



STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

1500 Jefferson Street SE • PO Box 41449 • Olympia, Washington 98504
(360) 407-9277 • e-mail sbcc@des.wa.gov • www.sbcc.wa.gov

**STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL
PUBLIC HEARING RECORD**

Hearing Date and Time: Tuesday, November 21, 2023, 10:00 a.m.

Council Members in Attendance: Tony Doan, Council Chair, Kjell Anderson, Jay Arnold, Justin Bourgault, Micah Chappell, Daimon Doyle, Tom Handy, Ben Omura

Staff in Attendance: Stoyan Bumbalov, Managing Director; Krista Braaksma; Dustin Curb; Rozanna Ghanie; Annette Haworth

Others in Attendance: Bryan Ahee, Craig Anderson, Jennifer Anderson, Amanda Armstrong, Jake Armstrong, Tim Attebery, Kim Barker, Mark Boggan, Debbi Boyd, Ian Casey, Ted Chesledon, Jasmine Chiu, Rupal Choksi, Brett Conway, Jerry Cornfield, Michael Currier, David Danton, Greg Davenport, Mallorie Davies, Kevin Duell, Bart Eidson, Erik Fossum, Mike Fowler, Bryan Galvin, Jenifer Gilliland, Robert Glass, Bobby Graham, Janelle Guthrie, Patrick Hanks, Jeff Hansell, Bart Hansen, Ian Harkins, Pat Harris, Kevin Hayes, Chris Hellstern, Brian Holtzclaw, Adam Hutchinson, Steve Hyer, Harshad Inamdar, Gregory Johnson, Kevin Jones, Dexter Kalliainen, Kevin Kaul, Wayne Keffer, Jonny Kocher, Rachel Koller, Renee Kruger, Joshua Kulla, Brett Lott, Noelle Lovern, Stacy Martin, Ted McCammant, Jeanette McKague, Joshua Mergens, James Moschella, Michael Murza, Mike Nykreim, Kevin OLeary, Erik Olon, Jennifer Parker, Lisa Parshley, Kathleen Petrie, Laura Petrillo-Groh, Paige Reid, Tracy Rhynes, Alaina Robertson, Joëlle Robinson, Tod Sakai, Celina Sanchez, Keith Sanderson, Jonathan Sargeant, Ruth Sawyer, Shaun Scott, Arthur Shaw, Lucas Shifflett, Ray Shipman, Deepa Sivarajan, Andrea Smith, Michael Snook, Tim Stone, Sarah Sutton, Kurt Swanson, Scott Swantek, Kelly Thomas, Eric Vander Mey, Mark Vossler, Nick Waggood, Dave Wagner, Angela Wethered, Judson Willis, Tom Young

WAC 51-11R and WAC 51-11C, Amendment of the 2021 Washington State Energy Code, Residential and Commercial Provisions.	WSR 23-21-105: WAC 51-11R; Amendment of the 2021 Washington State Energy Code, Residential Provisions WSR 23-21-106: WAC 51-11C, amendment of the 2021 Washington State Energy Code, Commercial
From:	Testimony
Mark Vossler:	Past President of Washington physicians for social responsibility, and I'm testifying in that role. Thank you. Members of the Commission for this opportunity to speak about the proposed amendments to the State Energy Code. Having practiced medicine in Washington for 22 years, serving as a board member and climate program Co. Chair, the Washington physicians for social responsibility. I'm here to urge the State building co-counsel to

