



STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

Department of Enterprise Services

1500 Jefferson • P.O. Box 41449 • Olympia, Washington 98504-1449
(360) 407-9280 • fax (360) 586-5366 • e-mail sbcc@ga.wa.gov • www.ga.wa.gov/sbcc

Residential Energy Code Technical Advisory Group Meeting Review Notes for February 27, 2025

Agenda Items	TAG Actions
1. Welcome and Introductions	<p>The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. Kjell Anderson welcomed everyone and thanked them for volunteering to work on the Technical Advisory Group. He provided an overview of the expectations and rules for the TAG. Roll was called and a quorum was present.</p> <p>Staff was asked to provide Member Type, Name of Members, Primary or Alternate seat, and email addresses to the TAG.</p>
	<p>TAG Members Present: TAG Chair Kjell Anderson, *Anne Anderson, *Larry Andrews, Tom Balderston Kim Barker, Julie Blazek, Rick Blumenthal, *Michael Brasgalla, Wade Craig, Greg Davenport, Kevin Duell, Jason Garrod, *Patrick Hanks, Luke Howard, Gregory Johnson, Duane Jonlin, *Jonah Kinchy, *Jon Lange, Shane Nilles, Irina Rasputnis, Albert Rooks, Deepa Sivarajan, Poppy Storm, Gavin Tenold, *Elizabeth Torske, Joel Ward</p> <p>TAG Members Absent: *Daimon Doyle, *Michael Beanland, *Shailesh Desai</p> <p>Visitors Present: Councilmember Todd Beyreuther, Councilmember Tom Handy, Tim Attebery, Joseph Briscar, Ian Casey, Nate Geller, Anne Gire, M. Heizer, Bryan Imai, Harshad Inamdar, Jonathan Jones, Rob Kilmer, Tim Lincoln, Amanda Lo, Ken Morgan, D. Scott Peterson, Tena Risley, Kevin Rose, Kerry Sutton, Kelly Thomas</p> <p>Staff: Dustin Curb, Krista Braaksma</p> <p style="text-align: right;">* Indicates an alternate member</p>
2. Review and Approve Agenda	<p>Motion: Greg Johnson and Duane Jonlin moved to approve the agenda as written. The motion carried with no opposing votes.</p>
3. Timeline and Outline of the Adoption Process and Expectations	<p>Kjell Anderson provided a broad overview of the process and explained the rules for voting of the Primary and Alternate seats. He also provided an overview of the website and how to find information for the meetings.</p> <p>Last cycle the TAG was able to get through the Integrated Draft in one meeting and that is the goal of the meeting today.</p> <p>Patrick Hanks noted the Council's Policies and Procedures dictates that three reports be drafted and forwarded to the Council—existing amendments, significant changes and committee proposed changes. He suggested that these items be identified as the TAG moves through the draft.</p>
4. Set Meeting Schedule	<p>Kjell noted the TAG will typically meet on Fridays. After the Integrated Draft is reviewed, the TAG will not meet again until code change petitions are</p>

	<p>received and forwarded to the TAG. In addition to the regularly scheduled submittal cycle for the 2024 code, the Council has also opened a submittal window for proposals to the 2021 code dealing with Initiative 2066 issues. That submittal window will close on April 14, 2025. The window for the 2024 code will likely open after the Council's March 21 meeting. It is unknown at this time what the closing date will be.</p>
--	--

5. Introduction and Review of Integrated Draft–2024 Washington State Energy Code-Residential

<p><i>2024 WSEC ID Draft</i></p>	<p>Krista Braaksma walked the TAG through the integrated draft document and associated comments. She provided explanation for the different colors of text. The draft on screen has some comments from Duane Jonlin; these had been submitted to staff prior to the meeting. The TAG then began review for potential code change proposals, minor modifications, acceptance, or rejection of the 2024 IECC language.</p> <p>Anne Anderson asked why the IECC Section R408 was not included in the draft. She believes it would be an important I-2066 response to move away from the WSEC Section R406. It would also allow envelope tradeoffs, which would be a big cost savings.</p> <p>Kjell Anderson noted the Council needs to comply with a were a number of different RCWs, not just those modified by I-2066. The Integrated Draft combines the most stringent portions of both the WSEC and the IECC. He believes the WSEC R406 provisions require more efficiency than the 2024 IECC Section R408. However, the TAG is free to make whatever recommendations and modifications they deem necessary. It is also possible to make any change through the code proposal process.</p>
----------------------------------	---

