

Illinois Energy Code Advisory Council Commercial Subcommittee
April 16, 2018 – 1:30 p.m.
Teleconference
MEETING MINUTES

In Attendance:

Subcommittee Members:

Tom Buchheit, Chairman, BRiC Partnership
Bruce Maxey, BLDD joined the call at 2:00 p.m.
George Patterson, Bennett & Brosseau Roofing Inc.
Ryan Nation, Hanson Engineers
John Meek, Felmley-Dickerson Company
Don Plass, Village of Shorewood/HR Green
Lisa Mattingly, Capital Development Board

Guests:

Bill McHugh, Chicago Roofing Contractors Association
Eric Lacey, Responsible Energy Code Alliance
Darren Meyers, International Energy Conservation Consultants LLC
Jeff Mang, Polyisocyanurate Insulation Manufacturers Association (PIMA)
Donald Surrena, National Association of Home Builders
Bill McHugh, Chicago Roofing Contractors Association
Ian Blanding, Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (MEEA)
Eric Makela, New Buildings Institute
Anita Lichterman, Village of Winnetka
Sean Lintow, Sr., SLS Construction & Building Solutions
Nicole Westfall, MEEA
Ed Krusec, Hunter Panels
Allison Lindberg, MEEA
Tom Hutchinson, Hutchison Design Group
Grant Ulrich, City of Chicago
Rob Schildgen, Priority Energy

- The meeting was called to order at 1:32 p.m.
- Roll call of Subcommittee members was taken followed by introduction of guests. There was not a quorum so time was given for Mr. Plass and Mr. Meek to join the call.
- Once Mr. Meek and Mr. Plass joined the call, Ms. Mattingly asked Chairman Buchheit if he would like to begin going through the proposed code changes.
- Proposed Code Change C01 – Mr. McHugh asked the Subcommittee to allow a change to this amendment. He asked that the words in line two of C504.2.6 be revised to remove the words “and insulation remains.” This proposal is intended to provide relief on insulation requirements for existing buildings when the energy use

of the building is not increased. This language was not approved in the 2015 adoption.

The City of Chicago has issued a memorandum which uses this language verbatim. Its use is allowed when the building has flashing height limitations and the energy use is not increased.

Chairman Buchheit wanted to revisit the reason this proposal wasn't approved in 2015 and would also like a copy of the memorandum from the City of Chicago. Mr. Meek stated this made sense.

Mr. Plass asked who would determine when the flashing height wouldn't allow for the insulation increase. Mr. McHugh said that City of Chicago left this to an honor system as long as the energy consumption was not increased for the buildings. Mr. Patterson stated, as a roofing contractor, he has to submit drawings to the City for review and permits. If he is unable to meet the requirements for the flashing height, he also submits a letter explain the reason why.

Mr. McHugh said that he would provide a copy of the City's memorandum.

Mr. Mang feels this language is overly broad and provides too much of an exemption to the code. Roof insulation is an important and cost effective way of improving energy use in buildings. Proper roof insulation saves approximately 7% of energy use in a building. He stated that code officials have the authority to give the variance in these cases when needed. There is no evidence to suggest that the code variance process doesn't work. A recent MEEA report supports this.

Mr. Hutchinson stated there is already a variance process included in the Code. The proposed language is codifying an exemption and it could be misused. The Code is intended to improve the building environment and this sets a precedent to decrease the Code.

Mr. Lacey commented on the location of this proposal in the code book. He thinks this creates an unnecessary conflict by having roof replacements in two areas of the code, alteration and roof repair.

Mr. Blanding stated that he would share the code officials report related to compliance.

Mr. Maxey will review notes from the last code amendment cycle and provide insight into why this proposal was not approved at that time.

Mr. McHugh stated that this could be moved from Section 504 to Section 503 as suggested by Mr. Lacey. He went onto say that the Chicago memo is a paradigm shift. This is to make clear that in existing buildings the work is to replace the roof, not increase the efficiency of the building.

Mr. Patterson mentioned that the roof is often a very small area compared to the skin on the rest of the building. Many building owners have chosen not to replace

the roof because the insulation installation would more than double the cost of the roof replacement.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that removal of the existing roof that is then replaced with a single layer mechanically fastened one could actually decrease the R-value of the roof.

Mr. Meyers offered to work with Mr. McHugh to come back with more specific language on the proposal.

- Proposed Code Change C02 – Mr. McHugh will also work with Mr. Meyers to provide revised language for this proposal.

Mr. Maxey made a motion to table Proposals C01 and C02 until the language has been revised and resubmitted to the Subcommittee.

- Proposed Code Change C03 – Mr. McHugh provided a summary of this proposal which only applies to tapered insulation. Mr. Meek asked why the R-20 value was chosen versus an average of R-30. Mr. McHugh stated that the difference between R-20 and R-30 could add two inches to the insulation height but he said that it could be changed to R-30 if it pleased the Council. He said that this could be addressed when revisions are made to Code Change Proposals C01 and C02.

Chairman Buchheit asked that Proposed Code Change C03 be added to the motion made by Mr. Maxey. Mr. Maxey revised his motion. It was seconded by Mr. Patterson. There was additional discussion. The motion passed.

- Proposed Code Change C04 – Mr. McHugh provided a summary of the proposal. He stated this same proposal was accepted by the Residential Subcommittee. This proposal language is also included in the City of Chicago Memorandum. Mr. Maxey asked if any damaged insulation is discovered during the roof replacement would the insulation then need to meet the Code. Mr. McHugh stated that the insulation would be replaced with equal or more efficient. Mr. Plass asked why the second sentence from the City of Chicago Memorandum wasn't included in the proposed code change. Mr. McHugh stated it could be added if it pleased the Council. Mr. Plass stated the Residential Subcommittee accepted the language as is. Mr. Plass said that this language seems in line with what ICC developed.

Mr. Mang stated that the intent of the Code is to improve the performance of the components that are being touched. Roof replacement is defined as removing the roofing components down to the roof deck.

Mr. Makela stated that goal of the Code is to bring existing buildings into compliance with the Code. He questioned how the last four provisions bring a building closer to compliance. Mr. McHugh stated that this is only peeling the roof and repairing the surface. A motion was made by Mr. Plass to approve the proposal. It was seconded by Chairman Buchheit. Mr. Meek asked that the Subcommittee look at all four proposals together. Motion didn't pass. Mr. Meek suggested tabling this proposal until the next meeting.

- Mr. Patterson made a motion to adjourn and thanked all the people that had participated in the process. Mr. Meek seconded. Motion carried.
- Meeting adjourned at 2:59 p.m.