	<p>adopt amendment option one to the 2021 state energy code. The amendments being considered, allow builders flexibility to choose app appliances as they achieve energy performance and maintain the intent of the strong code already in place. Further delay in implementing clean codes will perpetuate the harm from heat, trapping, methane and carbon dioxide that gas furnaces dump into our air. Our State buildings produce twice as much Nox is all our power plants combined. That's oxides of nitrogen. I've seen patients whose heart disease was exacerbated by the heat and the smoke that we experienced in Washington last summer. Low income communities and communities of color are exposed to far worse pollution indoors and out than white, wealthy communities. Access to cooling is also a health and equity issue. Electric heat pumps increase climate resiliency by providing life saving, cooling and air filtration as heat waves and wild wildfires intensify in our region. We're feeling the heat in our lungs, in our homes and in our most vulnerable communities. Please ensure that there's no further delay on these lifesaving measures. Please adopt option one.</p>
Steve Tapio	<p>I'm a building science team leader for new tradition homes a production builder here in Washington State. we build 100% energy star above code homes. To be exact, 3,277 homes to date. We are no stranger to building high performance and energy efficient homes. Having won the energy star builder of the year award for 17 years running. Today I speak to you on behalf of all home builders, both small and large. The energy code, as proposed in the most recent CO. 102, simply put, is flawed. This code does not create a simple or streamlined pathway for compliance. There is no fuel choice. despite some weasel wording allegedly along such, let's not fool ourselves thinking that we are complying with Epcra. Any attempts at putting together a pathway of options using natural gas for space or water heating is simply futile. It is laughable. No builder would attempt to insult any legitimate buyer by alleging that this outrageous related cost to do so are justified if passed as proposed. This code essentially removes consumer choice. What about during electrical power outages? Are homeowners to simply freeze? Natural gas provides such energy security for times such as that of interest. The majority of the several 1,000 energy star certified homes that we have built in the past had natural gas and space.had natural gas, space and water heating. In fact, it was more challenging Council Chambers: to get homes to qualify as energy style while using heat pumps, using any of the existing modeling software. something that I have not been able to figure out Council Chambers: why, under the initial proposal prior to the Epcra conflict and the Ninth Circuit decision. was I able to formulate a somewhat reasonable pathway. going all electric, and yet with the newest cr 102, dated October thirteenth of 23, with the revisions allegedly allowing a gas pathway. It is now harder to stay on the original all electric pathway which requires at least an additional half credit. The revisions to the energy equalization credits in Table 406.2, and the energy credits in Table 406.3 need to be recalculated. They are not accurate. Unfortunately, it's time to go back to the drawing board and come up with a better workable plan. That plan would be to</p>

	forego this 2021 code and go straight to the 2024 code.
Chris Hellstern	<p>I'm an architect and sustainability director from Miller Hall here in Seattle on behalf of Shift 0 in support of the amendments to the Washington Commercial and Residential Energy code Update, and I'm here to ask that you pass these amendments to protect strong codes and ensure that new buildings in Washington are as climate, friendly and cost effective as possible. Specifically, we'd like you to pass option one of the commercial code. With respect to the changes that Rmi has submitted to you in a recent November twentieth comment. Specifically, we wanna ensure that their amended language for the heat pump water heating credit, the removal of supplemental gas heating from air source heat pumps and the clarification on the electrical readiness language both available for space and water heating appliances are included in this final code language. I wanna just give you 3 brief, important reasons to pass these amendments. First, we need codes like this. The Washington State can meet its climate targets, and in an equitable way, in order to address the State's second largest source of greenhouse gas emissions, buildings. Second, while some of our clients are demanding increased energy efficiency. Architects in the building industry need this continued environmental leadership from the State to help bring up the baseline for building owners who won't voluntarily meet the energy and decarbonisation targets that they should. Raising the floor helps all of us to live healthier lives and finally, the cost of an action or delay in action is too great. If we keep pushing off building responsibly. Now, it'll cost all of us more in the future, because building retrofits are more expensive. And additionally, we know the human health and environmental impacts from not addressing emissions are much higher than project dollars. And even to just address, the previous testimony. I wanna say that natural gas appliances require electricity to spark the flame. So it's a bit of a misnomer to say that in event of a power outage, you won't be able to heat anything in your home or building.</p>
Kathleen Petrie	<p>I'm speaking on behalf of King County, and am requesting the approval of the proposed changes to the Washington 2021 State residential energy code and approval of the industry preferred option of the commercial energy code. We'd like to extend our thanks to the State building code, council and staff for the additional time and efforts you have devoted to this process these past many months. We believe these changes best reflect the intent of the strong energy code adopted last year by the Council, supporting the transition to healthy space and water, heating while keeping in alignment with the requirements of Epca. Moving toward building electrification will better support front line communities who traditionally have greater exposure to pollution, and who will bear the highest burden burden of costs for maintaining stranded assets. So we need to eliminate these appliances from new building stock electric heat pumps have an important role in mitigating the impacts of an increase in extreme heat events and wildfires, and they reduce utility bills. So we request your approval. Approval of these proposals.</p>

