



STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

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

STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING RECORD

Hearing Date and Time: Friday, September 30, 2022, 10:00 a.m.

Council Members in Attendance: Chair Tony Doan, Kjell Anderson, Jay Arnold, Todd Beyreuther, Micah Chappell, Peter Rieke

Staff in Attendance: Stoyan Bumbalov, Managing Director; Krista Braaksma; Dustin Curb; Annette Haworth

Others in Attendance: Andrea Smith, Larry Andrews, Jeanette McKague, Ray Shipman; Sean Angeley, Kim Barker, Elliott Brown, Ian Casey, Jacob Cassady, Randy Cooper, Kinley Deller, Cyd Donk, Chris Edmark, Brian Emanuels, Mike Fowler, Juan Gamez, Rebecca Hoshaw, Jessica Hostetler, Mary Hull-Drury, Anna Janecek, Ty Jennings, Angela Kleis, Jonny Kocher, Jenny Lybeck, Riley Lynch, Megan McPhaden, Mike Moore, Dave Nehren, Jenny Nickerson, Scott Peterson, Kathleen Petrie, Claire Richards, Tena Risley, Sammie Roeun, Jon Siu, Kerry Sutton, Quyen Thai, Andrea Velarde, MacKinnon Walsh, Kym Williams

WAC 51-50, Adoption and amendment of the 2021 International Building Code - Structural	WSR 22-17-151; The proposed rule adopts the 2021 edition of the International Building Code (structural provisions) published by the International Code Council, with state amendments to incorporate proposed changes as adopted by the Washington State Building Code Council. The rules will provide increased clarity and life safety measures for building construction in Washington State.
From:	Testimony
NA	NA
WAC 51-50, Adoption and amendment of the 2021 International Existing Building Code	WSR 22-17-151; The proposed rule adopts the 2021 edition of 2021 edition of the International Existing Building Code, published by the International Code Council, with state amendments to incorporate proposed changes as adopted by the Washington State Building Code Council. The rules will provide increased clarity and life safety measures for building construction in Washington State.
From:	Testimony
Chris Edmark	The building valuation data is very general, and it doesn't take into regional costs. I think that I would like to propose that they add a clause in there or otherwise determined by the building official, because the local assessors can provide very good data on the current market value, they are consistently evaluating the properties for the purposes of taxes. I'd like to follow up in writing on this. I think that it's going to be more work for the building department because we are going to have to try and buy our revenue, determine what our

	modifiers are, where, if we just go to the assessor's data or make it an option to use the assessor's data or other data as determined by the building official. And I'll leave my remarks at that and follow up in writing.
WAC 51-51, Adoption and amendment of the 2021 International Residential Code	WSR 22-17-148; The proposed rule adopts the 2021 edition of the International Residential Code, published by the International Code Council, with state amendments to incorporate proposed changes as adopted by the Washington State Building Code Council. The rules will provide increased clarity and life safety measures for building construction in Washington State.
From:	Testimony
Andrea Smith, BIAW	<p>We have 8,000 members across the state that represent all aspects of the residential construction sector. We're here today in opposition to inclusion of the EV supply equipment proposal that is included in the IRC CR102. First and foremost, the SBCC lacks the authority to pass this in the IRC. There is no legislative mandate to adopt EV charging requirements in the residential code. E2SHB 1287 as written only includes R-3 occupancies, a term used by the IBC. This term does not exist in the IRC. Legislative intent is not sufficient for the adoption of a rule outside of the scope of what was authorized in the 1287. A code of this nature really belongs in the Electrical Code, which is handled by L&I. If you recall, at the June 17 meeting earlier this year, the L&I representative on the SBCC stated: "sizing of circuits is dedicated and determined by equipment being used." Providing specifications for a branch circuit without knowing the equipment being installed is meaningless. Our members agree. We conducted a member survey and found 47% of new homes are already being built with EV charging capabilities because consumer demand is driving these installations – pun intended. The only exceptions are in less expensive homes where adding this feature doesn't pencil out and in instances where the electrical infrastructure cannot support increased loads and must be upgraded (cost estimates are upwards of \$11,000 per home in a subdivision). We also heard from many building officials about concerns of enforcing this code, should it be adopted. Primary concerns were of the lack of qualified staff to ensure compliance. Please listen to the people charged with building and enforcing this code and do not pass the EV charging proposal onto permanent rule making.</p>
Mike Moore	<p>I'm representing Broan-NuTone today and speaking in support of proposal 21-GP2-062 of the IRC. I have the same testimony for proposal 21-GP2-063 for the IMC. So, I'll just say it once here, and just note that that it applies to both codes, because it's the same. Essentially the same text. This text proposes new kitchen range hood minimum performance requirements that will bolster the dwelling units of Washington and the proposed improvements in the minimum performance targets for the range hoods are really aligned with the latest work at a Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory in California regarding acceptable exposure to hazardous pollutants and these proposed requirements have been thoroughly better with industry. The version of the proposals that were presented to the Washington SBCC or simplified versions of California's latest requirements. That are designed to improve compliance and enforcements and send clear signals to industry regarding the single target that would provide minimum performance that would be acceptable for controlling pollutants of concern. Compliant products are widely available to address these new performance targets that are being proposed, and the incremental equipment costs associated with them be as low as zero dollars when using electric cooking equipment, and that's the direction of the structural Industry's headed so it dove tales nicely with construction practices that are expected in Washington State. And looking forward, the proposal sets the stage for transitioning from a minimum range for the airflow, which is the traditional target that's been used to</p>

