

February 5, 2024

RE: Viewpoint Submittal in OPPOSITION to 2024 IECC Appeal 23-06

Dear Appeals Board,

This letter is specifically submitted in opposition to a portion of the “Formal Appeal of the addition of sections, R404.5, R404.6 & R404.7 into the 2024 IECC Residential Provisions and corresponding sections in the 2024 IRC chapter 11”, submitted by the Region VI Code Development and Review Committee.

The portion I am rebutting is relevant to Appeal Basis “Procedural Specific Issues”, and specifically, #2 (Calling of votes).

In a section of their letter titled “Inadequate Consensus Process”, they reference a January 19, 2023, Residential Consensus Committee Meeting. Those minutes can be found here: <https://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/IECC-RE-MINUTES-1.19.23-draft-minutes.pdf>

While I have not reviewed the recording of the meeting as they have, I believe they take issue with a motion to call the question by Ric Johnson that I “seconded”. [I am assuming their reference to ‘Rock’ Johnson was in error, and that their reference to ‘Gyathry’ is intended to reference me.]

Based on the meeting minutes and their reference to section R404.5, there may be a mistake in their letter with respect to who made the motion they reference, however, it is clearly stated in Robert’s Rules that a motion to ‘call the question’ is a viable motion to end debate and move to a vote. To be successful, the motion must be approved by more than 2/3 of the voting members, which the meeting minutes affirm was achieved. While it can be frustrating for those ‘waiting for their turn to speak’, in accordance with Robert’s Rules, which Region VI also follows according to Section 5 of their own [by-laws](#), a successful vote to call the question closes debate.

I therefore strongly disagree that any member, including myself, who is simply following Robert’s Rules is acting in a way that the Appellant describes in their letter as “vigorously unaligned with ICC’s Code of Ethics”.

This Appeal should not be sustained by the Appeals Board, as it has not identified a “significant irregularity of process or procedure”.

Sincerely,



Gayathri Vijayakumar, Voting Member, Residential Consensus Committee

Principal Mechanical Engineer, Steven Winter Associates, Inc.