Joelle Robinson	<p>I am up here in Walkham County. I have a 3 year old who's at daycare right now, and almost 2 years ago, to the day my parents home, my childhood home that my dad built 53 years ago was flooded with a foot of water in the home. My dad was 86 and my mom was 81 at the time, and so my family experienced the very severe impacts of the climate crisis, as it had rained about a month's worth of rain in only 2 days, and my sisters and I were frantically trying to get them rescued by calling 9, 1, one and trying to find tractors with lifts and fishing boats. Eventually they were rescued with a fishing boat. But it was very emotionally traumatizing and financially expensive. And then my parents actually had to move. So that's my personal side. And on my professional side. I just urge you, as a climate solutions staff person, to pass the State building code energy amendments for the residential and commercial, especially commercial option, one with the recommendations by Rmi. Last year thousands of Washingtonians from across the State made their voices heard to urge the Sbccc to pass strong energy codes that will accelerate our clean energy transition, and of course, reducing emissions from new buildings is crucial to protecting our climate and our air quality and our health, as you heard from Dr. Wasler. Just electric heat pumps are, of course, a double win. Not only do they reduce greenhouse gas emissions from buildings, but they are providing heating alongside with cooling, which is only growing more important as our region sees more and more wildfire smoke and heat waves.</p>
Ty Jennings	<p>I represent cascade natural gas. I speak today on behalf of Cascade as a former code official as a code educator. and on behalf of the people of Washington State. I ask that you please consider amending the filed Cr. 102. For both the residential and the commercial energy Code to fix several errors. This process to amend the 2021 Washington State energy code started on May 24, and will now be completed in less than 6 months. Let's be real. 6 months is incredibly fast, and with such speed we have some minor errors that must be corrected. Now is the time to do such. I would ask that each member of this esteemed council. Review my written letter within that letter. I provide thorough descriptions of each issue as well as proposed corrective actions. I apologize for my brief summary today, but I simply cannot speak to all of the details in the 3 min I am afforded. First. please note that the small business economic impact statements within both the commercial and residential filings are highly questionable. In fact, the minor cost estimates for each industry are estimated to be exactly the same to the penny as the 1% of average payroll or point 3% of average annual gross business income. These values were evidently created in a vacuum and do not accurately provide estimate of the economic impact. Small businesses will face failure to correct the small business economic impact statements within both the commercial and residential filings will put these filings at odds with the Administrative Procedures Act and the Regulatory Fairness Act. This would open the door to further legal challenges or legislative action that could further delay the implementation of these codes. I, as much as anyone want to see these codes move forward. But let's do it right. Next. I</p>

