



STATE OF WASHINGTON

## STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

Department of Enterprise Services

1500 Jefferson • P.O. Box 41449 • Olympia, Washington 98504-1449  
(360) 407-9277 • e-mail [sbcc@des.wa.gov](mailto:sbcc@des.wa.gov) • [www.des.wa.gov/sbcc](http://www.des.wa.gov/sbcc)

### Energy Code Technical Advisory Group Meeting Review Notes for May 10, 2019

**TAG Members Present:** Kjell Anderson, Chair; Alan Nolan; Amy Wheelless; Bill Kraus; Bruce Carter; \*Chuck Murray; CJ Brockway; Dave Baylon; David Reddy; Hans Frederickson; Jason Ramey; \*Jonathan Jones; Kim Barker; \*Louis Starr; Mike Lubliner; \*Poppy Storm; Tena Risley; Mike Fowler; Patrick Hayes; Treasa Sweek

**Visitors Present:** Dan Wildenhaus, Duane Jonlin, Henry Odem, Shane Nilles, Roger LeBrun, Kathleen Petrie, Laura Wynn, Carolyn Logue, Kelly Thomas, Shilpa Surana

**TAG Members Absent:** Alan Duer, Gary Heikkinen, Robby Oylear, Todd Blevins, Paul Highly

**Staff:** Krista Braaksma, Carrie Toebbe

\* indicates an alternate member

Agenda Items	TAG Actions
1. Welcome and Introductions	Meeting called to order at 9:20 a.m. Kjell Anderson welcomed everyone and introductions were made. Kjell noted the State Building Code Council has now officially assigned the proposals to the TAG. The Council has a mandate in <a href="#">RCW 19.27A.160</a> to move the energy code towards a reduction in annual net energy. The goal for this cycle is 15 percent. It was noted the 15 percent over the 2015 code equates to an approximate 8 percent savings over the 2006 code. It was also noted that the wording in the statute was changed by the legislature this session.
2. Review and Approve <a href="#">Agenda</a>	Agenda approved as written.
3. Review and Approve <a href="#">Minutes</a>	The minutes of the April 19, 2019 meeting were approved as written.
4. Review of Code Change Proposals	
<a href="#">WSEC-R01/R03</a>	Shane Nilles and Kim Barker said they had worked together to come up with one revised proposal. There was TAG discussion over whether this fix was necessary, and if it would cause confusion to have different definitions in the energy code and residential code. The TAG conclusion was that if it helped jurisdictions with enforcement and consistency, it was a good thing.  Dave Baylon and Treasa Sweek moved to recommend <a href="#">approval as modified</a> . The motion carried with one opposing vote.
<a href="#">WSEC-R17</a>	Bill Kraus felt a definition for mini splits was important for enforcement and compliance. The TAG suggested some slight changes to the IMC definition provided, and felt that global changes should be made to the code to incorporate this wording for these systems.

	<p>Treasa Sweek and Patrick Hayes moved to recommend <a href="#">approval as modified</a>. The motion carried with no opposing votes.</p>
<p><a href="#">WSEC-R20</a></p>	<p>Chuck Murray said this proposal normalizes the volume used for air leakage testing, to eliminate the disparity between the leakage rates allowed in buildings with different ceiling heights. It will also help simplify the calculations. Patrick Hayes suggested they should use the actual volume as they do in the commercial requirements. Dave Baylon noted that ASHRAE also uses 8.5 feet. There was discussion as to whether this should be moved to 9 feet.</p> <p>Dave Baylon and Mike Fowler moved to recommend approval as submitted.</p> <p>Alan Nolan and David Reddy moved an amendment to the motion to change from 8.5 feet to 9 feet. That motion failed, 6 to 7.</p> <p>The main motion carried, 9 to 6.</p>
<p><a href="#">WSEC-R23</a></p>	<p>Henry Odem introduced the proposal, which has a lot of parts. The proposal increases the points needed to align with the target for energy savings this cycle. He noted that each half point equates to approximately 600 kWh of savings. Some of the existing point values were adjusted to meet the modeled savings. Table R406.2 itself was revised to have a separate column for multifamily and the options that are applicable. The exception in R402.4.1.2 was added to cover leakage testing in multi-family residential. There was discussion over the column titles and what they should be to cover all residential occupancy types covered by the WSEC-R, and whether all air leakage testing should be standardized. The ducts in conditioned space section was revised to align with the current requirements in R406.</p> <p>The TAG went through the changes to existing options and the new options proposed.</p> <p>For option 6, the TAG noted that, based on the stated 600 kWh per half credit, the renewables should be assigned a full credit for each 1200 kWh of electrical generation.</p> <p>On option 7, the TAG debated the inclusion of a refrigerator in the list of supplied appliances. The language was modified to specify the appliances need to be new and actually installed. An allowance was added that the refrigerator does not necessarily need to be provided, but must meet the standard if it is.</p> <p>There was also debate regarding the HVAC options, especially the decrease of points for the heat pump while increasing the efficiency requirements and the availability of heat pumps with an HSPF of 11.</p> <p>Other items of discussion were the general layout of the table and the confusion between option numbers and footnotes, the change in the required number of credits with some of the more easily reachable options removed, and the removal of the low flow fixture credits based on legislative changes to the base requirements for water use.</p> <p>Dave Baylon and Treasa Sweek moved to recommend <a href="#">approval as modified</a>. The motion carried, 9 to 5.</p>

<p><u>WSEC-R16/R19</u></p>	<p>CJ Brockway asked to skip forward to the two lighting proposals before breaking for the day. She had some alternate language to suggest on both. She felt the additional option for a half credit in Table R406.2 in WSEC-R16 was a good idea but suggested changing the language from "...shall be high-efficacy lamps" to "...shall use high efficacy lamps." She also felt it would be more accurate to use "light sources" rather than "lamps." There was discussion over whether the additional 10 percent requirement for high efficacy lighting was equivalent to meet the standard 600 kWh savings per half credit, or if the increased ease of inspection would provide enough of an incentive.</p> <p>Treasa Sweek moved to recommend disapproval of WSEC-R16. Dave Baylon seconded the motion. The motion carried, 6 to 5. It was suggested that perhaps some additional lighting control requirements may push the option from approximately 0.25 credits to the 0.5 credit mark.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-----</p> <p>For WSEC-R19, CJ suggested similar wording changes to improve clarity and intent.</p> <p>CJ Brockway and Dave Baylon moved to recommend approval as modified for WSEC-R19. The motion carried with no opposing votes</p>
<p>5. Other Business</p>	<p>The next meeting is scheduled for May 17. An additional meeting was scheduled for May 24.</p>
<p>6. Adjourn</p>	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.</p>

DRAFT