

FINAL RESULTS FOR THE IECC RESIDENTIAL PUBLIC COMMENTS TO PUBLIC COMMENT DRAFT #1 BALLOTS

The following are the list of proposals that were acted upon at the June 29, 2023 meeting in the approved agenda order. Below are the final cumulative votes on these items from the meeting and the absentee ballot that followed

RED1-76-22 Vote to Disapprove: 23 yes 20 no 1 abstain. Vote to disapprove passes (simple majority achieved).

RECD1-13-22 Vote to Approve modification 1: This modification removes the 10 credit cap on the credit value shown in the table, removes the duplicate option 2 in row R408.2.3(1)(a), and indicates "NA" where credit totals are unavailable due to other measures. 39 yes 4 no 1 abstain (2/3 majority achieved). Vote to approve RECD1-13-22 as modified passes 39 yes 4 no 1 abstain (2/3 majority achieved).

Approved code changes from the Committee Action report and RECD1-13-22 (Approved as modified) all to be included in Public Comment Draft 2. Public Comment will be open on RECD1-13-22 until Wednesday, August 16 at 11:59 pm Pacific.

RESULTS OF ABSENTEE BALLOT #3 COMMENTS/REASONS

RECD1-13-22 Table R408.2 credit values

Voted Affirmative with comment:

Kochkin, Vladimir

I support the credits table overall and support going to public comment. I will be submitting a public comment on a few items of concern on this change, including:

- Some of the items with NA should be available for credit. For example, the table suggests that if a 97 percent furnace is installed in Climate Zone 4 there is zero credit. This is not the case because at a minimum they would get the same credit as a 95 percent furnace based on the reading of the text provision.
- For reduced air leakage (2.5 ACH50), the NA should be changed to zero. Unlike other practices that are not allowed for claiming credit, this practice does not provide any energy savings relative to the base code.
- Practice R408.2.2(13) shows negative credits. This is because site energy is used for conversion between fuels. We should not be discouraging the practice of installing heat pumps with a gas backup. A cost metric or source energy should be used in this case.
- ERV/HRV:
 - Superposition for MF needs to be included in the analysis and results should be updated.
 - The overall level of savings appears higher than other studies suggest. PNNL should evaluate energy savings using other commercially available software – Ekotrope and EnergyGage - to validate their results.
 - The 75 percent recovery rate is unnecessarily high for HRVs and nearly unrealistic for ERVs making this practice unusable. A more reasonable recovery rate should be selected and analysis should be updated.
 - ERV and HRV should be separated into different practices. These devices perform differently and should be analyzed separately. This is particularly an issue for some climate zones.

Voted Negative with reason:

Martino, Amy

RECD1-13-22

MODIFY THE MODIFICATION (comments in *RED*)

General:

1. *Remove any NA in the proposed motion. It is not consistently used across the table. There should be a number even if 0 even if it does not apply to that CZ.*
2. *I agree that with the Stretch code appendix the points should not be capped.*
3. *All negatives should be 0.*

Note the following:

1. R408.2.2(4) High Performance Gas Furnace (Option 1) 97 AFUE- (All climate zones)
Why has CZ0 through CZ4C and CZ8 been removed from the raw results?
2. R408.2.2(5) High Performance Gas Furnace (Option 2) 95 AFUE- (All climate zones)
Why has CZ5 through CZ7 been removed from the raw results?
3. R408.2.2(13) in the "motion" has negatives for CZ 6-8.
This should be 0. If a High Performance HP with gas furnace backup (Option 2) 95 AFUE + 8.1 HSPF2/15.2 SEER2 (cold climate heat pump) is used they should not be penalized by a negative. Technology is changing and improving. This is the one technology we should be promoting.

REASONING: It appears that the PNNL table still needs work. Without knowing if a public comment was submitted so it can be improved, corrected and further refined, I must vote against the motion to the modification and against the original motion to approve with the modification.