	<p>would also point out that several of the proposed amendments remain in conflict with Epca. proposals, considered today would force projects that include natural gas to achieve up to 7 times the number of efficiency credits as a building, using electric heating and by mandating the use of heat pumps in the standard reference designs. This code would further prohibit the use of natural gas even when using the performance method. Again, I ask the members of this Council to please review my written letter. I have identified many other areas wherein we must improve upon our fixed errors in the proposed mandatory language. We can make these fixes now and avoid the inevitable stumbling and confusion project teams and code officials will face. Come, March. I'd be happy to speak with any of you if you have any further questions.</p>
Keith Sanderson	<p>I am a current student at University Washington, and I'm here today in support of the adoption of the State Building code to adopt these amendments to the 2021. So Washington state energy, co residential and commercial. One thing that is implicit in my education is that you have to be proactive in building a future that you want to live and thrive and have good health in the future. Outlooks based on climate change. Research really worries me that I will not even have a chance at a future with good health and a successful life SBCC. In 2022 took a great step towards the human health with the requirements of heat pumps. This is a great option for balancing the reduction of fossil fuels with cost, effective investment. Economics with warmer and warmer summers. Heat pumps, all will also double as cooling units without any extra auxiliary appliances. This will help in communities that are in June inequality impacted by these warmer and warmer summers. Today we have the opportunity to strengthen Washington's leading charge against climate change. Passing the proposed amendment supports builders and appliance choice provides legal future safeguards, and is a large step towards human health and reducing pollution in homes and in communities, in these uncertain times, supporting human health will always lead to future thriving.</p>
Lisa Parshley	<p>I'm a Olympia City Council member. I'm also the chair of the first and mitigation plan planning and steering committee. Our city like Seattle shirline. Tacoma Bellingham have already implemented clean codes with pre similar provisions around heat pumps as of 2021 state energy codes. Delay on code implementation will also delay consistent policy around the State. And that's a that's a difficulty for builders and developers and actually, residents. We need to have a consistent statewide code. We are relying on the Sbcc's work to support our own climate action. Our community members are overwhelmingly telling us they want this work done. They need us to take climate seriously. Olympiawater and Thurston County all have declared a climate emergency. So please consider passing these forward and taking action because you will be helping not only the people of the State of Washington, the developers, the builders, and the city and the counties.</p>
Sarah Sutton	<p>I'm a Washington resident, speaking in my role as CEO of environment and culture partners, a Tacoma based nonprofit with a mission to accelerate environmental and climate action in the cultural sector. Locally and</p>

	<p>nationally. ECP. Supports amendments to these the strongest climate, friendly building codes in the nation. These amendments maintain the efficiency standards of the original code, while allowing flexibility for achieving those efficiencies and incentivizing all electric approaches. This approach makes good climate action accessible to all institutions, including the often overlooked commercial building sector of cultural institutions. This category of cultural institutions includes museums, zoos, Botanical Gardens and aquariums, which are an important part of community, state and national climate action. We know that energy use alone in these institutions contributes 4 million megatons of CO. 2 annually to the US. Carbon pollution case. But this is according to new research conducted by Ecp. In partnership with new Buildings Institute. We also know that this climate action in all types of cultural institutions is expected by both visitors and non visitors, according to research, by Wilkening associates in Seattle. The State Building Codes Council should adopt the proposed amendments, so that Washington State can have codes that provide critical guidance and accessible compliance pathways and support for these charitable educational community minded institutions trying to take positive climate steps.</p>
Jasmine Chiu	<p>I support the Americas all in coalition, a national coalition of subnational organizations, all committed to advancing climate solutions. I first wanted to thank the Council and the committees who worked tirelessly through the proposed amendments. Like many others who have spoken today already, I hope the Council will adopt these amendments to the 2021 Washington State energy Code for both residential and commercial and I specifically want to reiterate support for option. One of the commercial CR. 102. With the recommended changes that arm I made in their comments, submitted yesterday on November twentieth. Some of these recommendations include removing the allowance of supplemental gas heating in air source heat pumps, the inclusion of gas for supplemental heating for air source heat pumps in option. One did not appear in the Tag or MVE meetings, so we believe it should be removed. Other recommendations include amended language for the heat, pump, water, heating credit and also clarification on electric readiness being available for both space and water heating appliances.</p>
Kevin Jones	<p>I live on an island in Puget Sound. King County treasures our island. our forest support their 30 Year forest plan to expand green spaces which sustain habitats, stream functions, carbon storage, clean air. and cool waters and air temperatures. but our forests are threatened every summer we see the threat growing larger and coming closer. No wonder the Vashon Mori Community Council passed a motion on December twentieth of 2021 calling on King County to pass building codes which required heat, pumps for space and water heating in new buildings. Our community passed this motion with overwhelming support. The motion passed by 97%. We care about making buildings more efficient and less climate polluting our forests. Depend on it. Given the wild fire escalation from longer and hotter summer weather. Our lives may also depend on it. Please pass these amendments, build better buildings, save a forest</p>

