



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 June 13, 2025

TAG Members Present: Kjell Anderson, Chair; *Anne Anderson; *Larry Andrews; Tom Balderston; Kim Barker; Julie Blazek; Rick Blumenthal; *Michael Brasgalla; Greg Davenport; Kevin Duell; Jason Garrood; *Nate Geller; *Patrick Hanks; Gregory Johnson; Duane Jonlin; *Jonah Kinchy; *Jonny Kocher; *Nick Manning; Shane Nilles; Irina Rasputnis; *Bryan Russo; Deepa Sivarajan; Poppy Storm; *Alexis Suggs; *Elizabeth Torske

TAG Members Absent: *Michael Beanland; *Shailesh Desai; Wade Craig; Luke Howard; *John Lange; Albert Rooks; Gavin Tenold; *Joel Ward

Visitors Present: Katya Bautista, David Baylon, Joseph Briscar, Ian Casey, Tristan E. Grant, Gary Heikkinen, Daaniya Iyaz, Eric Lacey, Duane Lewellen, James Lee, Alex Mondau, Mike Moore, Ken Morgan, Sheri Newbold, Morgan Nielsen, Nick O'Neil, Kathleen Petrie, Kevin Rose, Rob Salcido, Lia Sommer, Steve Tapio, Jeb Thornburg

Staff: Krista Braaksma, Rozanna Ghanie

* 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. A quorum was present. Kjell noted the petitions have now been formally referred from the State Building Code Council to the TAG for review. Meetings will be scheduled this summer as needed to meet the statutory deadlines for adoption. Currently, the TAG is scheduled to meet on June 20 from 8:30 to 3:00, June 27 from 10:00 to 3:00, and July 11 from 8:30 to 3:00. The MVPE Committee is scheduled to consider the proposals referred from the TAG on July 18. |
| 2. Review and Approve Agenda | The agenda was approved as written. |
| 3. Review and Approve meeting notes from May 30, 2025 | The meeting notes from the May 30, 2025, meeting were approved as written. |