<p><i>Chapter 1</i></p>	<p>Kim Barker and Duane Jonlin both noted that Section R101.2 Scope is missing some necessary language to reference that the dwelling units should be accessed from the interior and not the building itself. The TAG concurred with the change.</p> <p>The TAG debated Section R101.3 and whether the language should match the changes made for the commercial provisions. After a motion to match that language was made and withdrawn, the TAG concluded that the IECC intent did not match the policies outlined in the statute.</p> <p>Motion: Kim Barker and Poppy Storm moved to retain the WSEC language in Section C101.3 Intent. The motion carried by voice vote with no dissention.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">— — —</p> <p>Greg Johnson and Duane Jonlin agreed with the Commercial Energy TAG that Section R103 was not necessary and should be removed.</p> <p>Motion: Gregory Johnson and Duane Jonlin moved to remove Section R103 Code Compliance Agency, in its entirety. The motion carried by voice vote with no dissention.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">— — —</p> <p>The TAG agreed with Duane Jonlin's comment that an item should be added to the construction documents list in Section R105.2 addressing the selection of energy credits.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the new Section R105.2.2 and whether it was needed or enforceable. They discussed removing the specifications for showing the conduit routing. It was argued that this made future installation less costly and unsightly.</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>Motion: Shane Nilles and Gregory Johnson moved to strike “and the routing of conduit or prewiring from the <i>solar-ready zone</i> to an electrical service panel or plumbing from the <i>solar-ready zone</i> to a <i>service water heating system</i>” in Section R105.2.2. The motion failed, 3 to 10 with two abstentions.</p> <p>It was noted this section should be flagged as a significant change.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">— — —</p> <p>Motion: K Shane Nilles and Gregory Johnson moved to modify Section R106.1 to modify the 2024 language, keeping the switch from “issued” to “valid” but retaining the punctuation from the 2021 code to not begin a second sentence with the word “Nor.” The motion passed by voice vote with one dissenting vote.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">— — —</p> <p>The TAG discussed the existing WSEC Section R105.2.2.1 Wall insulation inspection and the new 2024 IECC Section R107.2.6 Insulation and fenestration rough-in inspection. It was noted that there are two types of insulation—continuous and interior and R107.2.6 only address interior.</p> <p>Motion: Shane Nilles and Kim Barker moved to eliminate R105.2.2.1 and incorporate the 2024 IECC Section R107.2.6. The motion was modified to include the addition of “or exterior” after “the application of interior.” The motion carried by voice vote with no dissention.</p>
<i>Chapter 2</i>	<p>Kim Barker felt the IECC definitions for above grade wall and below grade wall should be incorporated. There doesn’t seem to be any reason to have a state amendment. It was suggested that she pursue this via a code change proposal.</p> <p>Duane Jonlin voiced concern about the new definition for duct system including any part of the HVAC system connected to the ductwork. It was suggested that he pursue this via a code change proposal, keeping in mind this change is linked to one in the mechanical code.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the retention of the ERI definition while the ERI provision of the IECC are not currently adopted. After a motion was made and then withdrawn, it was determined to retain the definition until after determination if there would be an ERI pathway in the WSEC.</p> <p>It was noted that the definition of low voltage lighting isn’t referenced within the code and doesn’t align with the current market. Again, it was suggested this be handled through a code change proposal.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">— — —</p> <p>The TAG discussed the definition of roof replacement and whether it should include taking the roof down to above deck insulation. Shane felt it should be retained as is until the TAG discussed the related technical provision in Chapter 5</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin and Tom Balderston moved to modify the definition of “Roof Replacement” by including the provision to remove materials down to insulation. The motion carried with one opposing vote.</p>
<i>Chapter 3</i>	<p>No changes were suggested.</p> <p>Duane Jonlin commented on the exception to the new Section R303.1.6 Airspaces and whether it was needed as weepholes can’t really be considered as ventilation. It was suggested he pursue this via code change.</p>

<p><i>Chapter 4</i></p>	<p>Patrick Hanks noted that Section R401.2 Compliance would need to be revisited if an ERI path were to be included.</p> <p>Duane Jonlin noted that under R402.1 there should be three compliance paths rather than just the two shown in the IECC. There should be a U-factor, R-value or component performance.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin and Kim Barker moved to modify Section R402.1 to provide for U-factor, R-value and Component performance paths. The motion carried by voice vote with no dissention.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">— — —</p> <p>The TAG discussed the U-factor and R-value tables for insulation requirements and the differences between the WSEC and IECC values. There was robust debate on the values for ceiling and wall insulation and the value of increased insulation.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin moved to include the more stringent values in Tables R402.1.2 and R402.1.3. Julie Blazek seconded the motion. The motion carried, 10 to 5 with one abstention.</p> <p>Motion: Rick Blumenthal and Greg Davenport moved to include the U-0.045 value for above grade walls in Table R402.1.2. The motion carried 12 to 0 with four abstentions.</p> <p>Patrick Hanks noted this should be flagged as a significant change/cost increase.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">— — —</p> <p>In Section R402.2.7, Duane Jonlin noted that items 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 don't specify the amount of insulation required and suggested adding "complying with the required wall insulation values" to provide guidance. The TAG concurred.</p> <p>In Section R402.4.5, Kim Barker pointed out a section reference that needed to be updated.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">— — —</p> <p>For Table R402.5.1.1, Duane Jonlin brought up several concerns. In the ceiling/attic section, it seems like the requirements would create an uninsulated pocket on the exterior wall to grow fungus. Tom Balderston stated it was very similar to the Energy Star requirements and is an important air sealing detail. He agreed to help Duane with a code change proposal.</p> <p>In the Windows, skylights and doors section, Duane voiced concern that there was no insulation required in the gap between the window and the framing. It was felt this needed to be discussed in more detail before changes were made.</p> <p>Motion: Albert Rooks and Duane Jonlin moved to retain the language as presented in the Integrated Draft for the Windows section of Table R402.5.1.1. The motion carried by voice vote with no dissent.</p> <p>In the Floors section, Duane questioned the last sentence in the air barrier criteria. What exactly does "enclosed" mean in this context?</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin and Albert Rooks moved to strike the last sentence in the air barrier column of the Floors section of Table R402.5.1.1. The motion carried via voice vote with no dissention.</p>
-------------------------	---