	protect our lives and livelihoods.
Andrea Hochleutner	<p>I actually submitted my information via email earlier today. I am representing the over 600 members of our Building Association, the Central Washington Home Builders Association. We are building the residential homes here in Central Washington. We have 6 counties that we represent. and unfortunately, they couldn't all be here today. They're out there doing what we ask them to do, which is to build homes. and we care very much about the energy effectiveness of these homes that we are building. However, unfortunately, these current regulations prevent us from building homes that actually meet the demands of our clients and our customers. People can't afford to build these homes. And unfortunately, I don't have enough time to speak to all the issues that are currently facing currently affected by these amendments. We would urge you to consider delaying these amendments until the next code cycle. I would like to reiterate both Steve and Ty's comments not to move forward at this time. While we understand there are limited options. This don't provide the necessary flexibility to create the homes that we need in our, in our home or in our State. We care about making homes energy efficient. However, these regulations prohibit our members from building the homes that we truly need so I would urge you to delay and make the changes that have been submitted in written testimony.</p>
Ruth Sawyer	<p>I am representing the Washington State Sierra Club. I'll keep my message brief. I just wanted to ask the State Building Code Council to pass the amendments to protect strong codes and ensure that new buildings in this State are as climate, friendly and cost effective as possible. We spent a lot of hours this summer talking to people all over all over the State. about. You know what we need to do to move forward and protect our climate. To the extent we can. And we talked a lot about buildings. So a lot of people are thinking about it. We talked about what we need to do. We talked about how we have the technologies that we need to make it happen. yeah. And we're excited to see this move forward. I know we've turned in thousands of comments on this. the public is continuing to weigh in and yeah, really and really, in support of the strongest climate, friendly codes that that we can have.</p>
Jennifer Gilliland	<p>I'm with the Seattle Department of Construction and inspections. Normally, Dwayne Jonlin would be who would be speaking with you today, But he asked me to provide some testimony on his behalf. I just wanted to let you know that at the Department of Construction Inspections we strongly prefer option. One we feel like there are several virtues, virtues to option, one not the least of which is that it sticks most closely to the Council's original charge to the energy Co-technical Advisory Group, which was to solve the problem created by the Ninth Circuit Court decision. While leaving everything else in the code alone and intact. Now, there is one item in this option that you could argue is not strictly necessary for compliance with this court ruling, and that's the electrification readiness, paragraph that was originally placed in option, one to minimize the future cost of a switchover to heat pumps. like, you know. For instance, if it was required by some future legislation. but that being said, it's not strictly</p>

	<p>necessary to comply with Epca. So Seattle Department of Construction inspections will support the Council either in keeping or removing the paragraph. option. One is good for everyone. We think most of the stakeholders. Obviously, one thing we like for Sdci is that our plans and examiners and inspectors will be able to find all the details of this compliance path in the same place in the code owners and engineers that are considering using the fossil fuel option can see the whole picture up front, allowing them to confidently weigh the costs and advantages for their own projects. Jenifer Gilliland: Meanwhile it doesn't clutter up the rest of the code, with complicated exceptions and requirements, so it makes life easier on the applicants. and finally, it. It makes removing the whole pathway very clean. Just in case in the future there's future legislation or a court decision renders it unnecessary, so it would be easy to extract it. And so we definitely support the Council moving forward. With option one.</p>
<p>Scott Peterson</p>	<p>I'm from Richland, Washington. I work with the Northwest Gas Association. Who opposes Council Chambers: these changes to the energy code that serve as a de facto ban on natural gas and new construction, both commercial and residential. So we're asking the Council to oppose these new rules that further restrict even more than the previous energy code that was adopted over this this year. This even further restricts the ability of natural gas to be introduced into new homes. We pose this for a lot of reasons. One is. people just don't want it in our in Independence survey research. 65% of Washingtonians want energy choice. They want the ability to have natural gas in their homes, and with all due respect this unelected Council is not speaking for the people of Washington who want natural gas. Why do they want it? It's great. It's a nicer heat in your home. The ban, although it doesn't mention stoves, is a de facto ban on all gas in homes. So this means no gas fireplaces, no gas stoves, for the most part in new construction, and people want it. They prefer gas for cooking, they just prefer it. And so we're asking the Council to listen to the people who are most affected by these decisions. Now, the Council does have a statutory obligation around efficiency in homes and its own research shows. They're on track to meet that efficiency obligation in 2030 without changing these codes. You're on track to do it just with the 2,018 codes. So the decision to ban natural gas is not a practical decision so much as an ideological decision. So let people choose for themselves what they want in their homes. Lastly, the gas industry continues to improve its system. Not only is it a huge system that delivers energy into Washington that works in power, outages, gas stoves and gas fireplaces but they continue. They're required by law to decarbonize, which they're on track to meeting, and they're showing how they do it. So we're asking the Council to listen to the people and do what we think is the right thing for Washingtonians.</p>
<p>Pat Harris</p>	<p>Want to speak as one of those citizens of Washington. I happen to live in Seattle, but I'm hoping that you will pass these amendments to protect the strong codes and ensure that new buildings in Washington are as climate, friendly and cost effective as possible. I live in a building with an electric</p>

