

**NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF STATE
DIVISION OF CODE ENFORCEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION
TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE - GREEN CONSTRUCTION CODE**

MINUTES of meeting of October 16, 2012

Minutes of initial meeting of the technical subcommittee reviewing the 2012 International Green Construction Code for adoption by New York State, commencing at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, October 16, 2012 at the Albany office of NYSERDA, 17 Columbia Circle, Albany, NY, via videoconferencing at the NYSERDA NYC office (10th Floor, Suite 1006 485 Seventh Avenue - New York, NY: 212-971-5342), and via teleconferencing.

Present:

Subcommittee members:

Mike Burnetter, Chair GCC Technical Subcommittee

John Barrows (by teleconferencing at 11AM)

Tina Carton

Olivia Cellini

Joseph Hill

Marilyn Kaplan

Laurie Kerr (by teleconference for part of meeting, no present)

Miriam McGiver

Erin Tobin (present to 2pm)

Adrian Tuluca

Hilary Beber

Absent: Jim Burton, Paul Vacca

Special Guests: Joe Berman, Environmental Certification Specialist, Price Chopper

Acronyms: Following is a list of Acronyms used during the meeting, and which may be in these minutes.

CC	New York State Fire Prevention and Building Code Council
Energy codes	Energy Conservation Construction Codes of NYS
GC	draft Green Construction Code of New York State
ICC	International Code Council
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
MRLS	More Restrictive Local Standard
NYSERDA	New York State Energy Research and Development Authority

Minutes: Michael Burnetter opened the meeting just after 10 am. Members listed were present either at the NYSERDA boardrooms in Albany, in NYC or by teleconference link.

Michael reviewed the minutes of the meeting of September 5, 2012, and asked for comments or corrections. There were none.

Michael proposed that he and Joe Hill review the energy section of the GC to correlate it with the Energy Code.

Marilyn asked for clarification regarding scope and goals of the GC and of the technical subcommittee. Mike asked that we hold questions until we have reviewed the proposals.

In response to a proposal to allow other green standards as options, Tina and Adrian discussed the differences between LEED, GC, ICC 700 (jointly ICC and NAHB) in terms of affordability, process, safeguards and effectiveness.

Mike described the structural proposal submitted by Olivia and distributed to subcommittee members before the meeting.

Marilyn again asked that we define the goals and scope before addressing specifics, so we know how things like Olivia's proposal apply. The subcommittee discussed the mandates of the CC, and how that limits what the CC can adopt as a GC; for instance, the CC cannot adopt a MRLS (more restrictive local standard). After further discussion, Adrian moved that we get past scope and address proposals. There was some further discussion of section 101.3 and the ICC700; John Burroughs supported using ICC700 for residential with a minimum level such as silver specified. Marilyn asked that we address the logistics of how the books would be presented.

Olivia stressed the importance of considering the structural provisions in her proposal, and adding them to address not only commercial but residential construction, as structural provisions for solar systems are most needed in residential construction and existing buildings.

We discussed the impact of the enhanced energy provisions of the GC on different types of buildings; there was some consensus that the updated energy code had enough new hoops to jump through, and now is not the time to add further energy requirements. Laurie said this discussion is why she would vote against the GC in a final vote.

Mike proposed deleting 302.1 in its entirety, Joe seconded, and unanimously approved.

Mike asked that we discuss Olivia's proposals regarding structural provisions for photovoltaic installations, and specifications for straw bale construction, including how to apply these to residential construction. In the ensuing discussion, we considered adding residential building to the GC, and requiring some renewable with all residential as long as this would include passive solar and provide for an exception if not feasible. This might involve defining or adding reference standards for passive solar if feasible, etc.

Marilyn made a motion to support the concept of a GC, and to table the GC unless the subcommittee has more time to consider it, citing incomplete understanding of how the GC interacts with NYSERDA, EC ICC700 other NYS Codes and existing buildings. Mike determined that this motion was not in code language or within the scope of the technical subcommittee. He encouraged her to send this to DOS as a comment on NYSERDA's behalf.

Several subcommittee members noted that there is a good framework in the GC, with good concepts that may need tweaking to be acceptable. It was stated by several members that the code is idealistically written, and some things are not doable or ready for prime time. We need time to pick things that would work in NYS at this time. It provides specs for some things that are not mandated and are not in any other code, like rainwater collection and straw bale construction and passive solar siting. Having specs make these things approvable by the CEO, without mandating their construction.

John proposed that we allow residential construction to follow GC or ICC700. Supported by Mike, Tina, Joseph Hill, Marilyn, Adrian, John and Heather (Erin and Laurie absent for this vote).

Tina proposed, and John seconded, revising to allow LEED for homes, Green Globe or Passivhaus as alternatives to ICC700 in 105.6. All ayes except Marilyn absented.

Mike moved Olivia's proposal to vote, now that the place of residential in the GC was clearer. The proposals passed with all ayes except two abstained – Joseph Hill and Hilary Beber. The proposal include the recommendation that these sections be carried into the ECCCNY in the event the GCCNY did not pass.

Joseph Hill proposed that in 603.4, we change 25,000 SF to 50,000 SF, amended after discussion to also strike 603.4.1. This passed with ayes: Mike, Joe Hill, John, Adrian, Tina, and Miriam.

Mike proposed that we vote for or against presenting the GC at this time to the CC. Marilyn requested an amendment to not approve the GC, but rather to approve individual technical items for insertion into other codes. Mike declined the amendment; he instead amended the proposal, after discussion, to postpone the vote to allow the subcommittee another meeting.

Mike requested that subcommittee members submit proposals for items they would like considered at the next and last committee meeting. He proposed that at the next meeting we consider specific proposals to each chapter, as submitted by subcommittee members before the meeting.

We adjourned at 3 pm.