



STATE OF WASHINGTON

## STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

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.sbcc.wa.gov](http://www.sbcc.wa.gov)

### Commercial Energy Code Technical Advisory Group Meeting Review Notes for February 14, 2025

**TAG Members Present:** Kjell Anderson, Chair; Larry Andrews; Kim Barker; Erik Bedell; \*Andi Burnham; \*Ian Casey; \*Kevin Charap; \*Brett Conway; Alessandra de la Torre; Kevin Duell, Luke Howard; Gregory Johnson; Nathan Miller; Margaret Montgomery; Irina Rasputnis; Sloan Richie; \*Kevin Roberts; Lisa Rosenow; \*Deepa Sivarajan; Poppy Storm; Irina Susorova; Shaun Vig; Markus Virta

**TAG Members Absent:** \*Todd Blevins, \*Rick Blumenthal, \*Marty Brennan, \*Shailesh Desai, Duane Jonlin, \*Nick Massie, \*Erik Olnon, \*Premkumar Siddharth

**Visitors Present:** Todd Beyreuther, Tom Handy, Ben Omura, Katy Sheehan, Jason Armstrong, Tim Attebery, Sven Bortlesen, Gunnar Brent, Andrew Daw, Lindsey Gaunt, Supriya Goel, Brenden Guffin, Pragya Gupta, Patrick Hanks, Gary Heikkinen, Darin Homchick, Adam Hutchinson, Bryan Imai, Eric Lacey, S. Leinenwever, Dan Luddy, Anthony Muai, Dave Nehren, Kathleen Petrie, David Reddy, Erik Reed, Kevin Rose, Michael Rosenberg, Kerry Sutton, Kelly Thomas, Elizabeth Torske, Eric Vander Mey

**Staff:** Krista Braaksma

\* indicates an alternate member

Agenda Items	TAG Actions
1. Welcome and Introductions	Meeting called to order at 8:30 a.m. Kjell Anderson welcomed everyone, and roll was called.
2. Review and Approve <a href="#">Agenda</a>	Patrick Hayes requested that 087 be moved to the top of the agenda. The agenda was approved as modified.
3. Review and Approve meeting notes from <a href="#">September 27, 2024</a> , and <a href="#">October 25, 2024</a>	The summary minutes were approved as written for both the September 27 and October 25, 2024, meetings.
4. Review of Proposals	
<a href="#">24-GP1-087</a>	Patrick Hayes stated that his proposal would remove the illustration from the definition of “Mass Transfer Deck Slab.” The illustration itself is confusing because that configuration is rarely seen. It was suggested that Patrick provide an illustration showing a more typical application.  <b>Kevin Duell moved to table discussion on 087 until the next meeting. Lisa Rosenow seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.</b>

<p><a href="#">24-GP1-205</a></p>	<p>Greg Johnson stated he wanted to clarify that the proposal didn't seek to abandon all the previous work but to look at this as another option for consideration by the Council and through public hearings. If proponents felt their petitions could also apply to the IECC, those petitions could be included. The Council would, of course, select only one option as the final adopted code. The simplification workgroup established at the last meeting could also look at the IECC language. This would go a long way in solving the I-2066 and EPCA issues.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the logistics of revising proposals to be based on IECC language and the time needed, how the changes would differ from what is already done in preparation of the integrated draft, if there were other paths to comply with I-2066, and how to ensure the retention of the current efficiency gains. They also discussed how this may interact with the work being done by the simplification workgroup.</p> <p><b>Greg Johnson moved to recommend approval of 24-GP1-205 as a parallel path option. Larry Andrews seconded the motion. The motion failed, 4 to 11.</b></p>
<p><a href="#">24-GP1-282</a></p>	<p>Larry Andrews noted that the 2015 code was the last version that did not have equipment preferences. The TAG can go through the code to integrate efficiency measures from the 2018 and 2021 code and all new petitions. He felt it would be a significant cost savings and would result in energy savings from not having cooling where it wasn't needed.</p> <p>The TAG again discussed the time and logistics for reviewing and revising proposals, and whether there would be energy savings or a step backwards in efficiency.</p> <p><b>Lisa Rosenow moved to disapprove 24-GP1-282. Erik Bedell seconded the motion. The motion carried, 13 to 1 with two abstentions.</b></p>
<p><a href="#">24-GP1-160</a></p>	<p>Ian Casey introduced his proposal to eliminate the total system performance ratio requirement. This requirement, introduced in 2018, is an additional compliance path placed on top of the prescriptive path and is based on carbon emissions, which is outside the scope of the energy code. In other codes with a TSPR requirement, it is considered an alternate compliance path, not an additional requirement.</p>
<p><a href="#">24-GP1-210</a></p>	<p>Lisa Rosenow and David Reddy spoke to the proposal on behalf of PNNL. The proposal aligns with I-2066 by removing the carbon emissions metric and moving to site energy. It also adds air to water heat pumps as a supported system type. It also allows for more detailed thermal zoning and responds to other items raised by users as outlined in the description.</p> <p>The TAG went through the proposal discussing the various changes and the intent and sources behind them. There was also a brief discussion about site versus source energy. There was a request that PNNL be available to address some of the questions, and David offered to facilitate a workgroup discussion with PNNL. Several typographical errors were corrected as the TAG moved</p>

