WABO Energy Ad-Hoc Committee Report– 2012 IECC/WSEC Code Cycle

The Ad-Hoc Committee was formulated consisting of 25 individuals representing industry/trade professionals, international code promulgators, building departments, and WABO membership alike. Additionally, the committee was co-chaired by interests representing eastern and western regions of Washington: Christopher Young (Chair) and Rick Hopkins (Co-chair) for western Washington, along with Randy Vissia (Chair) and Greg Colvig (Co-chair) for eastern Washington.

The committee was tasked with reviewing the proposed amendments to the 2012 IECC documents. The proposed amendments were to be reviewed using the 2/12 WABO Position Paper as a guide, with particular focus on position item #4:

- The energy code must be enforceable
- The energy code must be clear, concise, understandable to regulators and builders
- The energy code must not negatively impact economic development
- The energy code supports collaboration with designers, builders, and developers
- The energy code is consistent with regional and national standards
- The energy code supports regional flexibility for the enforcement of energy codes

Additionally, the committee sought to explore alternative examples of energy code programs (e.g.; New York State/ICC partnership, Douglas County adoption of 2012 IECC), and WABO's role in training/credentialing.

The committee held (3) separate conference calls, additionally communicating via email and individual phone calls as they began reviewing amendment proposals.

As the committee began reviewing the 170+ proposed amendments, it was confirmed by SBCC Staff that a staff document which merged the 2009 WSEC and 2012 IECC (referred to as the "mashed" document), was considered by the SBCC and Energy TAG to be the baseline document for amendment. The "mashed" document represented approximately 200 separate language changes to the 2012 IECC, and represents a proposed amendment(s) in itself.

With this information the committee reset its focus to include review of the additional 200 proposed changes, using the criteria cited previously.

During the June 5, 2012 conference call committee members concluded that, while able to review a majority of the proposed amendments (including "mashed " document), it would be unlikely that all proposals could be reviewed given the time frame, and a clear picture drawn of the potential impacts resulting from nearly 400 proposals. Reasons for this conclusion include:

- The additional changes included in the “mashed” document produced a level of confusion in the amendment process.
- Many amendment proposals sought to amend language that was in itself an amendment.
- Questions of proper Rule Making procedure in creation of the “mashed” document.
- A 2012 IECC so heavily amended as to become un-recognizable as a national standard by its users, and would not be properly supported by training, compliance materials/software, or credentialing.
- An estimated 75-80% of the proposed amendments lacked the necessary cost/benefit analysis.

In conclusion, the committee proposed creation of additional statements for the Membership’s consideration which would add, amend, and strengthen the WABO Energy Code Position Paper, adopted February, 2012.

These statements have been incorporated into the original Position Paper, which you have before you, and include:

1. WABO concerns with creation of a “code island” in the State of Washington, by creation of an international standard no longer recognizable by designers, builders, or code officials.
2. Requests additional direction from the legislature, and a process which allows orderly consideration of costs and enforcement needs.
3. WABO support of legislative adoption of a nationally recognized methodology for measuring advancements in energy efficiencies for each code cycle and all other energy code proposed amendments.
4. WABO support of establishing a fully funded statewide energy education program providing comprehensive education (commercial and residential) for code officials, designers, building owners, and the public with WABO playing a major role in curriculum development, and delivery of needed training and credentialing.
5. WABO support of an energy code implementation date of July, 2014 providing an opportunity for needed training and education to occur.
6. WABO concern with the “mashed document” and fears of potential litigation surrounding the process, while supporting a “simplified” energy document similar to the Douglas County proposal deemed equivalent to meet SB 5854 requirements, yet is supported by ICC for training, certification and support.

On behalf of myself, Chris, and our co-chairs, we wish to recognize the passion, commitment, and energy of the Ad Hoc Committee members, who without their valuable insight, contribution, and mining of information, we could not have come so far and in such a timely, organized manor. Well done.

Also special thanks go out to Ron Newbry, for his eloquent play on words, and masterful manipulation of the phrase, and to Ad Hoc member and WABO Government Affairs Chair, Gary Allsup, for keeping us on task, and the incorporation of the committee’s recommendations into its final form.