

Energy Efficiency Building Codes Working Group 4/25/2011 Meeting Notes

List of Working Group Members:

Tim Ryan, Chair, City of Overland Park
Randall Allen, Kansas Association of Counties
Samuel Alpert, Construction Users Council of Greater Kansas City
Trudy Aron, American Institute of Architects, Kansas Chapter
Luke Bell, Kansas Association of Realtors
Neal Ezell, Ezell-Morgan Construction, Inc.
Bob Fairbanks, Heart of America Chapter, ICC
Sandy Jacquot, League of Kansas Municipalities
Leslie Kaufman, Kansas Cooperative Council
Jerry Mallory, Johnson County Contractor Licensing
Tina Rakes, City of Baldwin City
Jeff Risley, Climate and Energy Project
George Schluter, National Association of Home Builders
Martha Smith, Kansas Manufactured Housing Association
Bruce Snead, KSU Engineering Extension
Chris Wilson, Kansas Building Industry Association
Glen Wiltse, Sedgwick County

Members Present: Tim Ryan, *Chair*; Sam Alpert; Trudy Aron; Luke Bell; Neal Ezell; Bob Fairbanks; Leslie Kaufman; Sean Miller (for Chris Wilson); Tina Rakes; Jeff Risley; George Schluter; Martha Smith; Bruce Snead; Glen Wiltse

KCC Staff: Liz Brosius, Susan Duffy, Bob Glass, Brett Bitner

Introductory remarks and member updates

Tim Ryan opened the meeting, noting that energy don't seem to be going away. Ryan invited members to update the group on activities in their areas. Sam Alpert noted that the commercial construction was still struggling and expressed frustration at the scarcity of government incentives for this sector, compared with the residential and public sectors. George Schluter said the homebuilders were still in survival mode and commented on some changes in energy efficiency incentives offered by KCP&L on the Kansas side of their service territory (Bob Glass, KCC Chief of Economic Policy, reviewed some of the issues in the recent KCP&L rate case, and Susan Duffy, KCC Executive Director, noted that KCP&L had withdrawn their application to be an Efficiency Kansas partner). Luke Bell said that the realtors were working to get the word out about the Efficiency Kansas, especially now that Westar was offering the program. He noted that the program may be more difficult to "sell" once the \$100

energy audit promotion and the \$500 thermal envelope rebate expire; Duffy agreed that it may be harder to get people to participate once the \$100 energy audit program expires on September 30th. Tina Rakes said that there was a lot of concern within the ICC about the recent increases in the 2012 codes. Martha Smith mentioned that manufactured housing was regulated by federal performance-based standards, established by HUD and DOE. Glen Wiltse reported that there wasn't too much new construction in the Wichita area, but that his codes officials were staying busy doing inspections for other jurisdictions. Ryan said that Overland Park had enhanced their plan review and inspections to include more energy-related items and were gearing up to do more in the future. He noted that they're learning that it's hard to get 100% compliance with the codes. Schluter mentioned that the NAHB has a problem with DOE's rationale for the 30% energy reduction in the latest codes.

Staff updates

Liz Brosius summarized recent and upcoming codes-related activities:

- Presentations to the Topeka Sustainability Board (Jan. 7); Energy & Utilities committee, Kansas House of Representatives (Feb. 1); and ICC, Heart of America Chapter annual meeting (April 5).
- January 26th meeting at MARC with homebuilders, energy raters, and codes officials to codes adoption strategies and potential for HERS raters to provide 3rd-party certification and/or inspections. (MARC is pushing adoption of consistent building codes, with 2012 as the current target, in the KC metro area.)
- Presentation to Paola city council study group (May 3)
- Information booth at the 2011 Commercial Real Estate Expo (May 11).

Brosius noted that she had been working with the Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (MEEA) to get a better understanding of the federal requirements (for example, MEEA clarified that DOE will consider the adoption of the 2009 IECC to meet the requirement for commercial structures) and learn more about additional tools and resources that have been developed to assist States in achieving the federal compliance goals. She is sending MEEA quarterly updates on the codes initiative in Kansas, and these updates are part of MEEA's quarterly report to DOE.

Update on benefit-cost study

Brosius provided an update on the benefit-cost study, which the Working Group asked staff to begin to develop to provide an objective Kansas estimate of the costs and benefits associated with codes adoption. (Currently, no such estimate of both benefits and costs exists for the state.) The plan is for KCC analysts to conduct the study, using cost data provided by homebuilders around the state. Brosius thanked Neal Ezell for

putting together a preliminary framework for the estimate of construction cost impacts of code changes from 2006 to 2009; Ryan noted that he had briefly reviewed and thought it was generally. Ezell walked the group through his spreadsheet and assumptions, explaining that he provided estimates for four types of homes (rancher with basement, rancher on slab, 2-Story with basement, and 2-story on slab), all of which and focused on requirements in the 2009 IECC and IRC. Ezell pointed out that the largest costs would be associated with duct testing, which wouldn't be necessary in many structures, provided the ductwork is within the conditioned space (thermal envelope. In the discussion that followed, it was agreed that the study would focus on the residential sector initially and that the baseline for comparison with the targeted code (IECC 2009) would be the 2006 IECC, since that is the code currently adopted as the applicable state standard for commercial and industrial structures. Additional comments included the following:

- Schluter said he thought Ezell's framework was a good start, but would like to review further and provide additional comment.
- Leslie Kaufman expressed concern about the geographic regions targeted for the study, which exclude smaller jurisdictions.
- Kaufman and Smith expressed concerns about the reliability of data collected from homebuilders not subject to the 2006 IECC, which serves as the baseline for comparison.
- Schuter commented that he thought homebuilders were able to provide reasonable cost estimates for various items, regardless of the level of local codes adopted.
- Smith suggested the study should include additional costs, such as equipment maintenance and costs of inspections.
- Wiltse said he thought the newer more-efficient HVAC equipment will require more maintenance than older models.
- Ryan noted that Overland Park was currently doing more inspections with fewer staff.

In wrapping up the discussion on the study, which included concerns about the types of costs and benefits that would be included, Ryan encouraged members to submit their comments on the proposed framework for estimated construction costs. Brosius noted that she would rely on members to help her get the data survey disseminated to homebuilders in the targeted geographic regions. She also said that once the study was completed, the write-up would include a clear outline of the assumptions used in preparing the analysis and the study parameters.

Building codes survey

Brosius reported that the survey would be updated annually, and she would begin working with the 55 cities in the fall to get more recent data compiled by the end of the year.

Additional Business

Alpert made two announcements about upcoming events: (1) a workforce development event for high school kids at Bartle Hall on April 28, 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., in which students display their models of energy efficient schools; and (2) CUC and AIA are co-sponsoring a BIM event on May 3, in Kansas City (along with the law firm of Stinson Morrison Hecker). Brosius informed members about a ICC Energy Course that the Unified Government (KC, KS) was hosting on May 5-6; she provided handouts that Greg Talkin had emailed. Ryan and Brosius said they would discuss future meeting dates and get back with the members.

Meeting adjourned.