**Illinois Energy Conservation Advisory Council**

**February 11, 2025 - 12:00 p.m.**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**In Attendance:**

**Council Members:**

Susan Heinking, AIA, Pepper Construction Company

Rebecca Luke, Illinois Environmental Protection Agency

Alison Lindburg, Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance

George Patterson, Bennett and Brosseau Roofing, Inc.

Harry Spila, HJS Consulting

Kevin Roth, AIA

Michelle Sablack, AIA, WJW Architects

**Guests:**

Jerry Bishoff, Capital Development Board

Amber Dooley, Capital Development Board

Ben Rabe, NBI

Bill McHugh

Cheryl Scott, Metropolitan Mayors Caucus

Eric Lacey

Erin Sherman, RMI

Heather Runge

Margaret Vaughn, CRCA

Mark Graham

Michael Rhodes, PIMA

Ryan Siegel, SEDAC

1. Jerry Bishoff called the meeting to order at 12:03 pm.
   * The meeting started recording.
2. Roll call of Council members was taken. Present members constituted a quorum.
3. Minutes from the January 28, 2025 meeting were presented. George Patterson brought it to the attention of the members that he and Harry Spila were listed in the minutes as council members and also as guests. He requested their names be removed from the guest section of the minutes. Susan Heinking made a motion to approve the minutes. George Patterson provided the second. Motion passed.
4. Bill McHugh presented Proposal C04, to add a new definition for roof membrane peel and recover, with technical requirements to maximize insulation and energy efficiencies while minimizing building owner costs of construction. He also stated that the naming was incorrect in the past because it is a recover, not replacement. Replacement would require removal of insulation to the roof deck. Mark Graham spoke in support to add specific wording for guidance to the code to allow flexibility to the code to achieve energy efficiency. George Patterson spoke in support stating that if code requires complete removal and replacement of materials above the roof deck then this would add substantial cost to construction and would result in the disposal of insulation into landfills that is still in good condition. Ryan Siegel of SEDAC spoke in opposition stating that this does appear to mirror language that had been previously included as an Illinois Amendment, known as peel and replace. However, Ryan stated that this is rarely applicable because a slow slope roof is rarely replaced before it begins to leak leading to the necessary replacement of damaged insulation. Michael Rhodes from PIMA spoke in opposition as this proposal would result in less energy efficiency and would weaken the code. Michael further indicated that the language of this proposal could also jeopardize DOE funding. According to Michael, nothing in the code says that insulation cannot be recycled and reused if it is in good condition. PIMA actually proposed deleting the roof membrane peel and replace provisions that were adopted in the 2018 cycle. Alison Lindburg spoke in opposition because 1) it could be considered an efficiency degradation, 2) previous research indicated that there were few variances requested around this, 3) if the insulation is in good condition, it does not need to be removed; making this proposal unnecessary. Also, as this proposal is currently written, the contractor can decide whether the insulation is good instead of a code official who has more experience in making that decision. Bill McHugh clarified a couple of points brought up by the opposition. First, the International Building Code Section 1512 defines roof replacement as removal of all materials down to the roof deck. Second, Section 1512.4 does not allow insulation to remain, instead requiring it to be removed. Third, CRCA Member Contractors report using peel and recover on large and small buildings. The big warehouses with loose laid or mechanically attached single ply are prime for this exception, which saves 60+ dumpsters of insulation from going to the trash. Finally, this is not a replacement, it is a recover, and does not weaken the code. That is our disagreement with those on the call, with whom, we have great respect. Harry Spila spoke in opposition indicating that he feels this is a weakening amendment. The subcommittee discussed the proposal. Alison Lindburg moved to accept the proposal. Rebecca Luke provided the second. A roll call vote was made with George Patterson and Susan Heinking voting “yes” and Alison Lindburg, Kevin Roth, Harry Spila, Michelle Sablack, and Rebecca Luke voting ‘no’. Motion was defeated.
5. Erin Sherman stated that at the last meeting we discussed adopting appendix CH for electrification readiness for commercial buildings that had been proposed as CO1. Discussion indicated concerns about intent and specific requirement. Would a subcommittee member like to submit an amended appendix CH. Erin discussed the original proposal. Kevin Roth made a motion to task Erin Sherman with gathering more information for the next meeting to discuss appendix CH. Rebecca Luke provided the second. A roll call vote was made with all members of the subcommittee voting “yes”. Motion passed.
6. There were no items for the next item on the agenda, Stretch Code Topics.
7. There was no additional public comment.
8. Michelle Sablack made a motion to adjourn. Susan Heinking provided the second. Motion passed and meeting was adjourned.