

Low rise multifamily proposal discussion

Duane Jonlin, City of Seattle Revised 6/9/22

084
Proponent Revision 3
Received 6/09/22

- 1. Suggested additional code changes
- 2. Cost comparison information
- 3. Pros and cons

1. Suggested Additional Code Changes (in Red)

RESIDENTIAL BUILDING. For this code, ~~((includes,))~~ the following building types are residential buildings:

- 1. Detached one- and two-family dwellings
- 2. Multiple single-family dwellings (townhouses)
- 3. ~~((and Group R-2,))~~ Group R-3 ~~((and R-4))~~ buildings three stories or less in height above grade plane *(Note to reviewers: because WA doesn't use R-4)*
- 4. Group R-2 ~~((buildings))~~ occupancy areas in buildings three stories or less in height above grade plane whose dwelling units are accessed directly from the exterior
- 5. Accessory structures thereto to residential buildings

Group R-2 buildings with dwelling units accessed from interior corridors or other interior spaces are not residential buildings.

R401.1 Scope. This chapter applies to residential buildings. Group R-2 ~~((buildings))~~ occupancy areas with dwelling units accessed from enclosed interior corridors or other enclosed interior spaces must comply with the WSEC--Commercial Provisions. Other Group R-2 occupancy areas are permitted to comply with the WSEC – Commercial Provisions, in lieu of the WSEC – Residential Provisions.

Exception: Water heaters that each serve only an individual Group R-2 dwelling unit in a building three stories or less above grade plane are permitted to comply with the requirements of the WSEC – Residential Provisions.

Four potential locations for “pointers,” where R-2 occupancy is mentioned in the code:

R405.2 Performance-based compliance. Compliance based on total building performance requires that a proposed design meets all of the following: (items 1 – 4 unaffected)

5.. For structures serving Group R-2 occupancies, the annual carbon emissions shall be less than or equal to 70 percent of the annual carbon emissions of the standard reference design. See Section R401.1 and residential building in Section R202 for R-2 scope.

R406.3 Additional energy efficiency requirements. Each dwelling unit in a residential building shall comply with sufficient options from Table R406.2 so as to achieve the following minimum number of credits: (Items 1, 2, 3 and 5 unaffected)

4. Dwelling units serving R-2 occupancies. See Section R401.1 and residential building in Section R202 for R-2 scope:4.5 credits

**TABLE R406.2
FUEL NORMALIZATION CREDITS**

| System Type | Description of Primary Heating Source | Credits | |
|-------------|--|-----------|------------------------|
| | | All Other | Group R-2 ^b |
| 1 | Combustion heating equipment meeting minimum federal efficiency standards for the equipment listed in Table C403.3.2(4) or C403.3.2(5) | 0 | 0 |

b – See Section R401.1 and residential building in Section R202 for R-2 scope.

**TABLE R406.3
ENERGY CREDITS**

| Option | Description | Credit(s) | |
|--|--|-----------|------------------------|
| | | All Other | Group R-2 ^b |
| 1. EFFICIENT BUILDING ENVELOPE OPTIONS | | | |
| Only one option from Items 1.1 through 1.7 may be selected in this category. Compliance with the conductive UA targets is demonstrated using Section R402.1.5, Total UA alternative, where $[1 - (\text{Proposed UA} / \text{Target UA})] >$ the required %UA reduction | | | |
| 1.1 | Prescriptive compliance is based on Table R402.1.3 with the following modifications: Vertical fenestration U = 0.24 | 0.5 | 0.5 |

b – See Section R401.1 and residential building in Section R202 for R-2 scope.

2. Cost comparison information

Options Table, General: The commercial code C406 options for R-2 multifamily cost very little extra, while the residential code R406 options for R-2 multifamily have definite costs attached.

Options table costs for R-2 in the commercial energy code. The following credits are available for the 2021 code. It appears that the reduced pipe sizing credit alone will provide more than the 41 credits required under the new credit system, while *reducing* construction cost, and there are many other options.

