



STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

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

WORKGROUP ON ECONOMIC IMPACT SUMMARY OF LISTENING SESSION

LOCATION: The meeting was held with Zoom and teleconference options were available. There was no physical location.

MEETING DATE: Wednesday, September 10, 2025

Staff: Managing Director Dustin Curb, Annette Haworth, Brandin Groat

Attendees: Todd Beyreuther, Kjell Anderson, Dan Young, Ben Omura, Katy Sheehan, Jay Arnold
Anne Anderson, Scott Black, Joseph Briscar, Ian Casey, Brett Conway, Josie Cummings, Lauren DiPalma, Kevin Duell, Jessie Gamble, Patrick Hanks, Riley Helean, TJ Houk, Adam Hutchinson, Chris Ivy, Hoyt Jeter, Gregory Johnson, Jonathan Jones, Jonny Kocher, Jon Lange, Carolyn Logue, David Lowrey, Nick Manning, Daniel Meyers, Ken Morgan, Dave Nehren, Jenny Nickerson, Dylan Plummer, David Reddy, Eric Urban

| Agenda Items | Committee Actions/Discussion |
|--|---|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions | The session was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Council Chair Todd Beyreuther and an overview of how the “Listening Session” is structured. |
| 2. Public Listening Session on Economic Impacts for proposed amendments: | Dustin Curb noted the SBCC is seeking additional input from the public regarding economic impacts resulting from proposed changes to the 2024 Washington State Energy Codes. Information gathered will assist the SBCC in its determination that the probable benefits of the rules are greater than their probable costs. In addition, the SBCC would like to hear from small businesses on topics such as the cost of compliance (including costs of equipment, supplies, labor, training, professional services, and increased administrative costs), changes to sales or revenue, job creation or loss and whether changes have greater impact on small businesses. Written Testimony is also welcome. Please use the SBCC Economic Impact Questionnaire located on the forms page of the SBCC website to provide written feedback. Send written comments to SBCC@DES.WA.GOV . |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. 2024 WSEC-C Provisions | The floor was open for comments on the Commercial Energy Code. |

This material in alternative formats including braille, large print, and audio recording is available on request by emailing the SBCC at sbcc@des.wa.gov.

| | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. 2024 WSEC-R Provisions | <p>Opposition was expressed for petition 24-GP1-264 due to small business impact.</p> <p>Concerns were expressed for petition 24-GP1-187 with details being submitted in written comment in the near future.</p> <p>Comments were made in favor of the TAG process and the petitions that were approved and moved forward in the process.</p> <p>The written comment period and process were discussed, and it was noted that the WGEI was meeting on Monday to review today's information and any written comments received by this Friday.</p> <p>Comments were made in favor of gas furnace to Heat Pumps process, but a specific petition wasn't provided.</p> <p>Discussion was held on the Integrated Draft, WSEC process and PNNL analysis on the 2021 Codes.</p> <p>Comments were made on the overall SBCC process and timelines. It was also noted that the SBCC shouldn't rely solely on the information provided in the petitions but conduct their own research on the CBA and SBEIS and if this isn't feasible for Staff to complete, a third-party vendor should be employed.</p> <p>At 1:38 the session was paused until 2:13.</p> <p>Comments were heard in relation to SBEIS and how cost recovery gets lost during the process, but energy efficiency is favorable and going in the right direction.</p> <p>At 2:16 the session was paused until 2:40.</p> <p>The floor was opened for comments on the Residential Energy Code.</p> <p>Comments were heard in support of the WSEC-Residential and the energy efficiency direction it is taking.</p> <p>Support was given to petition 24-RE-019, Gas furnace to Heat Pumps.</p> <p>Opposition was expressed for petition 24-RE-018 as being "all cost" and "no benefit" further explained as no energy benefit provided. Further discussion was held in relation to ICC repealing the intent of the petition but moving to Appendix as an available option. Comments were made on immediate savings versus life cycle costs and how all</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|------------|---|
| | <p>pertinent information is important to provide for further discussion.</p> <p>Comments were heard on the short notification for these “Listening Sessions” which hampers the ability to provide well prepared and detailed comments. It was also noted that the SBCC shouldn’t rely solely on the information provided in the petitions but conduct their own research on the CBA and SBEIS and if this isn’t feasible for Staff to complete, a third-party vendor should be employed. It was noted that written comments were being encouraged and should be expected.</p> <p>Specific proposals were called out with information provided for each; Comments in relation to the CBA where the benefits do not outweigh the costs were heard for petitions 24-RE-018, 015, 019. It was noted these petitions penalize or discourage fuel choice and unnecessary costs and do not directly improve the energy efficiency of a home; the UA changes in petition 24-RE-036 in conjunction with the change to maintain the 15% cap are going to make harder and likely more expensive to achieve the credit option 1 in R406; Petition 24-RE-010 would heavily restrict design without achieving energy efficiency benefits to make it worthwhile and 24-RE-034 would also likely heavily restrict design and may cause unintended effects for typical housing; petitions 24-RE-014, 008, 012 are all going to increase compliance time for the relevant projects which may have a larger cumulative effect for compliance costs of builders.</p> <p>Discussion was held on the process for moving forward with conflicting comments received on petitions, written comment deadline, public hearing dates and locations.</p> <p>Additional comments were heard on 24-RE-019 in relation to “add-on” options for gas furnaces being limited due to the difficulty in meeting requirements.</p> <p>It was noted that information provided to Staff will be provided to the WGEI and then to the Council for review and discussion.</p> <p>At 3:38 the session was paused until 3:59.</p> <p>A conclusion statement was provided by Dustin Curb.</p> |
| 3. Adjourn | The listening session was adjourned at 4:01 p.m. |