| 4. Review of Petitions | |
|--|--|
| 24-RE-002 24-RE-026 | <p>The TAG began the discussion with the petitions from Gregory Johnson and Patrick Hanks to replace the WSEC Residential Provisions with the IECC Residential Provisions. Kjell reminded the TAG that a workgroup was formed to see what may be possible for the 2027 cycle for this and Patrick Hanks' 026, since there was little support for them this cycle. Patrick Hanks asked if the workgroup has met since the May TAG meeting and was informed that it had not. He suggested that the workgroup report back before the proposals are voted down.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin moved to disapprove 002 and 026. Greg Davenport seconded the motion.</p> <p>Amendatory Motion: Larry Andrews moved to table 026 to allow the proponent additional time to present the proposal. Kevin Duell seconded the motion. The motion carried, 8 to 7.</p> <p>Vote on amended motion: Carried, 10 to 5.</p> |
| 24-RE-023 | <p>Patrick Hanks presented his petition to remove some of the requirements for solar ready systems from the new IECC language. This came out of one of the BIAW town hall style meetings where members voiced concerns that including this on the plans was unnecessary and burdensome. It's just not necessary at the permit application level.</p> <p>The TAG reviewed the petition and made suggestions to modify the first paragraph to ensure the design loads indicated were for the area of the solar ready zone, not the entire roof assembly. Larry Andrews felt L&I should review the proposal before the TAG acts. Other members felt that would be unnecessary as there were no technical impacts related to the electrical code. The TAG continued to argue whether the complete IECC text was necessary.</p> <p>Motion 1: Larry Andrews moved to table 023 for L&I review. Kevin Duell seconded the motion. The motion failed, 2 to 12 with one abstention.</p> <p>Motion 2: Duane Jonlin moved to disapprove 023, stating it would be better to include this information and be ready to move forward with solar later. Kim Barker seconded the motion. The motion failed, 4 to 8 with three abstentions.</p> <p>Motion 3: Shane Nilles moved to approve 023 as modified. Larry Andrews seconded the motion. The motion carried, 8 to 7.</p> |
| 24-RE-014 | <p>Rick Blumenthal presented his petition on blown in blanket insulation inspection. He stated that the only way to verify that it is installed at the correct density is to weigh a sample. This is typically done about every 500 to 600 square feet, and then the pertinent information is written on the insulation above the tested area.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal and noted that it does not describe the process as stated by the proponent. It was also noted that it would not</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| | <p>typically be possible to include the information from the manufacturer at the permitting stage. The proponent agreed the changes to Section R105.2 could be struck from the proposal. The TAG also felt this information would be better in the insulation details under Section R303.1.1.</p> <p>Motion: Tom Balderston moved to table 014 to allow the proponent to modify to address the comments provided. Greg Davenport seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote with one opposing.</p> <p>Greg Davenport and Tom Balderston offered to help Rick with the revisions.</p> |
| <u>24-RE-011</u> | <p>Rick Blumenthal introduced his petition to address continuous insulation inspections to ensure correct installation of control layers.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal. While they appreciated the attempt to bring some clarity to the issue, they had concerns about several technical aspects, including the specification of a registered design professional (which isn't required for residential structures in Washington) and the assumptions on the location of the air barrier.</p> <p>Motion: Shane Nilles moved to disapprove 011. Duane Jonlin seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.</p> |
| <u>24-RE-024</u> | <p>This proposal was tabled due to the absence of the proponent.</p> |
| <u>24-RE-048</u> | <p>Sheri Newbold spoke to her petition adding another building type allowed under the residential energy code to address missing middle housing and correlate with the work being done by the ad hoc TAG on Single Exit / Multiplex Housing.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal. Duane Jonlin spoke against carving out a specific exception for one building type. It was also suggested the proponent clarify the language regarding being able to choose which code to use. It was suggested that much of the language be moved into the scoping section in R101.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin moved to postpone action on 048 to allow the proponent to further modify the petition language. Tom Balderston seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.</p> |
| <u>24-RE-025</u> | <p>This proposal was tabled due to the absence of the proponent.</p> |
| <u>24-RE-001</u> | <p>This proposal was initially skipped over but was addressed approximately three hours later when the proponent's representative arrived.</p> <p>Jeb Thornberg spoke to the petition regarding adding footnotes to the prescriptive tables setting specific thermal values for cross laminated timber. It would also add in lines to the Appendix CA table for building materials.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal and asked if there was specific data supporting the R-values and U-factors provided. It was also felt that the information was too generic and didn't specify a particular size or density.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| | <p>The TAG also felt the information was inappropriate as a footnote to the table.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin moved to disapprove 001. Gregory Johnson seconded the motion. The motion carried, 9 to 3 with one abstention.</p> |
| <u>24-RE-027</u> | <p>Anne Anderson spoke on behalf of the proponent on this petition to move back to R-49 for ceiling insulation in Tables R402.1.2 and R402.1.3. This change was made at the national code level and in Oregon. There is no effective payback with the increase in insulation to R-60, and there is additional cost for the trusses.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal and different options for requirements, including providing a lesser R-value at the perimeter. It was suggested that Section R402.2.1 needed to be included as well.</p> <p>Motion: Greg Davenport moved to Table 027 to have a workgroup address changes as noted by the TAG. Gregory Johnson seconded the motion. The motion carried, 8 to 5 with one abstention.</p> <p>No specific workgroup was specified.</p> |
| <u>24-RE-036</u> | <p>Kevin Rose introduced NEEA's petition to drop the vertical fenestration U-factor from 0.28 to 0.27. This change is highly likely to appear in the 2027 IECC and is currently enforced in Oregon. He noted they have worked with the industry and the market will be ready for this change. The cost information is from EnergyStar information.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal. Some felt the change from 0.3 to 0.28 was already pushing affordability, while others felt this was a worthwhile, cost-effective envelope improvement. It was also suggested that the change would make it more difficult to achieve the 15% UA improvement credit.</p> <p>Motion: Gregory Johnson moved approval of 036 as written. Duane Jonlin seconded the motion. The motion carried, 10 to 3 with one abstention.</p> |
