



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

### Energy Code Technical Advisory Group Meeting Review Notes for January 26, 2018

Agenda Items	TAG Actions
1. Welcome and Introductions	Meeting called to order at 9:45 a.m.
<p><b>TAG Members Present:</b> Duane Jonlin, Chair; Amy Wheelless; Chuck Murray; Treasa Sweek; Robby Oylear; Lisa Rosenow; Dave Baylon; Patrick Hayes*; Bryan Russo; Gary Heikkinen; Luke Howard; Al Audette*; Kim Barker; Mike Fowler; CJ Brockway</p> <p><b>Visitors Present:</b> Eric Vander Mey, Andrew Pultorak, Mike Kennedy, Roger LeBrun, Rob Marks, Ty Wasserman</p> <p><b>TAG Members Absent:</b> Alan Duer, Dean Moody, Jonathan Jones, Todd Blevins, Jared Sheeks;</p> <p><b>Staff:</b> Krista Braaksma</p> <p style="text-align: right;">* indicates an alternate member</p>	
2. Review and Approve <a href="#">Agenda</a>	<p>Agenda approved as written. Duane Jonlin welcomed everyone and apologized for the late start.</p> <p>Duane asked if there were any volunteers to be vice chair of the TAG. Patrick Hayes volunteered and was duly appointed.</p>
3. Review and Approve Minutes	Approval of the minutes of the January 5 meeting was deferred.
4. Review Integrated Draft – 2015 Washington State Energy Code, Commercial	
C404	<p>Lisa Rosenow noted that Table C404.3.1 includes pipe sizes not allowed under the UPC. Duane noted there may be future code change proposals addressing the issue.</p> <p>C404.8—Lisa felt this section was too similar to circulation systems. Lisa felt this section should be moved to a subsection to C404.7.1. Eric Vander Mey disagreed. This is a different type of system. Duane said this would require a code change proposal.</p> <p>Dave Baylon noted Section C404.6 had the wrong section references. They should reference Table C403.10.3.</p>
No significant changes to report.	
C405	C405.2.1 – CJ Brockway noted this occupancy sensor controls section changes private offices to open plan offices. This is a big changes and configuring the controls would be difficult. Is this a mandate for luminaire level lighting controls? It is also a problem complying with C405.2.1.3 and providing a “reasonably uniform illumination

	<p>pattern.” This would also be difficult to enforce. Duane noted it would take a code change proposal to modify this, since this is more stringent than the 2015 code.</p> <p>C405.2.2 – Kim Barker noted the section references should be updated in this section. Also, the term “occupancy sensor” in C405.2.1 should be changed to “occupant sensor” for consistency and correlation with the defined term.</p> <p>Lisa Rosenow noted Section C405.2.2.2, Light reduction controls, where it is currently located, wouldn’t be required in a retrofit situation. Was that the intent? Duane noted it should be discussed during the review of Chapter 5.</p> <p>C405.2.4 – This change is a reduction in stringency. Exception 6 is a less stringent version of exception 5 and should be stricken.</p> <p>Fig. C405.2.4.2(1) – The section view should also be included.</p> <p>C405.2.4.3 – The use of the term sidelit is not consistent, here and in other sections of the code. Also, the figure arrangement doesn’t seem to make sense with rooftop monitor being numbered as a sidelit daylight zone. This needs to be cleaned up.</p> <p>C405.2.5 – The TAG debated whether the new language for task lighting was less stringent than the existing language. The TAG decided to go with the new.</p> <p>C405.2.6—Kim Barker felt this was really an exception to C405.2.1 and should be relocated. Digital timer switch, along with C405.2.6.1, was moved be an exception to C405.2.1.</p> <p>C405.2.7.2 – There was debate over the required for decorative lighting to be shut off from one hour after closing until one hour before opening. This could be a safety issue. Duane felt there should be a code change proposal submitted.</p> <p>C405.4.1 – Mike Kennedy felt the new calculation for calculating total connected interior power was less stringent than the current language, with 50 W to 30W. Both he and CJ felt the new language was more reasonable. The majority of the TAG determined the old language should be retained. Duane noted it would take a code change to bring in less stringent language, even if it was reasonable.</p> <p>C405.5.2 – CJ suggested adding clarifying language to item 12 to include lighting integrated within art features or monuments.</p>
	<p><b>Significant changes:</b> C405.2.1/C405.2.1.3: requirements for occupant sensor controls in open plan office areas will be difficult to both design and enforce.</p> <p>C405.4.1 – The model code language was not adopted because it was less stringent, but it was generally felt to be more reasonable language on calculating total connected lighting power.</p>
C406	<p>Lisa Rosenow noted there were some expedited changes missing from the language that needs to be updated. She also noted in C406.2.3, it should read “fan efficiency grade” rather than “energy efficiency</p>

	classification.”
	No significant changes to report.
<i>C407</i>	<p>Duane noted there was talk of a code change proposal replacing this section with ASHRAE 90.1 Appendix G.</p> <p>Krista noted there was one section in the new Mandatory table that wasn't marked as mandatory in the IECC—Voltage drop. The TAG determined it should be included.</p> <p>Mike noted that the two sections calling out mandatory provisions (C401, C407) had conflicts. The TAG debated the inclusion of interior lighting power in the new mandatory table. It was taken out of the requirements for C407 in the Seattle code. The TAG determined it would need to be a code change proposal. It was felt you can use a lower lighting power to trade, but can't trade against using more lighting.</p>
	No significant changes to report.
<i>C408</i>	<p>Treasa Sweek noted the figure would need to be updated to correspond with the new layout.</p> <p>Lighting systems was replaced with lighting controls throughout this section.</p>
	No significant changes to report.
<i>C409</i>	The metering section is a state amendment and has no substantive changes.
	No significant changes to report.
<i>C410</i>	<p>Mike Kennedy noted there was a numbering error in C410.1.1.</p> <p>Lisa Rosenow noted this section doesn't contain the changes made via interim rules. They need to be incorporated.</p>
	No significant changes to report.
<i>Chapter 5</i>	Mike Kennedy felt the new sentence in C503.3.2, Fenestration, was less stringent than the current code. The TAG concurred and removed the sentence from this section and the Skylight section C503.3.3 and the building envelope section as well.
	No significant changes to report.
6. Meeting Schedule	The TAG will continue to meet again after the Council sets a deadline for code change proposals. A meeting date will be set at that time.
7. Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.