

Mr. Sims,

I am a voting member of the [Residential Consensus Committee](#). I certainly don't speak for the other voting members, but I have BCC'd quite a few of them here in case they too want their voices heard.

Over the past three years, voting members, proponents, and interested parties invested thousands of hours building consensus and developing a code following this new process.

Many of us applied to serve on the Committee because we were inspired by the ICC's stated mission in the [ICC Energy Framework document](#) "to help our communities increase energy efficiency and also reduce greenhouse emissions (GHG) to meet their policy goals."

We did our job.

The ICC [Board of Directors'](#) job was to write a clear Scope and Intent.

One would have expected, given the issues in the last cycle, that the Scope and Intent would have been so carefully written that they could not again be the subject of appeals. Yet, here we are again.

One would have expected, that if questions came up regarding Scope and Intent, that the Board of Directors would at a minimum take responsibility and provide a clear answer to their Committees.

This did not happen.

When the Consensus Committees were being asked to deliberate on code change proposals in the Spring of 2022 and varying interpretations of the Scope and Intent were debated, the Committees correctly asked for clarification.

We asked, and the [Board of Directors](#), the authors of the Scope and Intent, **failed to provide crystal clear guidance.**

In the staff memo from Feb 15, 2022, we were told: "The Board has not previously provided updates or clarification to the scope or intent of codes or standards during an active development process, allowing the development process to proceed to resolution. If a topic is contained in the scope or intent statement, it may be included either in the base of the code or as an appendix, as determined by the consensus body."

You were copied on this memo.

If this instruction to the Committees was not correct, you could have corrected it. You could have requested that the Board provide us a definitive answer before wasting three years of our time.

In the [ICC Pulse](#) issued, it states: “The International Code Council Board of Directors determined that the scope and intent governing the 2024 IECC prohibited the inclusion of measures that did not directly affect building energy conservation within the base of the draft 2024 IECC.”

Given that the Board of Directors wrote that Scope and Intent, why was this clear interpretation not given to the Committees in 2022 when we asked?

With respect to some Appendices, the ICC Pulse states: “...the Board determined there was a significant risk of preemption based on case law or the Board had concerns about the ability to comply with provisions using minimum efficiency equipment.”

Again, why wait for an Appeal to be filed in order to make this determination?

In reading the ICC Pulse and your message below, I find some things lacking.

- Our Committees are owed a public apology.
- You and the Board of Directors should be taking accountability publicly for this failure to provide clear direction when it was asked of you.
- You say below how much you recognize our effort and the ‘unprecedented level of collaboration and consensus’, yet don’t acknowledge how the Board’s action undermines all that work.
- You express a commitment to continue working with us, but many of us are questioning whether the ICC is even capable of ‘leading the way’ and even worthy of our efforts again.
- You indicate a clearer scope and intent will be provided – when? Prior to the Group B hearings? Prior to soliciting new members for the new Committee? Will the current Committees get to review and provide input? Will it include clear examples of what belongs where? IRC vs IECC? Main vs Appendix?
- You indicate the development of 2027 IECC will ‘ensure the effectiveness of the committee members time commitments’. How? What Council Policies will be specifically changed? Will the current Committees get to review and provide input?

I am told that this email will serve no purpose. Based on this LinkedIn post of yours, I’m giving you the chance to prove everyone wrong and that your words below are sincere.

Dominic Sims reposted this

Justin Wright • 3rd+
Your success, my mission | Ex-CIO now entrepreneur | Ran...
1w • Edited •

+ Follow

Business is 100% about relationships.
Relationships are 100% about trust.

...see more



Gayathri Vijayakumar
Principal Mechanical Engineer
[Pronounced: GAYA-three; 'Gaya' rhymes with 'Maya'] [Pronouns: she, her, hers]
203.831.4223 (w) | 203.535.4503 (c)

Steven Winter Associates, Inc.
swinter.com