- **#20: 42 credits Hot water distribution right-sizing using plumbing code Appendix M** (*reduces* construction cost due to smaller pipe sizes, insulation thickness, and circulation pump size)

(Other available options – those in **bold** below equal 41 credits, total \$0.68/sf)

- #28: 19 credits Residential dishwasher & fridge with Energy Star “Most Efficient” label
- #07: 31 credits High performance DOAS
- **#14: 20 credits Renewable energy** (\$0.37/sf @ \$2.50/W)
- #21: 13 credits Hot water temp maintenance
- #25: 24 credits Reduced air leakage
- **#09: 4 credits 10% lighting power reduction** (\$0.18/sf - PNNL)
- **#11: 6 credits: High-efficacy lamps** (no additional cost)
- **#12: 8 credits main lighting switch for whole unit** (\$0.13/sf - PNNL)
- **#23: 3 credits low-flow shower heads** (no additional cost)
- #29: 6 credits Energy Star “most efficient” label washer & dryer
- **Total of items in bold: 41 credits, \$0.68/sf = \$558 for 820 sf.**

Options table costs for R-2 in the residential energy code. For residential, the TAG has recently approved the NEEA/Ecotope package of R406 changes (21-GP2-073). The required 6.5 credits could be provided for an R-2 multifamily building by any of several sets of options. One group is shown below with heat pump heating. These appear to be the least expensive packages available for multifamily, and the cost for either package will be considerably higher than the cost for meeting the commercial code options.

Residential code credit package, with DHP

- Credit 1.4: 1.0 credit for U-0.20 glazing (\$887)
- Credit 2.2: 1.0 credit for 1.5 ACH HRV (\$2034)
- Credit 3.4: 2.0 credits for Ductless Heat Pump (\$3060)
- Credit 5.4: 2.5 credits for Tier III HPWH (\$318)
- **Total: 6.5 credits, \$6,299**

Other differences between commercial and residential codes; no cost increase

- Most opaque envelope R-values will be slightly *less* stringent, lower cost

| Component | Residential | Commercial |
|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Ceiling | 60 | 49 |
| Wood wall | 20+5 or 13+10 | 20+3 or 13+7 |
| Floor | 30 | 38 |
| Below-grade wall | 10 or 21+5 TB | 10 or 19 |
| Slab on grade | 10 for 4 ft | 10 for 2 ft |

- Fenestration U-values will be *more* stringent, cost difference covered in Credit Package

| Component | Residential | Commercial |
|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| Windows | 0.30 | U-0.26 |
| Skylights | U-0.50 | U-0.45 |

- Air barrier leakage resistance requirement will be *more* stringent, cost difference covered in Credit Package

| | Residential | Commercial |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Test requirement | 3 ACH 50 | 0.25 (0.40) @75 Pa |

- Required ERV efficiency will be *slightly* more stringent, cost difference covered in Credit Package

| | Residential | Commercial |
|------------|-------------|------------------|
| Efficiency | 1.0 cfm/W | 1.2 cfm/W |

3. PROS AND CONS

| Pros | |
|--|--|
| Comment | Jonlin response |
| WSEC-C is easier to interpret/apply for Group R-2 developments; WSEC-R more appropriate for single family, duplex, townhouses. | |
| It is awkward to have projects that must meet IBC, but are under WSEC-R | |
| In some developments, there are both 3 and 4 story garden-style apt buildings on the same site, so it is awkward to have them under different energy codes. It would be convenient to allow construction of 3 and 4-story woody walkups under one code | Changed proposal to give builders the option to use commercial energy code for 1, 2, or 3-story garden-style apartments. |
| Commercial code has been less costly than residential code | |
| | |

