

**Illinois Energy Code Advisory Council Commercial Subcommittee**  
**March 26, 2015 – 12:30 p.m.**  
**Teleconference**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**In Attendance:**

**Subcommittee Members:**

Bruce Maxey, BLDD  
George Patterson, Bennett & Brosseau Roofing Inc.  
Ryan Nation, Hanson Engineers  
Tom Buchheit, BRiC Partnership  
John Meek, Felmley-Dickerson Company  
Tom Ayers, City of Rock Island  
Lisa Mattingly, CDB (coordination only, non-voting)

**Guests:**

Bill McHugh, CRCA  
Jeff Mang, Polyisocyanurate Insulation Manufacturers Association (PIMA)

- Chairman Maxey called the meeting to order at 12:33 p.m.
- Roll call of Subcommittee members was taken followed by introduction of guests.
- Mr. Ayers motioned to approve the meeting minutes from the January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2015 meeting. Mr. Buchheit seconded the motion. Motion passed.
- Chairman Maxey began the discussion with the proposed amendments by CRCA. Chairman Maxey stated that since the proposed language from CRCA came in late and seems add new language from what was previously submitted it would not be considered. He said that his goal is to come to an agreement on what language should be proposed to the full council and also can be supported through the JCAR process.
- Mr. McHugh stated that the language is not new and is from the International Green Construction Code. Mr. McHugh said that if the PIMA language was approved in place of theirs, they would accept it. Mr. Mang stated that the proposed language was added to the 2012 IgCC. At that time there was some confusion about the definitions of reroofing, roof replacement and roof recover. In 2015 more specific language was included.
- Chairman Maxey commented on the use of inches of insulation versus using the R-value. This is not a common way to measure the effectiveness of polyiso insulation. Mr. McHugh stated that using inches gives an opportunity for the use of other types of insulation. Chairman Maxey asked that this sentence be removed.
- Mr. Mang stated that he reads “Exception 6” by CRCA to still exempt most roofs because of the flashing heights. Chairman Maxey asked if the CRCA or NRCA has

compiled any data on how often there are issues with flashing heights and what costs are involved. Mr. McHugh said that they do have data but he did not have it with him. Mr. McHugh stated that CRCA has been made aware of several roofs completed without permits so that the contractor doesn't have to comply with the code because it is too costly. Mr. Patterson stated he is aware of some of projects where the costs almost doubled when the insulation thickness drove the need to raise other elements on the roof. He said that on one project the costs were raised from \$200k to \$400k.

- Mr. Mang asked that he be allowed to explain how the PIMA proposal would address these issues. Mr. McHugh stated that the PIMA proposal would not address flat roofs. Chairman Maxey stated that he thinks PIMA's proposal covers both flat and sloped roofs. He also said that his goal is to get as much insulation as possible without driving up the costs to an unreasonable amount. PIMA's proposal would allow for unlimited averaging of the insulation. This is a flexibility that is not included in the current code. Minimum of R-5 is needed to protect against condensation, but other than that averages can be used across the roof. He believes their proposal addresses CRCA's concerns. Mr. McHugh said that this doesn't address all the issues. He said it only addresses the tapered section not the flat stock.
- The current 2012 IECC calls for R25 or R20 if 2010 ASHRAE is followed. In the 2015 and 2013 ASHRAE, it changes to R30.
- Chairman Maxey commented on a discussion he had with a local code official who said that he had never been asked for a variance on the insulation. He also expressed concern about the costs to the building owners that insulation issues can cause. Chairman Maxey had also spoken with some designers who said there are often issues that have to be addressed in design and there is some cost involved but the costs are not typically show stoppers. He feels the CRCA proposal is backtracking from the 2012 but it does provide for a minimum R value.
- There was no motion made on either proposal. Mr. Ayers stated that the contractors would have to work with the building officials on variances.
- The question was raised if this type of amendment has been proposed in any other states. Jeff Mang responded that it hadn't.
- Mr. Ayers stated that we have gone very far in the amount of insulation that is required. He suggested that CRCA bring up these issues at the national level for the next IECC cycle. Mr. Ayers moved that we accept the proposal from the CRCA 1b. Second was made by Mr. Buchheit. A roll call vote was taken. There were 5 nays and one recusal.
- There is no other business for the Commercial Subcommittee to take action on. The date of the next full council meeting is April 20, 2015.
- Mr. Ayers made a motion to adjourn and thanked all the people that had participated in the process. Mr. Meek seconded. Motion carried.

- Meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.