	<p>using a minimum capture efficiency metric which is based on actual performance. And as we focus on performance as with all aspects of code, we can ultimately steer the market towards better performance at lower cost and at less energy consumption. While offering better architecture for homeowners. I've served as a Chair of ASHRAE 62.2 and it's my personal opinion that the language is a great model for national codes and standards to follow and I urge Council's approval.</p>
Kathleen Petrie, King County	<p>We request the approval of the EV charging proposal as a requirement for all new small residential construction. We support this requirement, residing in either the IRC or residential portion of the Energy Code, whichever is most appropriate. But as long as it is a base code requirements for all new construction. Under the 2020 law Washington's required to reduce its overall greenhouse gas emissions, forty five percent by 2030, seventy percent by 2040, and ninety-five by 2050. Almost forty-five percent of Washington's annual greenhouse gas emissions come from transportation. Washington, along with sixteen other States, have laws requiring State emissions policies to mirror those of California's Air Resources Board requiring one hundred percent of new passenger vehicle sales to consist of zero emission vehicles by 2035. As a part of that timeline phasing, thirty-five percent of required sales are EV by 2026 and sixty-eight percent by 2030, although 2035 is still the official date, the 2022 move ahead Washington package is a whole new policy aimed at end of the sales of new internal combustion and engine vehicles starting in 2030, which is just seven years away. Oakland, Culvert City, and Berkeley are already targeting a 2030 deadline. Rural areas are struggling with infrastructure. Many locations along highways and other straight infrastructure require costs of utility upgrades which leave private companies wary of investing in charging sites in remote or rarely used areas. This is a challenge. The National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program will send seventy-one million to Washington State over the next five years, however, and this funding addition to other sources will provide some things, such as outfitting highways designated as alternative fuel corridors with charges at least every fifty miles. Sixty-nine million will go towards Grant program for the development of EV charging infrastructure in rural areas, helping to appease this range anxiety. Buildings built to this code will be occupied in 2024, 2025. Do we have enough infrastructure by 2026 to accommodate thirty-five percent of new vehicle sales that responsibility will likely land at home more than it does today? To alter a building in order to install an EV charger is much more costly and intrusive than at the time of construction. As a requirement, it will ensure all people have access to the charging system needed for new and used cars that will be purchased over the next ten years. That a person is not precluded from purchasing an electric vehicle because they are either renter or perhaps do not have the means to buy both the vehicle and pay a contractor to make modifications to an existing home. We urge that you please pass this proposal.</p>
WAC 51-52, Adoption and amendment of the 2021 Washington State International Mechanic Code and International Fuel Gas Code	WSR 22-17-147; The proposed rule adopts the 2021 edition of the International Mechanical Code and International Fuel Gas Code, published by the International Code Council, with state amendments to incorporate proposed changes as adopted by the Washington State Building Code Council. The rules will provide increased clarity and life safety measures for building construction and use in Washington State.
From:	Testimony
Andrea Smith, BIAW	We have 8,000 members across the state that represent all aspects of the residential construction sector. We're here today in opposition to the range hood