In the Common walls section, Duane questioned the use of the word “recognized” in the Insulation column.

Motion: Duane Jonlin and Albert Rooks moved to replace the word “recognized” with “included” in the Insulation column of the **Common wall row of Table R402.5.1.1**. The **motion carried** by voice vote with no opposition.

Duane also felt that IC = insulation contact should be removed from the bottom of the table as the term is not used within the table. The TAG concurred.

Lastly, Footnote b is only noted on the Rim Joist row where it really isn’t applicable.

Motion: Duane Jonlin and Greg Davenport moved to delete **footnote b** from the Rim Joist row and add it to the Ceiling/Attic row in **Table R402.5.1.1**. The **motion carried** via voice vote with no dissention.

— — —

Kim Barker felt that the Dwelling unit leakage rate in Sections R402.5.1.3.1 and R402.5.1.3.2 should also reference sleeping units as in the model code. The TAG debated the applicability of adding sleeping units to this section and determined that any change should be via a code change petition.

Kim also suggested adding a pointer or renumbering the code to point to the Fireplace section of the code, which was moved to R402.4.6 in the WSEC but is under Section R402.6 in the IECC and move Maximum fenestration U-factor to R402.7. Krista stated that may cause some confusion during the public hearing process. The TAG concluded to leave it as is for now.

— — —

Duane Jonlin noted that the requirements in Item 4 of Section R403.3.3 conflict with Section R403.3.9. He suggested striking all of item 4. After discussion, the TAG determined that returning to the 2021 WSEC language would be best.

Motion: Duane Jonlin and Albert Rooks moved to revert back to the **2021 WSEC language in Item 4 of Section R403.3.3**. The **motion carried** unanimously via voice vote.

The TAG briefly discussed the requirements within the two buried duct sections of the code but made no changes. It was suggested that a code change may be forthcoming.

Duane Jonlin suggested striking the second sentence of Exception 3 to Section R403.3.6. This would remove redundant language.

Motion: Duane Jonlin and Albert Rooks moved to strike the last sentence in **Exception 3 to Section R403.3.6**. The **motion carried** unanimously by voice vote.

— — —

The TAG discussed the differences between the IECC and WSEC language in Section R403.5.3 for pipe insulation. A motion was made and withdrawn to incorporate the IECC requirements. It was ultimately determined to keep the simpler, more enforceable language of the WSEC.

The TAG discussed a number of items within R406 for later code change proposals.

	<p style="text-align: center;">- - -</p> <p>The TAG discussed the deicing systems in Section R403.9.3 and concurred with the Commercial Energy Code TAG's modification</p> <p>Motion: Gregory Johnson and Albert Rooks moved to modify section R403.9.3 to remove Item 2. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.</p> <p>Patrick Hanks noted this should be flagged as a modification.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- - -</p> <p>Gregory Johnson noted the new lighting controls requirement in R404 should be flagged as a significant change. It is not a cost issue so much as a usability issue. The TAG discussed the requirements briefly and it was noted that this would probably receive a code change proposal.</p> <p>The TAG also discussed the REC documentation requirements and how it fits in with the site vs. source discussion. The TAG noted it should be flagged for possible action after the Council determination.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- - -</p> <p>The TAG discussed the inclusion of "as-built" in Section R405.4.2 for the and debated its applicability. A motion was made and withdrawn, with the final determination that there is some advantage to retaining the requirement for the building performance specifications.</p> <p>The TAG discussed a number of issues within Table R405.4.2(1). Most will be the subject of later code change proposals. Two items were modified by the TAG. The first was to retain the current language for the proposed design for air leakage rate as it is not possible to use a measured air leakage rate for a building that hasn't been built.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin and Gavin Tenold moved to retain "As proposed." for the proposed design in the air leakage rate row of Table R405.4.2(1). The motion carried with one opposing vote.</p> <p>The second was under the Thermal distribution systems row, where Kevin Rose noted this change should be flagged as significant. The new requirements allow for envelope trade offs for efficient HVAC equipment and is a rollback.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin and Greg Davenport moved to retain the 2021 WSEC language for the Thermal distribution system row of Table R405.4.2(1). The motion carried, 10 to 2 with one abstention.</p>
6. Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 1:37 p.m.