	<p>stove a I did live before in a building with gas, water, gas, stove, gas furnace. Since I've moved into a house without gas I have had less difficulty with my asthma, and I think that cleaning up things in our house environments in our larger buildings is important. So I hope you'll pass those amendments.</p>
<p>Jeff Hansell</p>	<p>I'm with Swift Water Custom Homes. I'm a member of the Central Washington Home Builders Association. I've been in the business for 42 years and have built homes all over the State of Washington currently building in the Central Washington area. I guess I would like to testify to request that we skip this code cycle for the adoption and reconsider this in 2024 everything that's come down the pike at us. With the recent code changes have been very difficult for us to integrate into the home building. That we're doing specifically in a high Alpine climate. It's just causing us to do several things that are outside of our construction norm. The additional costs that are placed on or burdened on the homeowners or the purchasers of our homes is significant. Some of the most recent code changes have increased our cost by anywhere from 15 to \$25,000, and the current code change that you're considering. And my estimation will add probably another 25 to \$30,000 in cost for our homes that we build as we look at the incremental payback in terms of energy savings. It's very minor. We're not achieving the energy savings that we're investing in. Beyond that I think the very supply chain issues we're experiencing around the country have made it very difficult for us to find the materials that we need to use to implement some of the things like the requirement, for, you know, something like a heat pump. Hot water tank. Very challenging to use in some areas. but I guess I would very much encourage you to skip adoption of this code cycle and consider it next year. So we have time to go through. Do more research into how we could implement some of these code changes, but also consider whether these code changes are incrementally acceptable in terms of cost versus energy savings, I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.</p>
<p>David Danton</p>	<p>With a company teso homes. Dba inspire homes. We build out of 5 locations. We build homes all over the State of Washington. Then I am in Burlington, Washington. Oh, yeah, call me positive. Yeah. I, too. know, Jeff. And and state similar to Jeff. That right now. you know, the payback for the current energy code is difficult for our customers to understand and and see how they're truly getting the financial benefit of these and by extending these to what the proposals are that I've seen so far, are very expensive to do the materials to do some of them are gonna most likely be impossible to find. I've told, been told that we're very tied in with the manufacturers and distributors. and they said that some of the items if this goes into effect, will not be able to be supplied in the State in in a rapid enough speed, and we'll hold construction up immensely. And the cost of that right now. Our customers are already having difficulties finding the dollars to consider building a home today. And this is just gonna exasperate that for what half the State is in a a very mild climate and some of the proposed items makes sense, maybe in more harsh climates, but in half the state the proposals that are being made simply,</p>