| Cons | |
|---|--|
| Comment | Jonlin response |
| Moving these structures under the commercial energy code will have a real and negative impact on housing affordability | Commercial code for multifamily appears to be less costly than residential code |
| This will remove a large segment of the licensed, bonded, and insured builders from pursuing these projects | General contractors' licenses and bonding are not based on which portion of the energy code is used |
| developers will no longer see these projects as a viable investment and will turn their attention to other projects – such as luxury homes, luxury townhomes, etc | This change may make low-rise multifamily more attractive to developers, not less. |
| Split between low and high rise might have been based on envelope area to volume ratio | David Goldstein of NRDC, who was involved in the original negotiations for ASHRAE 90, does not recall this argument, and thinks it may have been based on fire department ladder reach of the time. Also, multifamily buildings have surface-to-volume ratios similar to those of commercial buildings. |
| This change should originate at model code level | Such changes more typically originate at state and local level, and are subsequently taken up by national model codes. (California recently created a single code applicable to all multifamily buildings.) |
| | |

Revisions based on group comments

RESIDENTIAL BUILDING. For this code, ~~((includes,))~~ the following building types are residential buildings:

1. Detached one- and two-family dwellings
2. Multiple single-family dwellings (townhouses)
3. ~~((and Group R-2,))~~ Group R-3 ~~((and R-4))~~ buildings three stories or less in height above grade plane **(Note to reviewers: because WA doesn't use R-4)**
4. Group R-2 ~~((buildings))~~ occupancy areas in buildings three stories or less in height above grade plane whose dwelling units are accessed directly from the exterior
5. Accessory structures thereto ~~to~~ residential buildings

Group R-2 buildings with dwelling units accessed from interior corridors or other interior spaces are not residential buildings.

R401.1 Scope. This chapter applies to residential buildings. Group R-2 ~~((buildings))~~ occupancy areas with dwelling units accessed from enclosed interior corridors or other enclosed interior spaces must comply with the WSEC--Commercial Provisions. Other Group R-2 occupancy areas are permitted to comply with the WSEC – Commercial Provisions, in lieu of the WSEC – Residential Provisions.

Exception: Water heaters that each serve only an individual Group R-2 dwelling unit in a building three stories or less above grade plane are permitted to comply with the requirements of the WSEC – Residential Provisions.

4 locations for “pointers” elsewhere in code

R405.2 Performance-based compliance. Compliance based on total building performance requires that a proposed design meets all of the following: (items 1 – 4 unaffected)

5.. For structures serving Group R-2 occupancies, the annual carbon emissions shall be less than or equal to 70 percent of the annual carbon emissions of the standard reference design. See Section R401.1 and residential building in Section R202 for R-2 scope.

R406.3 Additional energy efficiency requirements. Each dwelling unit in a residential building shall comply with sufficient options from Table R406.2 so as to achieve the following minimum number of credits: (Items 1, 2, 3 and 5 unaffected)

4. Dwelling units serving R-2 occupancies. See Section R401.1 and residential building in Section R202 for R-2 scope:4.5 credits

New Footnotes:

TABLE R406.2 FUEL NORMALIZATION CREDITS

and TABLE R406.3 ENERGY CREDITS

b – See Section R401.1 and residential building in Section R202 for R-2 scope.

Options table costs for R-2 in the COMMERCIAL energy code

The following credits are available for the 2021 code. It appears that the reduced pipe sizing credit alone will provide more than the 41 credits required under the new credit system, while *reducing* construction cost. For multifamily buildings without central hot water, many other packages are possible.

#20: 42 credits Hot water distribution right-sizing using plumbing code Appendix M (*reduces* construction cost due to smaller pipe sizes, insulation thickness, and circulation pump size)

(Another credit package – those in **bold** below equal 41 credits, total **\$0.68/sf**)

- #28: 19 credits Residential dishwasher & fridge with Energy Star “Most Efficient” label
- #07: 31 credits High performance DOAS
- **#14: 20 credits Renewable energy (\$0.37/sf @ \$2.50/W)**
- #21: 13 credits Hot water temp maintenance
- #25: 24 credits Reduced air leakage
- **#09: 4 credits 10% lighting power reduction (\$0.18/sf - PNNL)**
- **#11: 6 credits: High-efficacy lamps** (no additional cost)
- **#12: 8 credits main lighting switch for whole unit (\$0.13/sf - PNNL)**
- **#23: 3 credits low-flow shower heads** (no additional cost)
- #29: 6 credits Energy Star “most efficient” label washer & dryer

Total of items in bold: 41 credits, \$0.68/sf = \$558 for 820 sf.

