)”.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: There is no energy savings by requiring R8 on the return ducts. The return air has changed temperature from the supply air such that the R6 is adequate for the supply ducts.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC63-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was not comfortable with the provision of this proposed change, which would single out underground ducts with more detail requirements than is provided for other ducts. The committee stated that a comprehensive look at all ducts would be in order for future code development.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC64-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed text provides a specific way for manufacturers to comply as an option.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no standard or method specified for the testing. This is based on the Florida Code and this may not be appropriate for the rest of the nation. Also, this will allow sealing the air handler with tape and this could effect the warranty and may give the appearance to the homeowner of an inferior product.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC65-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the approach taken in EC64-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on proponent's request to disapprove. Also, this is based on the Florida Code and may not be appropriate nationwide.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC66-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is a needed "pointer" to Chapter 5 to tell users what to do when designing large systems to deal with multiple dwelling units.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC67-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This type of restriction on equipment is not justified by technical data. Opponents made a compelling argument that pilot gas is not necessarily wasted energy. The proponent requested committee disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC68-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal would provide for regulations that provide a cost effective way to save energy in the use of lighting in common areas.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC69-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The use of cost, or site energy is appropriate in determining the appropriate performance based design because in this context, source energy and site energy are interrelated. The prescriptive provisions of the code relate to provisions that are dependent upon the type of energy used, and the equipment needed therefore. For instance, if someone were to use electrical power for a hydronic heating system with no duct work and in a building with double the insulating values on the external envelope, it would not be fair to assess the 3.16 factor to account for the losses in the electrical grid. Cost is the baseline requirement to use for comparison of the performance based design and appropriately (not perfectly) accounts for variables in the design of the total energy package.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC70-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed exception will make it easier for the builder to document compliance with this code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC71-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed code change would remove redundant language, and more appropriately reference the section of the code that should be referenced.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC72-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposed text would provide more information to the plan reviewer regarding the basis for the proposed design that will assure that compliance can be verified.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC73-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed text for EC72-06/07 was preferred, given the intent of the two proposals was the same.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC74-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that this proposed change would discourage the use of external shading, which the committee believes can be an important part of energy conservation.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC75-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed change will clarify use of the equation.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC76-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed change in temperatures would raise cooling demand more than heating demand.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC77-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent failed to provide any compelling technical data to support this change.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC78-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistency with action taken on EC62-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC79-06/07

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published in the "Errata to the 2006/2007 Proposed Changes to the International Codes and Analysis of Proposed Reference Standards" provided at the code development hearings:

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed standard does not comply with ICC Standards Criteria.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC80-06/07 **Withdrawn By Proponent**

EC81-06/07

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published in the "Errata to the 2006/2007 Proposed Changes to the International Codes and Analysis of Proposed Reference Standards" provided at the code development hearings:

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The standard proposed for use has been discontinued by the promulgator.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC82-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent that the total UA alternative should be contained within the pages of the IECC. This will give designers ready access to that alternative. The committee acknowledged that the values in this proposed change are more stringent than ASHRAE 90.1 in some cases.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC83-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the committee acknowledges that the proponent has a good intent to exempt greenhouses, the proposed language is not focused and therefore could open the door for abuses of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC84-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposed change is the same as the proposed method given in EC82-06/07 except that it also adds needed definitions that aid understanding of the proposed method.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC85-06/07 **Withdrawn By Proponent**

EC86-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee prefers the approach taken in the proposal given in EC82-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC87-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed changes to these climate zones is based upon the regulations imposed by a single state. While any state or jurisdiction can modify the energy code to use different values, there has been no technical data or analysis provided to justify these proposed values for this national code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC88-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposed change would provide an undesirable reduction in the energy efficiency requirements of the code, with no technical justification.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC89-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed deletion of the row for R19 + R 10 is a problem because the information is still needed, while the proposed new row for R 19 + R 13 is not needed because this is not specified anywhere in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC90-06/07

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published in the "Errata to the 2006/2007 Proposed Changes to the International Codes and Analysis of Proposed Reference Standards" provided at the code development hearings:

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed new text would reduce stringency of U-Factors in some climate zones. In addition, the committee was concerned with ability to apply this method and enforce the code, given the possibility that changes in locations of partitions on the interior could affect the values determined.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC91-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the committee agrees that the more appropriate approach would be for requirements to be "material neutral", this table was the result of a needed compromise in the last code change cycle; therefore, the committee felt that it would be undesirable to make any changes at this time.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC92-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee voted in favor of the stringency in EC95-06/07; this would reduce that level of stringency.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC93-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed change would reduce the value of using projections as a trade-off for SHGC factors, and therefore give the designer less flexibility in the selection of fenestration products.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC94-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: For the same reasons as given in EC93-06/07 for disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC95-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 502.3
BUILDING ENVELOPE REQUIREMENTS: FENESTRATION

CLIMATE ZONE	1	2	3	4 Except Marine	5 and Marine 4	6	7	8
Skylights (3% maximum)								
SHGC	~~0.40~~ 0.35	~~0.40~~ 0.35	~~0.40~~ 0.35	0.40	0.40	0.40	NR	NR