	<p>financially. Don't make sense for customers home cost is a difficult, difficult thing for buyers right now. And this is just gonna add, as Jeff said, another 20 to \$30,000 of expenses, and I think that really needs to be looked at before this before our new code is implemented.</p>
Stuart Dreebeck	<p>With a direct contractors. I'm government affairs. Chair of Olympia, master Builders. Builder, for 35 years. continual increase in cost of housing is making housing unaffordable to nearly everyone. Now the ratcheting up as high as it's going on every level. it purely makes it less affordable. The elimination of natural gas is very short sighted, and there is no way to make up for that kind of therm loss in the bill. In the electrical infrastructure that now exists. there isn't any reason to change from where we are, and we should adopt the 2024 IBC. Energy code. That goes with.</p>
Mike Nykreim	<p>Newport, West Llc. Out of W. Washington. I like to speak on behalf of energy security. if we move to an all electric system, we will lose energy security across her state case in point. Last week the wind only blew 40 miles an hour, and Bellevue lost 2 PSE. Lost 2,000 customers in an urban neighborhood of Bellevue. 2,000 customers were without power for 12 h. Some 18 years ago as as a builder here in the Kirkland area. The wind blew. Hit about 50, 60 miles an hour, and PSE. Lost power to well over a quarter of a million customers lost power for a week. Had it not been for natural gas as a backup system for people's energy security, there would have been no heat, no cooking very little habitability of homes across Greater Puget Sound. When I was a kid the Columbus day storm came through in October of 1962 hit a hundred miles an hour. When I was a kid. We didn't have near the trees that we have now today in our neighborhoods that when storm's coming again, and when it does, it's going to blow down trees and limbs, it will collapse. The overhead infrastructure without natural gas people literally will die. So until PSE. Can put together an energy infrastructure, give us the security that we have to day. We cannot ban natural gas and on this side, through natural gas systems, we can lower our CO. 2 output. I'm speaking to you in a truck that I converted one of one of about 7 trucks I've converted. They run on natural gas. My truck runs 30%. Cleaner CO. 2, than gasoline vehicles. We must maintain our natural gas infrastructure until we have 100% energy security liability 100% equal to what we have now with natural gas.</p>
Judson Willis	<p>I'm here representing as co-founder of the Home Building Energy Efficiency Academy out of Olympia. Washington. Appreciate your time and allowing me to provide testimony, and what I'd like to do is provide a quick testimony into the fact that I've traveled all over the United States talking with multiple builders, national builders, regional builders, talking to them about their issues that they're having. And one of the biggest issues is not really being able to sell inventory because of the high mortgage rates, the volatility of the market client affordability issues. And it's really stemming mostly because of the interest rates are so high and where they're gonna continue to be. But they're actually having to cut from their bottom line profits just to be able to give up the concessions, so that consumers can afford their homes. And this is this is relevant between Dr.</p>

	<p>Horton, Lenar, Katie home, you know, all the way down to the small little mom and pop builders that are they're building custom on their loss. And so what I've done is, I've created a a path forward for them to be able to take advantage of appraisal processes, mostly green appraisal processes that give them value for building a more energy, efficient, higher performance, home and essentially take that value from building a better home and utilize that as a an incentive from the seller. So it actually helps with affordability. And essentially, where I'm going with this is that that's all great when it's combined with the 2024 energy code. As I've read it. And as I've seen it, this essentially provides a path forward, performance base instead of prescriptive. And every builder that I've talked with is well under 60 hers, which is really what the single family Green Bond program for Freddie and Fanny. It kind of stipulates that they must have at least the 60 hers energy star compliant 3.1 right now, one to 3.2 here soon, and they're all most the builders that I know are hitting that but they're not getting any value for it. And so that's because they're they're following the prescriptive path, putting these pieces and po components and techniques together based on the prescriptive path. But if they had a performance based path. I appreciate that it could actually lower the cost of construction and then get additional value from the green appraisals that have been around for decades and actually mostly helps save in an appraisal industry. Because right now appraisers are hurting workforce development hurting builders are hurting. Consumers are hurting. So I've got multiple case studies and a lot of paperwork that I put together. There'd be more than happy to share with anybody to be interested in that. But basically here to say that I wish we could look at the 2024 adoption code a little quicker.</p>
<p>Debbi Boyd</p>	<p>Co-owner of real estate the South Sound in Olympia. Washington. I urge you to skip this code cycle and adopt the 2024 i. Ecc. As soon as possible. This code is over complicated eliminates choices by penalizing gas units, users. We have added way too much to the cost of housing. Home prices are already high with the cost of permits, building and interest rates that we are pricing out our home buyers in Washington State.</p>
<p>Kurt Swanson</p>	<p>I'm with the Washington State Association of the United Association of Plumbers, Pipe Fitters, and HVAC. Refrigeration technicians. I'm also a proud United Association Local 32 member. and I'm a former natural gas worker. the WSA. Represents over 9,500 UA. Members working in Washington State. I speak in opposition to these proposed code changes and ask that the SBCC. Not implement these code changes. Kurt Swanson: Our members have built significant portions of the natural gas system in Washington State. They work every day to supply energy to homes and businesses in our region. Our members are proud to work on natural gas systems, and they earn family level wages and good benefits, and they're proud to be in the energy supply business. Our members do not agree with these proposed restrictions on natural gas, and they believe that this level of interference and energy choice is an overreach by the State Building Code Council. Adopting these changes will place additional cost burdens on energy consumers in our state. our members serve,</p>

