



STATE OF WASHINGTON

## STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

### MECHANICAL, VENTILATION & ENERGY COMMITTEE SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES

**MONITOR LOCATION:** Enterprise Services, Rm. 2332  
1500 Jefferson Street  
Olympia, Washington

**MEETING DATE:** May 7, 2014

Agenda Items	Committee Actions/Discussion
1. Welcome and Introductions	<p>Meeting called to order at 10:00 a.m.</p> <p><u>Members in Attendance:</u> Eric Vander Mey, Chair; Jeff Peterson, Vice Chair; Ray Allshouse; Duane Jonlin; Tom Balbo</p> <p><u>Staff In Attendance:</u> Tim Nogler, Managing Director; Joanne McCaughan; Peggy Bryden</p> <p><u>Visitors Present:</u> Chuck Murray</p>
2. Review and Approve Agenda	<p>The agenda was approved with the addition of Public Comment on #3.</p>
3. Governor's Executive Order 14-04	<p><b>Tim Nogler</b> summarized the executive order, which is on the Council's website. The order refers to a new statewide program which includes existing buildings and new buildings to ensure they are energy neutral as possibly. The Order directs the SBCC to achieve early and widespread deployment of energy neutral buildings prior to the 2031 statutory deadline. It also states we direct and ensure the cost benefit tests to include external costs of greenhouse gas emission. SBCC is to work on needed code requirements for the new buildings as described in the new statewide program. This program has Commerce working in the lead, working with WSU and SBCC.</p> <p>A brief overview was given of executive orders. There is an established policy of how executive orders work. There are three types of orders; they are general policy statements, directives, and an operative effect. The first two types do not have a force and effective law. They are an incentive to encourage the state agency to carry out the policy of the Governor. The Council's Governor appointed members are expected to carry out the order to the extent allowed under statute. Only the operative effect executive order has a force and effective law. This</p>

Executive order is a directive encouraging actions compatible with the law. Tim stated he had discussed this Order with the Attorney General's office, specifically about energy neutral and what the implication of that is to achieve an energy neutral building before 2031. He noted that SBCC could be more aggressive in achieving this goal.

This has implications of what our work plan is and what our expectation is for the next code cycle.

**Chuck Murray**, with Commerce, states this is what my boss thinks he ought to be working on in the next year. This is how he looks at it. There is a specific item at the end of Page 6 that mentions SBCC first. Council should be working on new code requirements as described above. Because SBCC is the rulemaking body it needs to make sure there is a place to have those public meetings and to be held in a timely fashion. Most of this SBCC already does. Chuck continues to state most of these points in the order come out of the state energy strategy that was developed several years ago. This order encourages us to implement the concepts in the state energy strategy. Commerce plans to develop, with interested parties, sets of code change proposals that will get us to the goals stated in the order. We are going to develop further economic analysis methodologies that will apply to demonstrate the cost effectiveness of the code implementation. The greenhouse emission piece will evolve over the next four or five months. Commerce feels we should get some guidance on this work group. Commerce will want feedback from SBCC on this and how it will fold into the work SBCC does. In a month we will know more of how we are doing on this.

**Duane Jonlin** asked about cost effectiveness for owners and tenants which is in legislation. Does this greenhouse gas emissions piece somehow now find its way into that formula? Chuck's first guess at this answer is, when we present information to SBCC for their consideration we might present more than one evaluation result, which would provide that cost effectiveness to owner or occupant as one result. We will need to discuss this further as we move forward. Commerce's job is providing the methodologies and providing options for SBCC prior to the beginning of the next code cycle so people making proposals understand it.