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee agrees that this proposal eliminates an undesirable differential that is based upon different materials. The modification would utilize the more stringent factor of 0.35 for skylights, as presently required for plastic skylights, as the committee believes that the more restrictive factors should be used in consolidating these requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC96-06/07

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published in the "Errata to the 2006/2007 Proposed Changes to the International Codes and Analysis of Proposed Reference Standards" provided at the code development hearings:

Analysis: Review of proposed new standards, ASTM E2178, E2357 and E1677, indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard, ASTM E779, indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was concern expressed as to the validity of the NIST report that was cited, because it had not yet been peer reviewed. In addition, the proposed text would be applicable to all types of walls, but is written for frame walls.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC97-06/07

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published in the "Errata to the 2006/2007 Proposed Changes to the International Codes and Analysis of Proposed Reference Standards" provided at the code development hearings:

Analysis: Review of proposed new standards, ASTM E2178, E2357 and E1677, indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard, ASTM E779, indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The test standard is intended for single zones, so it is not clear how this test would be conducted for all buildings. In addition, the test would require special equipment to check compliance. In addition, there was a valid concern that this could not be applied to remedial work where compliance is only required for a percentage of the building.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC98-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal provides a needed restriction on hot gas bypass and evaporator pressure control systems that will have the effect of saving energy.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC99-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the committee acknowledges that the present provisions are difficult to apply, the proposed text is confusing as well. The proposed language in Exception no. 6 adds more confusion, rather than make the code clearer. In addition, the use of vestibules in the definition could cause a conflict with the *International Building Code*.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC100-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal fails to provide any metrics to assess deterioration.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC101-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The information proposed to be deleted is useful information for the users of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC102-06/07

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published in the "Errata to the 2006/2007 Proposed Changes to the International Codes and Analysis of Proposed Reference Standards" provided at the code development hearings:

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 503.2.3(1)
UNITARY AIR CONDITIONERS AND CONDENSING UNITS, ELECTRICALLY OPERATED, MINIMUM EFFICIENCY REQUIREMENTS

Equipment Type	Size Category	Sub-Category or Rating Condition	Minimum Efficiency[b]	TestProcedure[a]
Air Conditioners, Air Cooled	< 65,000 Btu/h[d]	Split System	13.0 SEER	ARI 210/240
		Single Package	13.0 SEER	
	≥³65,000 Btu/h and < 135,000 Btu/h	Split System and Single Package	10.3 EER[c] (before Jan 1, 2010) ~~11.0~~ 11.2 EER[c] (as of Jan 1, 2010)	
	≥³135,000 Btu/h and < 240,000 Btu/h	Split System and Single Package	9.7 EER[c] (before Jan 1, 2010) 11.0 EER[c] (as of Jan 1, 2010)	ARI 340/360
	≥³ 240,000 Btu/h and <760,000 Btu/h	Split System and Single Package	9.5 EER[c] 9.7 IPLV[c] (before Jan 1, 2010) 10.0 EER[c] 9.7 IPLV[g] (as of Jan 1, 2010)	
	≥760,000 Btu/h	Split System and Single Package	9.2 EER[c] 9.4 IPLV[c] (before Jan 1, 2010) 9.7 EER[c] 9.4 IPLV[c] (as of Jan 1, 2010)	

TABLE 503.2.3(2)
UNITARY AIR CONDITIONERS AND CONDENSING UNITS, ELECTRICALLY OPERATED, MINIMUM EFFICIENCY REQUIREMENTS

Equipment Type	Size Category	Sub-Category or Rating Condition	Minimum Efficiency[b]	TestProcedure[a]
Air Cooled (Heating Mode)	< 65,000 Btu/h[d] (Cooling Capacity)	Split System	7.7 HSPF	ARI 210/240
		Single Package	7.7 HSPF	
	≥³65,000 Btu/h and < 135,000 Btu/h (Cooling Capacity)	47°°F db/43°°F wb Outdoor Air	3.2 COP (before Jan 1, 2010) 3.3 COP (as of Jan 1, 2010)	
	≥³135,000 Btu/h (Cooling Capacity)	47°°F db/43°°F wb Outdoor Air	3.1 COP (before Jan 1, 2010) 3.2 COP (as of Jan 1, 2010)	ARI 340/36

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposed changes are needed to bring the table up to date with the requirements of the 2005 Federal Energy Policy Act. The modification corrects some of the values, based upon the input from the proponent.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC103-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent offered some changes to the tables to correct some of the values. This modification was ruled out of order because of the complexity. While the committee does not necessarily disagree with the proposed concept, the proposal could not be approved using the wrong values.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC104-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal would bring provisions in the code consistent with ASHRAE 90.1 that represent significant energy savings.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC105-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: There is no technical justification for treating laboratory fume hood systems with higher exhaust rates differently than those with lower exhaust rates. The conditions in exception 3 should apply to the fans in exception 2.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC106-06/07