	interact with these energy consumers daily. We do not agree with proposed code changes Kurt Swanson: as they serve as a de facto ban on natural gas. We know that the businesses and homeowners that use this valuable energy source agree with us, and so we respectfully ask the State Building Co Council. Please do not ban our State's citizens access to natural gas, and please do not limit our citizens. Energy choices.
Michael Currier	I'm with Sigma drafting and design services. I do home design for new construction additions, remodels in the South Sound area. I'm speaking on behalf of just my company. I agree with many of the points I've heard today and brought up by previous speakers. I agree that we should skip this code cycle and move on to the adoption of the 2024 energy code at a future date. Mainly, this would give us, in the industry, especially on the design side, ample opportunity to become familiar with a completed energy code, and how we would apply it to our you know, our designs as a home designer. Part of my job is to help my clients navigate the already confusing code options and credit choices that they see. So me, having a rock, solid understanding on all of the options available, is pretty critical to control major construction costs that will impact homeowners directly. So again, please consider skipping this code cycle in favor of adopting the 2024 energy code at an appropriate time.
Bart Hansen	I am the executive director of the Building Industry Association of Clark County and also a Vancouver City Council member, and I do not speak on behalf of the Vancouver City Council. I want to make that very clear upfront. First and foremost, I would like to skip this code cycle and adopt the 2,024 international energy code. And the reason I would like to go down. This path is based on the affordable housing issues that we are. We're trying to work through here in Vancouver, Washington, and Clark County. We have in the city of Vancouver about 7,500 units that were behind in building. We need to be building about 1,500 units a year to keep up with the growth. People are moving to Clark County in record numbers, and especially Vancouver, and keeping up with that growth can be rather difficult by adding. You know, more stringent codes to energy, measures that go on the homes that is going to add to the cost of the homes and further exacerbates the problem. So you know, I also worked at the local power utility here for 23 years. So these measures are going to be difficult to achieve in order to keep the price down. I'm a big fan of incentives. I'm not a big fan of mandates that that drives people to and builders to want to get there. But it's the energy code being so stringent that can be difficult on affordable housing. And when you look at the price of a home here in Clark County. Your average is around \$550,000. Are youth are not going to have the opportunity to get into a starter home. We're doing anything we can to find starter homes. And when you look at the growth of ads in our community. And you look at the lack of land. It's difficult to achieve this, and every little bit helps. So that would be my 2 cents. And I really appreciate you taking the time. And once again, everything I'm saying does not represent the city of Vancouver. These are my personal comments
Joshua Mergens	I'm a principal and co-owner of balance structural engineering, and I'm

	<p>speaking both on behalf of myself and of the company. I just wanted to echo many of the concerns that been raised by others in our industry. In particular, I believe we need to better address the vulnerability of rural homes during winter conditions that could leave them without electricity for extended periods of time and kind of the necessity of alternative sources of heat for the safety of those occupants. Also. Given that we're nearly through this code cycle. I believe it makes sense to move forward to the 2024 Washington State energy code. With these considerations in mind for potential revisions. And that's a that's essentially it. So I thank you folks for the opportunity to share my concerns and encourage everyone to move forward to the 2024 Washington State energy code, considering a lot of the public comments that have been made.</p>
Adjourn	The Hearing was adjourned at 2:02 p.m.

DRAFT