**Tim** stated SBCC would need to work with Commerce to develop this methodology.

**Chuck** feels an aspirational code would be effective before the 2015 code.

**Tom Balbo** expands on this; stating we have four codes. We have the base code which required a savings of 70% by 2031, we also have a green building TAG that is working on code changes then we have aspirational code and now we have this Executive Order. Do we want to combine them all or pick out like items so we don't duplicate our efforts. Another way would be to let Commerce to come out with their recommendations. How can we collect all of these issues? **Jeff Peterson** added the IPCC came out with their study which is making news from the federal level and they will have their own direction. **Chuck** said first the Dept. of Energy has to do a determination of the newest codes compared to the previous edition and make a determination whether it saves energy or not. Then the state code determines whether it meets or exceeds what the Dept. of Energy selects as the base federal code. Washington has demonstrated that we are on track with the federal standard or even better. **Jeff** then asked if the rest of the country is going to a better furnace say a 95 based on federal code changes and we adopt a 98 that will make the change the cost benefit analysis and then we will need specialized equipment which creates a difficulty.

**Eric Vander Mey** asked Chuck if he feels SBCC through the Energy Code TAG should actually do a direct comparison of our commercial energy code to ASHRAE 90.1 2013. **Chuck** feels that a line by line comparison is not needed. **Tim** noted that SBCC is in the process of putting together the base code which is the 2015 IECC with state amendments. **Ray Allshouse** and **Tom Balbo** then bring up the issue of limited resources. **Ray** is anticipating some support from the Governor's office as a result of the Executive Order.

**Eric** asked Chuck if he knew what meter based financing was. Chuck said it is a new concept. We are trying to attach the financing for energy to the utility meter or house rather than the individual so when the house is sold the meter charges stay with the house. We are hoping these charges would be incorporated in the utility bill. This is not under SBCC. This is about developing market

	<p>based programs. <b>Tom Balbo</b> asks if there will be builder incentives to help us in this process. Chuck agreed this is an important issue.</p> <p>There were more questions asked of Chuck which he did his best to answer with the knowledge he had about the Order.</p> <p><b>Eric</b> asked if there was any action needed by the Committee today. <b>Tim</b> said the idea was to discuss the order and then give a report to the Council on Friday as to what our next steps would be.</p>
<p>4. Interpretation – Pierce County 14-MAR07</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Motion</b></p>	<p><b>Eric</b> stated this referred to air side economizers and simple systems. The interpretation was discussed in the last committee meeting and was redrafted by staff for today. The answer to the first question was yes. Eric then read the complete answer given with the 2 exceptions. There was more discussion about elevator rooms and the temperature they should be among the Committee.</p> <p><b>Duane</b> suggested a revision to the last sentence in the answer which was modified in the meeting.</p> <p><b>Duane Jonlin</b> moved the Committee accept the interpretation as modified. <b>Tom Balbo</b> seconded the motion. <b>The motion carried.</b></p>
<p>5. Staff Report</p>	<p><b>Tim</b> had a couple of things. He asked the Committee to look at the minutes emailed this morning so they can be approved on Friday. He encouraged the Committee to review the expedited rules that will be presented on Friday at the Council meeting.</p> <p><b>Jeff Peterson</b> asked for an update on what the Council’s revenue would be. <b>Tim</b> said we get a monthly report which he has been watching closely. He has also done some outreach to jurisdictions and there are some issues. The processes from the counter to the Treasurer’s Office need to be checked. The fund balance has moved out to March, 2016. This is operating at the same level we are now. However to accomplish the goals on the work plan this will need to be changed; requiring a fee increase or other methods of funding. <b>Jeff</b> indicated that builders are really low on permits because land use is tight. <b>Tim</b> said he would get the most recent revenue numbers for the Council on Friday.</p> <p><b>Duane</b> then asked what the status was on the Energy Code printing. <b>Tim’s</b> reply was that ICC sent a draft and</p>

	<p>although they hoped it would be final version, there were a number of errors. The draft was marked up and sent back to ICC this week. We hope they can turn this around quickly so we can go to print.</p>
6. Other Business	<p><b>Tim</b> mentioned the ICC hearings held in Memphis, with Duane in attendance. Tim said Duane did a good job expressing the Council’s issues. There are some interesting progressive ideas being vetted through this process. Staff will continue to monitor this and participate through WABO and the Green Building TAG. This TAG is meeting on May 19 and will be doing a summary of what is in this code.</p>
7. Adjourn	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.</p>

DRAFT