



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 20, 2025

TAG Members Present: Kjell Anderson, Chair; *Anne Anderson; *Larry Andrews; Tom Balderston; Julie Blazek; Rick Blumenthal; Wade Craig; Greg Davenport; *Shailesh Desai; Jason Garrood; *Nate Geller; *Patrick Hanks; Luke Howard; Gregory Johnson; Duane Jonlin; *Jonah Kinchy; *Jonny Kocher; *John Lange; *Nick Manning; Shane Nilles; Irina Rasputnis; Albert Rooks; *Deepa Sivarajan; Poppy Storm; *Elizabeth Torske

TAG Members Absent: Kim Barker; *Michael Beanland; *Michael Bragalla; Kevin Duell; Bryan Russo; *Alexis Suggs; Gavin Tenold; *Joel Ward

Visitors Present: David Baylon, Ian Casey, Gary Heikkinen, Bryan Imai, Jonathan Jones, Eric Lacey, Ken Morgan, Kevin Rose, Lia Sommer, Steve Strawn, Steve Tapio

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 today's petitions mostly cover R406 that change the structure of the code. Next week the TAG will look at petitions specific to R406 credits. The goal is to spend the first 60 to 90 minutes discussing the energy equalization options, the next 60 to 90 minutes on the credit requirements and home size, and then end the meeting with the third category of petitions.
2. Review and Approve Agenda	The agenda was approved as modified; 015 will be heard at the same time as 005 since they are similar proposals.
3. Review and Approve meeting notes from June 13, 2025	The meeting notes from the June 13, 2025, meeting were not available and will be addressed at the next meeting.

4. Review of Petitions	
<p>R406 Energy Equalization</p> <p><u>24-RE-017</u></p>	<p>The TAG began the discussion with the petition from Jonny Kocher to move the equalization credits from the equalization table into the main credit table.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal. Members expressed different opinions on EPCA compliance issues. There was also concern that this change may make R406 more confusing. Others felt that it would be best to try to stay as close to the IECC R408 format as possible. It was also felt that the carbon emission title should be removed, if this is the route the TAG goes. There was also support expressed for 015 as a better way of handling this issue.</p> <p>Motion 1: Gregory Johnson moved to disapprove 017. Shane Nilles seconded the motion.</p> <p>Motion 2: Albert Rooks moved to table discussion on 017 and refer it to a workgroup. Deepa Sivarajan seconded the motion. The motion failed, 5 to 7 with five abstentions.</p> <p>Vote on Motion 1: Carried by voice vote.</p>
<p><u>24-RE-005</u></p> <p><u>24-RE-015</u></p>	<p>Gregory Johnson introduced his petition 005 adjusting the systems in the equalization table. Types 2 and 4 are essentially the same, with 2 specifying supplemental heating, so system type 2 was removed as redundant. Both systems 4 and 5 have added language to clarify that you can add supplemental heating. He noted that Dave Baylon's 015 only allows supplemental heating by electric resistance in type 5 while his 005 allows electric resistance or combustion.</p> <p>The TAG discussed 005 and debated the the original intent of the differences in system types 2 and 4. They also discussed the appropriateness of doubling the points for systems with combustion supplemental heating. There was general agreement that this confusion needs to be cleaned up in whatever approach moves forward.</p> <p>Dave Baylon then introduced his 015, noting that he tried to correct the charging paragraph, which wasn't included in 005. The rest of the proposal is to ensure the heat pump is out of the system before the gas furnace starts running.</p> <p>The TAG felt both proposals should go to a workgroup to look at the system types and clean up the language.</p> <p>Motion: Gregory Johnson moved to postpone discussion on 005/015 and send them to a workgroup. Shane Nilles seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.</p>