	<p>ventilation proposals. Specifically, we'd like to see a uniform standard applied for all ranges and not singling out ranges of specific fuel types. You'll hear from proponents of these proposals that cooking with natural gas is bad for your health. That is simply not true. Proponents reference studies that support their arguments, understandably, but fail to mention that many of these studies are conducted in controlled environments (such as laboratories or a specific floor plan of a home). Further, it's what you're cooking that emits harmful substances that decrease air quality and can make asthma worse. What others forget to mention is that the self-clean oven function is the primary culprit of emission of harmful by-products like carbon monoxide that cause health issues. As with the energy efficiency codes, we see in the energy code, this code proposal relies on the individual cooking to turn their range hood vents on. Now, I must admit it was not long ago that I learned the dangers of cooking without ventilation. I'm sure many others are unaware of these dangers, too. We can't fix all of society's problems with regulation because the success of many of our state codes are dependent on human behavior as they live in their homes. What we really need is a public education campaign on the dangers of not ventilating while you cook. That is not a function of the SBCC, so we ask that you please do not pass these proposals into permanent rulemaking.</p>
Jonny Kocher, RMI	<p>RMI is a climate policy nonprofit working to accelerate the clean energy transition. Today, we encourage the State Building Code Council to pass all proposals today, especially the science-based IRC and IMC range hood proposals requiring differentiated ventilation requirements for gas stoves. The evidence is now very clear. For a long time, nitrogen dioxide was used for a proxy for measuring exposure to air pollution, and that has changed. This new study, showing that if exposure to nitrogen dioxide, even in short doses and at low levels can we do variety of health effects. The latest 2016 EPA integrated science assessment, or ISA, which analyzed all the latest literature for the first time, found a causal relationship between short term exposures to nitrogen dioxide and respiratory effects, including the development of asthma. This over one-thousand-piece document, something else became very clear, indoor exposure is critical. Two key points from the ISA; The evidence shows that the indoor exposure to nitrogen dioxide may be associated with more health effects than outdoor exposure, that repeated short-term exposures lead to long-term exposures in increasing incidents of asthma. In the same study, the EPA states that the homes with gas stoves have a fifty to four hundred percent higher concentrations of nitrogen dioxide than homes with electric stoves. So, it is very clear that cooking on a gas so at home is very likely a source of repeated short-term exposure. Gas stoves also generate more particular matter than electric stoves during the active cooking. Researchers from Lawrence Berkeley National Lab indicates that increased range of the ventilation rates from gas stoves, such as the required amount of 250 CFM, stated in the proposal, decreased both knocks and PM2.4.4 pollution below rates that are dangerous for health occupants. Similarly, the 160 CFM rate for electric stoves was shown to reduce PM2.5 rates below rates that are dangerous for health occupants. I highly encourage the State Building Code Council to pass the science-based proposals which will improve the health of Washingtonians.</p>
Claire Richards	<p>I'm a neuroscientist and here on behalf of the Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility. I'm here to support strengthening the building code to have high ventilation rates on stoves. This will improve the health of Washingtonians and reduce health disparities in Washington State. Essentially, the pollutants related to burning gas affects our lungs, hearts, brains, kidneys, causes still-birth and pre-term birth, and premature deaths, and especially asthma. This is also a concern because of us of our primary public health strategies for reducing exposure to hazardous wildfire smoke is to ask people to stay inside and close</p>