| <u>24-RE-028</u> | <p>This proposal was tabled due to the absence of the proponent.</p> |
| <u>24-RE-008</u> | <p>This proposal was tabled due to the absence of the proponent.</p> |
| <u>24-RE-037</u> | <p>Kevin Rose introduced NEEA's next petition to adopt the IECC air leakage rate. This is one area where the WSEC is behind the IECC, which has had a 3.0 ACH rate since 2012. He also noted that the credits for the 2021 code had been calculated using this leakage rate.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal. There was general support for the change, but it was argued that it can be hard for smaller dwellings to achieve this rate. It was noted that this change is only applied to one- and two-family dwellings and townhouses. Group R-2 dwellings remain unchanged. The TAG suggested an amendment for smaller dwellings and debated the cutoff size.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin moved for approval of 037. Kim Barker seconded the motion. Gregory Johnson suggested a modification to allow dwelling units</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| | <p>800 square feet and smaller to remain at 4.0 ACH. That modification was accepted as a friendly amendment. The motion carried by voice vote.</p> |
| <u>24-RE-010</u> | <p>Tristan Grant from NBI to introduce King County’s petition regarding solar reflectance requirements for low sloped roofs. This introduces similar requirements as found in the IECC commercial for climate zone 3 for roofs below a 2:12 pitch. He noted there are more than a thousand compliant products to meet this requirement. This is a passive cooling method with low to no cost.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal. Gregory Johnson asked what the benefit of this type of roof was over a roof designed with an air channel. Tristan replied that there was a study looking at several roof types but was unsure if that was one of the roofs included. There was some objection to the cost comparisons, which were done in Washington DC and Philadelphia. It was noted there would not be much impact on single family, which rarely uses flat roofs, but would make a difference for R-2. It was suggested that it maybe belonged more in the commercial provisions than in the residential. There was a suggestion to modify the language, striking the initial commentary section, specifying that it is for roofs over conditioned space, and including it in the mandatory requirements for R405.</p> <p>Motion 1: Gregory Johnson moved to disapprove 010. Duane Jonlin seconded the motion. The motion failed, 3 to 10 with one abstention.</p> <p>Motion 2: Tom Balderston moved to approve 010 as modified. Shane Nilles seconded the motion. The motion carried, 8 to 0 with 6 abstentions.</p> |
| <u>24-RE-012</u> | <p>Poppy Storm introduced her petition which revises several elements related to centrally ducted heat pumps. They help with good installation practices, efficient operation and documentation to assist plan review and inspection. This addresses both new construction and conversion in existing dwellings. These do not necessarily increase stringency but do help with clarity and proper installation.</p> <p>The TAG reviewed the proposal. Gregory Johnson suggested removed “fuel-fired or electric resistance” from Section R403.1.1.1 since it doesn’t really make a difference. The TAG discussed the language for centrally ducted heat pumps, specifically the balance point and whether the correct temperatures were referenced and if it should be in the mechanical code rather than the energy code. It was also suggested that the amendment to Chapter 5 be removed because having to replace or resize ducts could be detrimental to installing more efficient equipment. The proponent was not in favor of removal.</p> <p>Motion: Gregory Johnson moved to approve 012 as modified: striking “fuel fired or electric resistance” in R403.1.1.1; strike “electric resistance” in R403.1.3; strike R403.7.3; and remove the amendment to R403.1.2.1. Larry Andrews seconded the motion.</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| | <p>Amendment to Motion: Poppy Storm moved to amend the motion to restore R403.7.3. Duane Jonlin seconded the motion. The motion carried, 8 to 3 with two abstentions.</p> <p>Vote on Main Motion: The motion carried, 8 to 2 with three abstentions.</p> |
| 24-RE-034 | <p>Nick O'Neil noted that both his 034 and 016 were closely related. This proposal moves the requirement for ducts to be within the conditioned space from R406 to the prescriptive requirements. It would allow for deeply buried ducts as well. The credit is still available as well. This aligns with current requirements in Oregon.</p> <p>The TAG reviewed the proposal and questioned the retention of the credit allowance. It was also unclear how you would apply the deeply buried duct and buried within the ceiling insulation requirements. It was also questioned how this would apply to additions and alterations. It was also felt that the sentence added to R403.3 adds only confusion.</p> <p>Motion: Gregory Johnson moved to postpone action on 034 to allow the proponent to address the stated concerns. Tom Balderston seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.</p> |
| 24-RE-016 | <p>Nick O'Neil stated that this petition required the air handler to be within conditioned space. The current credit assumes that the air handler is in conditioned space. If 034 passes, this change may not be necessary.</p> <p>Motion: Gregory Johnson moved to postpone action on 016 to allow it to be heard with 034. Kevin Duell seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.</p> |
| 24-RE-049 | <p>Mike Moore introduced his petition on behalf of HVI to change the fan efficacy for H/ERVs from 1.2 to 1.7 and changing the sensible energy recovery in R406 from 65 to 67. This is very cost effective, with a simple payback of 1.6 years. The commercial energy TAG approved a similar proposal. As an aside, Mike noted that the standard on the commercial side would need to be updated.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal briefly and established that these units were readily available.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin moved to approve 049 as modified by the proponent. Kevin Duell seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.</p> |
| 24-RE-038 | <p>Kevin Rose noted that he had Mike Moore's petition heard first because 038 assumes the same fan efficacy and heat recovery values. It also assumes the 3 ACH leakage rate as proposed in 037. This would require a heat or energy recovery ventilator to be installed in climate zone 5. Analysis of the IECC proposal shows it to be cost effective down to climate zone 5.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal and the whether the credit for H/ERV should be adjusted. It was noted that the SRE should be changed to match that approved in 049.</p> |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| | <p>Motion 1: Gregory Johnson moved to approve 038 with a modification to exempt additions and alterations. Greg Davenport seconded the motion. The motion failed, 5 to 6 with two abstentions.</p> <p>Motion 2: Duane Jonlin moved to approve 038 as submitted, with the SRE adjusted to 67 percent. Deepa Sivarajan seconded the motion.</p> <p>Amendment to Motion 2: Gregory Johnson moved to amend the proposal to include climate zone 4. Larry Andrews seconded the motion. The motion failed, 5 to 7 with one abstention.</p> <p>Vote on Main Motion 2: The motion carried, 10 to 2 with one abstention.</p> |
| 5. Other Business | None addressed due to lack of time. |
| 6. Adjourn | The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m. |