PART I — IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed text would exempt hazardous exhaust systems, commercial kitchen exhaust systems and clothes dryer exhaust systems from requirements for an energy recovery ventilation system, but with the accompanying change to the IMC, would not outright prohibit it in these locations. This is a more appropriate code logic, given advances in technology that can be used for energy recovery systems in these locations.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II — IMC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No substantiation was provided to allow hazardous exhaust systems or Type I hood exhaust to be included in an energy recovery system. Such systems can be approved by the code official as an alternate design with the appropriate scrubber systems installed. Removing the restrictions in this section could allow such systems to be installed without proper cleanup and controls.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC107-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

503.2.7 Duct and plenum insulation and sealing. All supply and return air ducts and plenums shall be insulated with a minimum of R-5 insulation when located in unconditioned spaces and with a minimum of R-8 insulation when located outside the building. When located within a building envelope assembly, the duct or plenum shall be separated from the building exterior or unconditioned or exempt spaces by a minimum of R-8 insulation.

Exceptions:

1. When located within equipment.
2. When the design temperature difference between the interior and exterior of the duct or plenum does not exceed 15˚F (8˚C).

All ducts, air handlers, and filter boxes~~, and building cavities used as ducts~~ shall be sealed. Joints and seams shall comply with Section 603.9 of the *International Mechanical Code*.

Committee Reason: The requirements for sealing ducts is appropriately dealt with in the IMC. Removal of provisions here will avoid conflicts. The modification removes text regarding sealing of building cavities, as this is not presently covered in this code section.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC108-06/07

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published in the "Errata to the 2006/2007 Proposed Changes to the International Codes and Analysis of Proposed Reference Standards" provided at the code development hearings:

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard, ARI 840, indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard, ARI 440, indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

503.2.8 Piping insulation. All piping serving as part of a heating or cooling system shall be thermally insulated in accordance with Table 503.2.8.

Exceptions:

1. Factory-installed piping within HVAC equipment tested and rated in accordance with a test procedure referenced by this code.
2. Factory-installed piping within room fan-coils and unit ventilators tested and rated according to ARI standards 440, except the sampling and variation provisions of Section 6.5, and 840, respectively.
3. Piping that conveys fluids that have a design operating temperature range between 55˚F (13˚C) and 105˚F 41˚C).
4. Piping that conveys fluids that have not been heated or cooled through the use of fossil fuels or electric power.
5. Runout piping not exceeding 4 feet (1219 mm) in length and 1 inch (25 mm)in diameter between the control valve and HVAC coil.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The new test standard proposed are acceptable alternatives for piping insulation within these units. The modification makes a provision of ARI 440 not applicable, because the language of the Section 6.5 of that standard is ambiguous and permissive.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC109-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed change would make this section of the code consistent with Section 503.4.2.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC110-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The subject of equipment commissionings reaches beyond just energy conservation issues. These provisions are not appropriate for this code; rather, the subject should be covered in the *International Mechanical Code*.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC111-06/07

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published in the "Errata to the 2006/2007 Proposed Changes to the International Codes and Analysis of Proposed Reference Standards" provided at the code development hearings:

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: In addition to the concerns stated in EC110-06/07 regarding the appropriateness of this subject for this code, the referenced standard is not promulgated by a consensus process, as required by ICC policy.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC112-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is a needed exception for computer rooms and other rooms requiring controls for humidity.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC113-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposed revision provides a needed closure of a loophole that allows a designer to install multiple systems smaller than the threshold in the given climate zones.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC114-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Improvements in technology make this proposal practical for the climate zones 4A, 5A, and 6A.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC115-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based upon actions taken on EC117-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC116-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based upon actions taken on EC117-06/07.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC117-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This reorganization of the sections makes the code requirements clearer. The technical changes are necessary energy conservation requirements for heat rejection equipment.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC118-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed deletion is based upon an analysis related to a single region. The committee was disinclined to approve this proposal without a consensus from nationwide interests.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC119-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is a reasonable requirement that will conserve energy.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC120-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed text of Item 6 provides ill-defined and vague terminology that could lead to abuse of the code requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC121-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed text of Item 5 provides ill-defined and vague terminology that could lead to abuse of the code requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC122-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed text will provide for a reasonable control of energy in daylight that will conserve energy.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC123-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed change in the section title clarifies the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC124-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent that these areas should be exempt from the requirements of Section 505.5.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC125-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee considers the proposed revised text to be improved language regarding exterior lighting controls, using terminology consistent with ASHRAE 90.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC126-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal reorganizes these exceptions in a logical manner that makes the requirements of the code clearer.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC127-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The provision would make non-compliance with the code more probable, because it is too easy to change out the equipment.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC128-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed text changes to Section 505.6 are grammatically incorrect.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC129-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned regarding whether “mini circuit breakers” was correct terminology.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC130-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: It is necessary to the integrity of the code to keep referenced standards current.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC131-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The energy code is a minimum standard. While the proposed measures are probably good information for greater energy savings, it is not necessary to put these provisions in the energy code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC132-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This provision simplifies the requirements of the code by putting a hard number on the R-value for insulation of unfired hot water storage tanks.

Assembly Action: **None**