	<p>their windows and doors, but without sufficient ventilation on gas stoves this would increase exposure to indoor sources of air pollution. Given predictions of increased wildfire due to climate change, we should invest now in creating healthier infrastructure. Also increasing exposure to pollutants in the home, such as by increasing ventilation requirements has the potential to decrease tremendous health care costs over the coming decades. Asthma poses a tremendous economic burden in the United States broadly costing at least eighty billion dollars a year. Moreover, Washington State has one of the highest rates of asthma in the nation. This is also a concern of equity. Communities of color and low-income communities have a higher asthma rates due to greater exposure to indoor and outdoor air pollution sources. Research has shown that people of color have higher than average exposure to particle pollution across many different sources, including gas stoves. Low-income communities have smaller homes that expose them to more air pollution, and they often have unventilated or poorly ventilated stoves. The way to reduce health disparities is to control pollution at the source. This means that strengthening the ventilation requirements in buildings is a very important way to reduce health disparities and allow children to reach their full potential, regardless of what zip code they grow up in.</p>
<p>Andrea Velarde, WPSR at PNWU</p>	<p>I'm a resident in Yakima, Washington. I'm a medical student at PNWU training to become a doctor with a goal of serving underserved communities. I strongly urge you to adopt this proposed update to increase ventilation requirements. Increasing ventilation requirements allows for toxic fumes produced by gas powered appliances to be more effectively removed from homes which will protect our community's health. Updating this code is important for addressing the health and equity of our underserved communities, who might live in a smaller space, and already be affected by higher levels of pollution in their communities. As a future physician, these health concerns will be at the root of my diagnosis, and there's no better treatment than prevention of irreversible long-term damage. This proposal can save thousands of healthcare dollars while maintaining health equity in our communities.</p>
<p>Rebecca Hoshaw</p>	<p>I am a resident of Yakima, Washington. I am also a student doctor at Pacific Northwest University's College of Osteopathic Medicine and I'm training to provide optimal patient care to rural underserved and vulnerable individuals. As a future osteopathic physician, my goal is to treat the whole person. This means treating not only the physical aspect of a person's health, but mental, emotional, and spiritual, which are all interconnected. When the environment in which an individual resides proves harmful to their physical health, it has a spiraling effect that negatively impacts all facets of that person's health. This places a significant burden on families and communities as individuals affected by home pollution often develop challenging chronic health issues and these individuals struggle to get the appropriate care necessary to heal and recover. Establishing a strong ventilation, energy code could mean setting a high standard for clean energy in the home and in effect, setting a high standard for the health and equity of the community, which is able to augment the ability of individuals to live a life where they can be more present in family units and actively engage in their community circles, free from the burden of pollution-related health problems. Today, I strongly encourage you to adopt these updated ventilation proposals.</p>
<p>Larry Andrews</p>	<p>I own Andrew's Mechanical with my wife. We are a plumbing, heating, and a mechanical contractor. I'm speaking about the code about only MERV13 air filters. I am speaking against this code. I believe that have three hundred electronic air cleaners do just as good a job as a MERV13 and I believe that this amendment would violate RCW 19.27.020(3) to permit the use of modern technical methods and devices for improvements. Honeywell Air Cleaner doesn't put anything into the airstream when properly installed. What electronic air</p>

	<p>cleaner does is gives you a non-throwable option for real good air cleaning. You wash them monthly, which is best. These don't put any harmful effects into the air. The information published by Honeywell proves this. We've had these for fifty years, and now we're trying to ban them. This is wrong. These air cleaners do just a great job cleaning smoke, and in fact, they're used in smoke eating jobs. If you have a casino or something, that's what they use for cleaning the smoke out of the casinos. They use very little pressure drop in the blower system where a MERV13 filter has a great pressure drop, the more it loads, the more it cost. And then, as we're moving more and more into heat pumps and compressors when the filter gets plugged, the airflow drops and takes the compressor out. The way electronic air cleaner works actually cleans the air. It pulls the particle out of the airstream attaches it to the plates. Thus, there's very little pressure drop and a lot less chance for compressor failure. I encourage you to at least add electronic air cleaners to this proposal or remove the proposal.</p>
<p>Randall Cooper, AHAM – Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers</p>	<p>The first point I would like to make is that AHAM is an approved alternate for HVI in California, and should be noted as such, and all the relevant clauses in the update to the Washington Building Code, for example, clause 403.4.73.1.2 lists HVI and their Directory, or equivalent, but it does not list AHAM specifically, even though we are listed in the previous clause. So, we are asking that AHAM also be added to the subsequent clauses where only HVI is listed. AHAM can provide any required documentation for equivalency, so we can be added to the subclauses of 403.4.7.3.2. AHAM does have a verification and certification program for residential range hoods. It has been accepted by the California Energy Commission for their title, twenty-four building codes. We meet all of their requirements as a certification body. We are also accepted by EPA as a verification body for Energy Star range hood, and not including AHAM specifically, would remove specific products from the market in Washington. The we have products listed only in our Directory. AHAM is also deeply involved in all the technical matters on rangehoods from a new nominal installed airflow rating point which will be through ASHRAE62.s in the future to capture efficiency. I would like to highlight on capture efficiency which has been added this requirement. So, we do thank the Commission for listening to our previous input about simplifying the requirements to just one capture, efficiency, or equivalent airflow for electric and one for gas. But we do want to highlight the capture efficiency is not quite ready for regulations. ASTM E3087 does exist. But there's active work across four different labs to improve repeatability and reproducibility. For example, one lab saw a ten percent change in capture efficiency in a test on the same rangehood in the same lab from morning to afternoon. There are new requirements that are needed in ASTM E2087 before a certification body can certify to those. Keeping the parallel requirements as we have specified before in Table 403.4.7.3 is good, it's just the correlation between capture efficiency and airflow may not be accurate. I would appreciate consideration for adding AHAM as an alternative.</p>
<p>Scott Peterson, Northwest Gas Association</p>	<p>I am from Richland, Washington. Discussing the gas stove ventilation proposals. I oppose the bias against natural gas stoves, and when looking at cooking there are potentially health risks from cooking without ventilation, using anything, gas stove, electric stove, a fire, whatever. But there's no science contrary to what's been said. There is no science indicating that gas stoves are particularly dangerous, so we encourage strong ventilation requirements for cooking for all sources to protect everyone. So let me say, on the science so far, looking at the Physicians for Social Responsibility website and RMI's website, I can't find a single longitudinal, a peer-reviewed study showing a causal link between natural gas and cooking or space heating or water heating a causal link between natural gas and asthma, or any of the conditions that keep getting listed off, such as premature death. And the reason is, there are no longitudinal studies showing</p>