	Workgroup volunteers: Gregory Johnson, Greg Davenport, Poppy Storm, Duane Jonlin, Albert Rooks, Larry Andrews, Dave Baylon, Ken Morgan, Jonny Kocher, and Julie Blazek.
24-RE-021	<p>Gary Heikkinen introduced his petition cleaning up the equalization table. He noted it is clear from the earlier discussion that the current language causes some confusion. This petition basically just provides a credit if you're using a heat pump.</p> <p>The TAG had a brief discussion of the proposal. Gary Heikkinen stressed the need to, at the very least, recalculate the credits. Duane Jonlin felt it was moving the code backwards.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin moved to disapprove 021. Nate Geller seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote with one opposed.</p>
24-RE-004	<p>The next petition from Gregory Johnson reverts the equalization table back to the 2018 version. He noted that he had asked for the analysis of how the 2021 points were achieved but has not yet received a sufficient answer. He suggested tabling this discussion until he hears back from Ecotope.</p> <p>The TAG briefly discussed the proposal. It was noted the 2021 code baseline moved from carbon emission to energy use. It was suggested that this proposal could be a vehicle to have PNNL recalculate the values.</p> <p>Motion 1: Gregory Johnson moved to postpone discussion until the credit rationale is received. Elizabeth Torske seconded the motion. The motion failed, 3 to 14.</p> <p>Motion 2: Duane Jonlin moved to disapprove 004. Nate Geller seconded the motion. The motion carried, 13 to 3.</p>
24-RE-030	<p>Patrick Hanks presented his petition to eliminate Section R406.2. He felt that the table presented a significant EPCA legal risk that creates a lot of uncertainty for the industry. He noted the credits assigned in Table R406.2 have been removed from the required number of credits to comply with R406. This essentially brings the code back to the 2015 requirements where the credits were not dependent on heating system type.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal, the analysis provided by the proponent, and the validity of a legal risk. Some members felt the change constituted a rollback of efficiency.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin moved to disapprove 030. Jonny Kocher seconded the motion. The motion carried, 12 to 5.</p>
<p>R406 Credit Requirements and Home Size</p> <p>24-RE-035</p> <p>24-RE-031</p>	<p>Duane Jonlin presented his petition, noting that he sent out a new version this morning based on comments received in the last 24 hours. The required credits for small homes remain the same but then a credit gradient is</p>

	<p>introduced for 1,500 square feet to over 3,500 square feet. The overall impact is a 10 percent reduction in energy use.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal and the differences from the earlier posted version. It was noted the workgroup had not yet met and it may be a good idea to postpone discussion until after their meeting.</p> <p>Motion: Gregory Johnson moved to postpone discussion on 035 and 031 until the workgroup has concluded. Shane Nilles seconded the motion. The motion carried, 10 to 1 with six abstentions.</p> <p>Albert Rooks expressed his desire to join the established workgroup.</p>
<u>24-RE-029</u>	<p>Patrick Hanks introduced his petition to replace WSEC R406 with the 2024 IECC Section R408. He noted that the table still needs to be cleaned up to remove the non-applicable climate zones. He also wanted to double check that there are no credits that cover base code requirements.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin moved to disapprove 029 as a rollback of code stringency. Greg Davenport seconded the motion. The motion carried, 12 to 2 with 3 abstentions.</p>
<u>24-RE-046</u>	<p>Larry Andrews introduced his petition to require 5 credits, regardless of the size of the dwelling. It makes sense to focusing on multigenerational housing and make larger homes more affordable rather than expend energy to run two or more houses. Larry stated that he would like to see this proposal included in the workgroup for 031 and 035.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal. Some felt this would be a rollback of the code. Others felt there needed to be some differentiation between larger familial homes and larger trophy homes and how that could be enforced. It was also voiced that this would not be a good fit with the current workgroup as it has a much different focus.</p> <p>Motion: Albert Rooks moved to disapprove 046. Greg Davenport seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote with one dissention and one abstention.</p>
<u>24-RE-013</u>	<p>This proposal was withdrawn by the proponent.</p>
<u>24-RE-041</u>	<p>Kevin Rose spoke to his petition to reduce the size threshold in both R405 and R406. He stated that he would be happy to postpone and have his proposal addressed by the 031/035 workgroup.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal. There was support for keeping the current small home threshold as being able to include some three-bedroom family homes in the category. The TAG also discussed if they needed to retain this petition to make changes to the R405 compliance requirements; the chair noted that 039 also addressed the R405 component. It was felt that the current workgroup was flexible enough to consider the concepts without approving or postponing this proposal.</p>

	<p>Motion: Shane Nilles moved to disapprove 041. Gregory Johnson seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.</p>
<p>Other Misc. Petitions</p> <p>24-RE-033 24-RE-040</p>	<p>Gregory Johnson noted the workgroup for 033 and 040 is still moving forward on a combined proposal and advocated postponing discussion until the workgroup finishes. Patrick Hanks added that they have met once but have made good progress. They should be able to report out on July 11.</p> <p>Motion: Gregory Johnson moved to postpone discussion on 033 and 040 until July 11. Duane Jonlin seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.</p>
24-RE-034	<p>Kevin Rose introduced the revised Nick O’Neil petition to move ducts fully within conditioned space or be deeply buries. The new version brings in some additional language from the Integrated Draft to provide context. He suggested that the numbering be changed to match the IECC.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal and asked if there was a revised economic analysis. Kevin Rose said the question would need to be referred back to Mr. O’Neil. There was some concern expressed that the new version was not submitted prior to the meeting for full review. There was also concern expressed about how crawlspace ducts were to be handled.</p> <p>Motion: Patrick Hanks moved to table discussion until the next meeting, to allow adequate review time. Gregory Johnson seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.</p>
24-RE-016	<p>Kevin Rose also introduced the associated petition to require the air handler be within the conditioned space.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal, with an initial motion made and withdrawn to postpone this one along with 034. There were arguments made against dictating system design, and it was mentioned that the requirement for A2L refrigerants may negatively affect having the air handler within the envelope.</p> <p>Motion: Patrick Hanks moved to disapprove 034. Shane Nilles seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote with one opposed.</p>
24-RE-018	<p>Jonny Kocher introduced his electric readiness petition to require electric conduit plug wiring for most major appliances when you install combustion equipment. This requirement has been adopted by several states and jurisdictions in their code or stretch code.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal. Greg Johnson felt the section for space heaters should be removed; a heat pump will not necessarily be located in the same area as a gas furnace and will be wired to an outdoor unit. There was opposition voiced because this does not provide any energy savings and just adds cost. There were also concerns regarding possible EPCA or I-2066 impacts. Others felt it would improve the overall lifecycle cost of the building.</p>