	<p>through the document. The TAG also discussed the value of TSPR as the prescriptive path moves towards the statutory efficiency goal.</p>
	<p><b>Kevin Duell moved to table both 160 and 210</b> to a subsequent meeting, to allow time for a workgroup to address the questions Lisa and David were unable to answer. <b>Greg Johnson seconded the motion. The motion failed, 6 to 7 with two abstentions.</b></p> <p><b>Poppy Storm moved to accept petition <a href="#">24-GP1-210 as revised</a></b>, with the intent to modify it later as subsequent proposals are reviewed and accepted. <b>Lisa Rosenow seconded the motion. The motion carried, 12 to 2 with two abstentions.</b></p> <p><b>Larry Andrews moved to accept petition 24-GP1-160. Greg Johnson seconded the motion. The motion failed, 4 to 10 with two abstentions.</b></p>
<a href="#">24-GP1-203</a>	<p>Greg Johnson felt his petition would help bring transparency to the code and allow peer review of the credit calculation methods. This would not require publication of all the calculations in the new appendix; it could just contain hyperlinks to them.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal and the benefits and drawbacks. The TAG concluded that it should specifically reference Section C406 in the scope. It was also felt that the language in G101.3 was too vague and overly burdensome on the jurisdictions. Ultimately, the TAG determined that G101.3 should be removed.</p> <p><b>Erik Bedell moved to recommend adoption of <a href="#">24-GP1-203 as revised</a>. Greg Johnson seconded the motion. The motion carried, 11 to 0, with four abstentions.</b></p>
<a href="#">24-GP1-206</a>	<p>Greg Johnson presented his next petition to define the basis for energy use—site or source energy. It would also require PNNL to recalculate all credit values based on each method. The petition also includes some edits to the intent section that don't seem pertinent to the WSEC.</p> <p>Kjell argued that, as a policy issue, the site vs. source determination should be a Council decision. The TAG agreed.</p> <p><b>Erik Bedell moved to recommend adoption of <a href="#">24-GP1-206 as revised</a>. Greg Johnson seconded the motion. The motion carried, 13 to 0, with three abstentions.</b></p>
<a href="#">24-GP1-248</a>	<p>Eric Vander Mey spoke to his petition to insert a new section allowing the code official to modify the code provisions provided it met the specified criteria. The key specification would be item 4, maintains or improves the energy efficiency. This section is based on similar code language in other model codes.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal. There was some feeling that this did not bring anything to the code that was not already stated in C103.1. It was felt that item 3 was a bit vague and agreed that language more closely modeled on the IMC requirement would be an improvement.</p>

	<b>Greg Johnson moved to recommend approval of <a href="#">24-GP1-248 as revised</a>. Kevin Duell seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote with one opposing vote.</b>
	Having come to the end of the allotted meeting time, the remaining items on the agenda will be continued to a future meeting.
5. Meeting Schedule	The next meeting will be next Friday, February 28, at 8:30am. It was requested that a draft schedule of future meetings be sent out, with as much detail as possible. Kjell noted that the meetings on February 28 and March 7 would both run until 3 pm to try to ensure the TAG gets through all the petitions in the allotted time.
6. Other Business	None, due to lack of time.
7. Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 1:58 p.m.