	<p>that connection, there are zero. And so, the science is not as simple as what's being presented here. There are meta-analysis and reviews of reviews. But inside of all of these scientific, these reviews of scientific studies there isn't a study that longitudinally shows a connection. But I can point you to one, in the study of cooking fuels and prevalence of asthma, a global analysis of phase 3 of the international study of asthma and allergies in childhood, commonly known as ISAAC, a quote which analyzed five hundred and twelve thousand seven hundred and seven primary and secondary schoolchildren from one hundred and eight centers in forty-seven countries there is no evidence. There is no evidence of an association between the use of gases of cooking fuel and either asthma, symptoms, or asthma diagnosis, and that was done over three years, and I've seen no rebuttal of this study by anyone who has testified. And so, I think it's time for people to put up or shut up on this issue.</p>
<p>Mike Moore, Broan-NuTone</p>	<p>There was a lot of discussion in California's Title 24 recent rulemaking that pointed at the health studies associated with exposure to cooking pollutants, not only natural gas products of combustion, but also particular matters generated electric cooking events as well, and so I would just urge the Council to go and scour the Title 24 rulemaking for all the documents there, especially through the case reports. That's a great resource to answer the challenge given by the last speaker. I also wanted to say that HVI looked at the 160 CFM targets on the electric side of the house, and one hundred percent of the listed range hoods in the HVI Directory could achieve that 160 CFM target, ninety-three percent over the probably over the range microwaves could hit that 160 CFM targets, so it's widely attainable if you're installing cheaper form, generally of cooking out there. So, from a builder's perspective and from portability, perspective, there's really not much to lose if it's cost-effective means out there of providing cooking and reducing exposure to pollutants. On the gas side of the house, it does get more expensive to hit the targets that are established. But that's based on the concentration of NO2 that's likely to be generated. Again, that study was done by Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. So, you know the targets that are set out there are just to address the pollutants that are generated, based on a study of typical generation rates, and then health studies that look at the health effects of different kinds of being exposed to different concentrations of especially animals. So, you know this is all traceable, and I would just encourage the Council to take the lead in this and move forward with these proposals.</p>
<p>Ian Casey, Northwest Natural</p>	<p>I'm here to provide comment on the range hood proposal that would increase the exhaust flow rate required at electric and combustion ranges. I was present during the TAG meeting. When this proposal was reviewed in the group and ultimately disapproved, and despite that disapproval, the MVE Committee chose to move it forward anyway. I think we can all agree that range hoods are a beneficial appliance in our homes. They provide a variety of functions that improve the air quality in our home's, things like evacuating cooking odors, cooking fumes, and providing humidity control. They have served and will continue to serve an important purpose in our homes. There are several proposed changes in section 403 that we can support. Things like venting range hoods directly to the outdoors but when it comes to providing new exhaust rates for gas and electric ranges, we have some concerns. The recommended exhaust rates in this proposal are speculative, based on limited lab measurements and modeling. We'd like to point out that there is ongoing work being done at the national level by multiple organizations like ASHRAE, as a work group actively developing a rangehood metrics to be incorporated in their updated 62.2 standard. Also, LEC and ASTM are working towards a joint standard regarding capture efficiency that is expected to be published in 2024. Since the flow rates prescribed in this proposal lacks supporting data on their effectiveness, our recommendation is that Council remove these changes to rangehood, exhaust</p>