Options table costs for R-2 in the RESIDENTIAL energy code

Options table costs for R-2 in the RESIDENTIAL energy code. For residential, the TAG has recently approved the NEEA/Ecotope package of R406 changes (21-GP2-073). The required 6.5 credits could be provided for an R-2 multifamily building by any of several sets of options. One group is shown below with heat pump heating. These appear to be the least expensive packages available for multifamily, and the cost for either package is clearly higher than the cost for meeting the commercial code options.

Residential code credit package, with DHP

- Credit 1.4: 1.0 credit for U-0.20 glazing (**\$887**)
- Credit 2.2: 1.0 credit for 1.5 ACH HRV (**\$2034**)
- Credit 3.4: 2.0 credits for Ductless Heat Pump (**\$3060**)
- Credit 5.4: 2.5 credits for Tier III HPWH (**\$318**)

Total: 6.5 credits, \$6,299

Other differences between commercial and residential codes

No cost increase

- Most opaque envelope R-values will be slightly *less* stringent, lower cost

| Component | Residential | Commercial |
|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Ceiling | 60 | 49 |
| Wood wall | 20+5 or 13+10 | 20+3 or 13+7 |
| Floor | 30 | 38 |
| Below-grade wall | 10 or 21+5 TB | 10 or 19 |
| Slab on grade | 10 for 4 ft | 10 for 2 ft |

- Fenestration U-values will be *more* stringent, cost difference covered in Credit Package

| Component | Residential | Commercial |
|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| Windows | 0.30 | U-0.26 |
| Skylights | U-0.50 | U-0.45 |

- Air barrier leakage resistance requirement will be *more* stringent, cost difference covered in Credit Package

| | Residential | Commercial |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Test requirement | 3 ACH 50 | 0.25 (0.40) @75 Pa |

- Required ERV efficiency will be *slightly* more stringent, cost difference covered in Credit Package

| | Residential | Commercial |
|------------|-------------|------------------|
| Efficiency | 1.0 cfm/W | 1.2 cfm/W |

Comments: Pro

| Pros | |
|--|--|
| Comment | Jonlin response |
| WSEC-C is easier to interpret/apply for Group R-2 developments; <u>WSEC-R</u> more appropriate for single family, duplex, townhouses. | |
| It is awkward to have projects that must meet IBC, but are under WSEC-R | |
| In some developments, there are both 3 and 4 story garden-style apt buildings on the same site, so it is awkward to have them under different energy codes. It would be convenient to allow construction of 3 and 4-story woody walkups under one code | Changed proposal to give builders the option to use commercial energy code for 1, 2, or 3-story garden-style apartments. |
| Commercial code has been less costly than residential code | |
| | |

Comments: Con

| Cons | |
|---|---|
| Comment | Jonlin response |
| Moving these structures under the commercial energy code will have a real and negative impact on housing affordability | Commercial code for multifamily appears to be less costly than residential code |
| This will remove a large segment of the licensed, bonded, and insured builders from pursuing these projects | General contractors' licenses and bonding are not based on which portion of the energy code is used |
| developers will no longer see these projects as a viable investment and will turn their attention to other projects – such as luxury homes, luxury townhomes, etc | This change may make low-rise multifamily more attractive to developers, not less. |
| Split between low and high rise might have been based on envelope area to volume ratio | David Goldstein of NRDC, who was involved in the original negotiations for ASHRAE 90, does not recall this argument, and thinks it may have been based on fire department ladder reach of the time. Also, multifamily buildings have surface-to-volume ratios <u>similar to</u> those of commercial buildings. |
| This change should originate at model code level | Such changes more typically originate at state and local <u>level, and</u> are subsequently taken up by national model codes. (California recently created a single code applicable to all multifamily buildings.) |