From: Eirene Knott <Eirene.Knott@brrarch.com>
Sent: Friday, January 8, 2021 9:56 AM
To: Member Input <memberinput@iccsafe.org>
Subject: IECC feedback

While I can appreciate having a standard which is written by a balanced committee, which would hopefully be comprised of those with a vested interest in energy, I truly believe that those who will be enforcing the provisions of those requirements should be the ones involved in the process.

Taking away the ICC process of code development from one code book because there are "problems" within that process is not the solution. If that were really the solution, then the entire code development process should be reevaluated at becoming a standard consensus process. Since that's not on the table, then the problem appears to be within one code book. Yes, that code has been written predominantly by industry. Shame on those code officials who do not get involved in the process of approving energy code changes. That being said, most code officials do not have a background in energy code related issues. The energy code is something that evolved without their input because industry was the driving force behind the code. Then the code official was forced to adopt and enforce a code with which they knew little about. ICC should have developed a more comprehensive training plan to educate code officials on this new code, but that's hindsight now. Now code officials have a bad taste in their mouth and this is where we are today.

The process of the code development is where the problem needs to be solved; not taking a code and now making it a standard because not enough people understand it.

I have no vested interest in the energy code other than to hope that code officials can become more educated on how to apply the code which in turn may increase more activity within the energy code development process.

EIRENE KNOTT, MCP, CBO, CFM
Director of Code Services

BRR ARCHITECTURE, INC.
DIRECT 913.236.3361 | **MAIN** 913.262.9095

www.brrarch.com