	<p>rates until nationally recognized organizations like ASHRAE and ASTM complete their work to develop standards based on lab testing that produces an effective exhaust that addresses IAQ issues. We would support a single ventilation ARY for all range types. We asked the Building Council to consider these revisions before finalizing the proposed code.</p>
<p>Anna Janecek</p>	<p>I'm testifying in support of updated in relation requirements. I am a pediatric resident at Seattle Children's Hospital and a member of the Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility. As a pediatrician, I see children every day whose health is affected by poor air quality. Unfortunately, none of us are strangers to the looming clouds of smoke that descend on our State, caused directly by climate change, fueling wildfires every summer. Many of us close our windows and doors and are able to stay inside and escape the smoke when air quality hits the orange or red zone. However, many children in this state are not able to escape smoke indoors, particularly children who are low income and live in small spaces without control over what fuel is used in their homes. Gas stoves emit harmful pollutants that impact the developing bodies and lungs of children. Even when stoves are turned off, the amount of these indoor air pollutants reaches levels that would be deemed illegal if found outside. Because of these issues we are seeing higher rates of diseases, including asthma, a condition that is worsened by breathing bad air. And I've seen multiple children in the ER recently with severe asthma exacerbations. Today, we've heard outcast on the science that clearly states that pollution indoor is produced by methane gas harms in our bodies. The science is still there. It doesn't matter how much those who want to recognize the science as illegitimate, tried to deny it. There is still science to prove these points. As a pediatrician, it's my job to follow what science tells us about how to protect the health of our children, and the science tells us that, continuing to burn gas in homes and letting indoor air pollution skyrocket is making our children sick. While we cannot personally stop wildfire smoke from blowing down from Canada, and we can't prevent the next heat dome that will cause strain in our communities. Today we have the opportunity to follow science and take distinct action that will directly improve the health of families across the State. As pediatricians, I will not be quiet, and we will not be quiet about the health of our patients. I urge you to adopt the updated inhalation requirements for the health of all Washingtonians, especially our most vulnerable population, children.</p>
<p>WAC 51-55, Adoption and amendment of the NEW, 2021 Washington State International Wildland-Urban Interface Code</p>	<p>WSR 22-17-150; The proposed rule adopts the 2021 edition of the International Urban Wildland Interface Code, published by the International Code Council, with state amendments to incorporate proposed changes as adopted by the Washington State Building Code Council. The proposed rule will also take the International Urban Wildland Urban Interface Code out of WAC 51-54A and produce a new WAC 51-55. This will in turn make the International Urban Wildland Urban Interface Code a stand-alone code under WAC 51-55.</p>
<p>From:</p>	<p>Testimony</p>
<p>Andrea Smith, BIAW</p>	<p>We have 8,000 members across the state that represent all aspects of the residential construction sector. We're here today in opposition to all three WUI code proposals. While I appreciate the proponent including BIAW in the development of these proposals, we disagree on one fundamental principal: whether the SBCC has authority to adopt all sections of the 2021 version of the WUI. Simply put, the SBCC does not have this authority. There is no legislative mandate for inclusion of the full body of code. ESSB 6109 only directed the SBCC to adopt specific provisions of the 2018 version of the WUI code. Any code adopted that surpasses the 2018 WUI sections that covers roof coverings, exterior walls, appendages and projections, and driveways would be an overstep</p>