	<p>Motion: Duane Jonlin moved to approve 018. Deepa Sivarajan seconded the motion.</p> <p>Amendment to Motion: Gregory Johnson moved to amend the proposal by removing Section R404.5.3 for space heaters. Tom Balderston seconded the motion. The amendment to the motion was then modified to retain the section but reword it to require space in the panel to support future space heating needs. This amendment was accepted as a friendly amendment to the main motion. Additionally, a sentence was added to the main scoping section to allow any electrical circuit used by the existing appliance to be deemed to meet this requirement.</p> <p>The motion to approve 018 as amended above carried, 10 to 5.</p>
<u>24-RE-008</u>	<p>Jonathan Jones introduced his petition requiring third party air leakage testing. This is aimed at clearing up any confusion around blower door testing by ensuring the testing is done by certified individuals. It does exempt rural areas where it may be difficult to find certified testers.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal but had some concerns regarding the rural exemption and how that could be better addressed. There were also questions around the certification for both the testing and the testing agent.</p> <p>Motion: Gregory Johnson moved to postpone discussion on 008 to allow a workgroup to address the issues discussed. Tom Balderston seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.</p> <p>Workgroup volunteers: Duane Jonlin, John Lange, Shane Nilles, Tom Balderston, Luke Howard, and Jonathan Jones</p>
<u>24-RE-009</u>	<p>The next petition from Jonathan Jones adds a new requirement for a capacity check to be performed on heating systems, using a heat pump commissioning standard. Since it just requires a manometer to perform the testing, no new equipment would need to be purchased.</p> <p>The TAG discussed this proposal and had several questions. What are the consequences if the system doesn't pass? What if the test cannot be performed at the time of construction due to seasonal differences? How would this apply to ductless equipment? It was unclear to the members if this was actually solving a problem.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin moved to disapprove 009. Poppy Storm seconded the motion. The motion carried, 8 to 1 with eight abstentions.</p>
<u>24-RE-019</u>	<p>Jonny Kocher presented 019 for the proponent. This petition was revised based on concerns voiced previously. It originally came from language in Title 24 revised to better fit the WSEC. It would require that ducted air conditioners in existing buildings that are replaced or altered to be replaced by a heat pump sized to meet the cooling load.</p>

	<p>The TAG discussed the proposal and had concerns regarding cost and replacement timeframes. It was suggested this go to a workgroup to address further concerns.</p> <p>Motion: Albert Rooks moved to postpone discussion and move 019 to a workgroup. Greg Davenport seconded the motion. The motion carried, 11 to 5 with one abstention.</p> <p>Workgroup volunteers: Albert Rooks, Jonny Kocher, Greg Johnson and Duane Jonlin</p>
24-RE-007	<p>Greg Johnson introduced his petition to add an appendix chapter containing the calculations and assumptions used for the development of the credit table, similar to what was moved forward for the commercial code.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal. Duane Jonlin felt this was an unnecessary complication to include in the code. Others liked the transparency it provides but felt it needed some wordsmithing. Others expressed some reservation with how the information is provided.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin moved to disapprove 007. Nate Geller seconded the motion. The motion carried, 10 to 6.</p>
24-RE-028	<p>Patrick Hanks presented his petition to allow the use of component performance data to be taken from ASHRAE 90.1, WSEC Appendix CA or the ASHRAE Handbook of Fundamentals. It also removes the redundant language in R402.1.6.</p> <p>The TAG discussed the proposal. There was concern expressed that users could pick and choose between values. Others felt it provided needed flexibility within the code. The biggest concern was over the removal of R402.1.6, which can be used for paths other than the component performance alternative.</p> <p>Motion: Duane Jonlin moved to disapprove 028. Greg Davenport seconded the motion. The motion carried, 9 to 5 with two abstentions.</p>
5. Other Business	Kjell Anderson reminded people that the June 27 meeting will begin at 10 a.m.
6. Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 2:49 p.m.