	<p>of rulemaking authority. Further, the WUI mapping as completed by DNR is incomplete. The mapping is not helpful for local jurisdictions or builders because it does not go down to the parcel level, leaving an immense amount of discretion to the building code official for enforcement. Discretion means no uniformity in enforcing the code statewide.</p> <p>I'd also like to state for the record that the process of adopting proposed code amendments at the TAG level was extremely rushed and lacked adequate representation of all interested stakeholders. There were only 2 meetings in which presentation, discussion and passage of these proposals were undertaken. That is simply not enough time to make good, enforceable code. Lastly, the WUI code has real impacts on constructing homes affordably. None of the proposals had any cost data provided, which alone should invalidate these proposals due to the incomplete nature of the code change proposal application. This is policy as outlined in WAC 51-04-025(2). To quote partially: "the proponent's proposal will be deemed incomplete and shall not move forward." Throughout the entire process, this established procedure has been ignored. But to provide cost data for the record, the Home Innovation Lab studied the cost impacts of the WUI across the country. For a single-story house, implementing the full 2021 WUI code, it would add over \$31,000 to the cost of a home. For a two-story home, that number jumps up to more than \$41,000. This will impact housing affordability. So much so that these proposals should not become permanent rule and should instead be provided to the legislature for a potential fix of the original bill as passed.</p>
<p>Jeanette McKague, Washington Relators</p>	<p>We have a lot of concerns with the code proposal with respect to process and to some of the requirements. You know we appreciated having a seat on the TAG, and that was a good experience to be able to get the information on the code. Trouble is that there wasn't sufficient time to really vet that code; two days within a week and six hours. So that's not enough time to even understand what all the aspects are in the code. So, in 2018 the Legislature passed EGSB 6109 that selected different sections of the 2018 WUIC. We think that Bill, as written, did not allow the Code Council to go beyond the sections that were in that Bill. Now one of the things that it allowed was cities and counties to go ahead and adopt the International Wildland-Urban Interface Code or any portion of that. So, you know the cities, or the counties were allowed to do that, but not the international code. And there was no authority to adopt the whole code by the Council. So, we would say that, as noted in the TAG meeting, they tried to go through the legislative process, there was too much legislation during a short session. There wasn't enough time. So, I think some folks decided that well, let's throw it together to what we get. Unfortunately, the TAG was kind of an afterthought. Couldn't find a TAG record. It was hard to find what was filed. I think that going forward we would ask you to consider not moving the proposal forward, going through the legislative process, allow cities and counties to adopt whatever sections of the 2018 Code that they need and then just come back and do this code, maybe next year. Now the other thing that's really important, Section 302. Now in the International Code, it allows the legislative body to do the findings of fact and we think that's a very important thing to have happen.</p>
<p>WAC 51-56, Adoption and amendment of the 2021 Washington State Uniform Plumbing Code</p>	<p>WSR 22-17-153; The proposed rule adopts the 2021 edition of the Uniform Plumbing Code, published by the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials, with state amendments to incorporate proposed changes as adopted by the Washington State Building Code Council. The rules will provide increased clarity and life safety measures for building construction in Washington State.</p>
<p>From:</p>	<p>Testimony</p>
<p>Larry Andrews</p>	<p>I'm President of Andrews Mechanical. I'm against the air admittance valves.</p>

	<p>Number one; It wasn't even vented through the TAG process at the TAG level. But the plumbing system is based on a non-mechanical device to do the work forever. And when you have an air admittance valve, you have a mechanical device that's going to fail. All mechanical items fail. The average person has no idea that these valves would be installed in their home or business. There is no reason to install an air admittance valve in new construction. If you can put in a passive plumbing system always, in new construction. The plumbing code has a way to vent everything in the construction. The instructions for an air admittance valve, if it's in a listed approved air admittance valve comes with the manufacturer's instructions and those are the instructions, if you were to use, one, should be followed. If we are to provide a healthy place for people to live, we don't want to use these valves. We, as plumbers, avoid these things because we know in the future they're going to fail and cause health issues. As a plumber, you want to stay away from all these things. I was shocked when Micah talked about builders wanting to use these in new constructions. The only reason would be to save a little cost. But you're sacrificing the health of the community. SARS was caused by a bad venting problem in China. Sewage gas will cause health problems up to death and that's why plumbers protect the health of the nation. Plumbers don't want these in because of the health problems that they could cause.</p>
Ray Shipman	<p>I'm here to speak in opposition of the Air Admittance Valves in the UPC. I personally sat with the TAG on this, with the design professionals that denied this to be put in the model code. And during that thing I heard from professionals who are not wanting this in homes. It is a cheaper alternative to normal venting. But the only way you know that these systems fail is when you get sick. I've heard over the last two days everybody's so concerned about the energy code and the health crisis of having natural gas. This is a bigger health crisis than having natural gas in a home. So, during the process the BFP asked the Council for review, and they decided that they would like to hear public testimony on it and have it put in the appendices of the Plumbing Code. It has actually been put in the model code. So, I'm asking that it was filed one hundred and one not within the parameters that the Council voted. I'm asking it to be removed from the CR-102, before filing for the CR-103.</p>
Adjourn	<p>The Hearing was adjourned at 2:01 p.m.</p>