



**International Code Council**  
500 New Jersey Avenue, NW  
Sixth Floor  
Washington, DC 20001  
t: 888.ICC.SAFE (422.7233)  
t: 202.370.1800  
f: 202.783.2348  
[www.iccsafe.org](http://www.iccsafe.org)

February 28, 2022

Mr. John Cymbalsky  
U.S. Department of Energy  
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy  
1000 Independence Avenue SW., EE-5B,  
Washington, DC 20585

Submitted Electronically

**RE: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DOE/EIS-0550) for Proposed Energy Conservation Standards for Manufactured Housing, Docket Number EERE-2009-BT-BC-0021**

The International Code Council (ICC) is a nonprofit organization, with more than 64,000 members, that is dedicated to helping communities and the building industry provide safe, resilient, and sustainable construction through the development and use of model codes (I-Codes) and standards used in the design, construction, and compliance processes. Most U.S. states and communities, federal agencies, and many global markets choose the I-Codes to set the standards for regulating construction, plumbing and sanitation, fire prevention, and energy conservation in the built environment. The Code Council recognizes the essential role the I-Codes and supporting resources play in realizing energy efficiency and greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals through the framework, [Leading the Way to Energy Efficiency: A Path Forward on Energy and Sustainability to Confront Climate Change](#). We appreciate the opportunity to provide comment on how the Department of Energy (DOE) should use information from the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to develop proposed energy conservation standards for manufactured housing in the above-captioned matter.

The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA) requires DOE to establish by regulation standards for the energy efficiency of manufactured housing.<sup>1</sup> These standards “shall be based on the most recent version of the International Energy Conservation Code (including supplements), except in cases in which the Secretary finds that the code is not cost-effective, or a more stringent standard would be more cost effective, based on the impact of the code on the purchase price of manufactured housing and on total life-cycle construction and operating costs.”<sup>2</sup> EISA required DOE to complete this rulemaking nearly ten years ago.<sup>3</sup>

Absent action by DOE, energy efficiency requirements for manufactured housing remain tied to U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development requirements (the “HUD Code”) which have not been updated since 1994. In contrast, the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) has increased energy efficiency requirements by roughly 40% over the past 15 years along with corresponding improvements in building, mechanical, and material science and technology. High energy burdens remain a persistent

---

<sup>1</sup> See 42 U.S.C. § 17071(a)(1).

<sup>2</sup> § 17071(b)(1).

<sup>3</sup> See 42 U.S.C. § 17071(a)(1).

challenge in the United States for families living in manufactured housing. Energy efficiency improvements for manufactured homeowners are overdue.

We commend Congress and the Department for recognizing the role model codes, like the IECC, serve in achieving national priorities. The model codes are designed to support consistency in policy and reflect knowledge and practice from across the building industry. At the same time, they allow for flexibility during adoption to reflect specific building types or technologies.

The Code Council's response to the draft EIS on DOE's proposed energy conservation standards for manufactured housing is provided below.

Under the draft EIS, DOE has evaluated four proposed alternatives as approaches in establishing the energy conservation standards for manufactured housing. The EIS provides valuable information the Department should use on weighing the effectiveness of different actions including impacts on energy use, energy cost savings, home cost, emissions reductions, and the industry. These parameters are important considerations, but must be balanced with other considerations including ease of compliance and enforcement of the different options and long-term applicability of the approach.

The EIS determines that application of the 2021 IECC across all manufactured homes (Alternative C) would provide the greatest energy and greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions. The 2021 IECC would offer manufactured housing with lower indoor air concentrations of outdoor air pollutants and improve the ability to control exposure to wildfire smoke, providing enhanced indoor air quality and health benefits not realized in the current HUD code.

Further, the 2021 IECC provides several pathways to achieve compliance. This optionality allows for flexibility, which, depending on construction parameters, can achieve equivalent or greater efficiency at a lower incremental cost. We encourage DOE to further consider these options in its final EIS and rulemaking.

As identified in the EIS, Alternatives A and B provide roughly equivalent energy and GHG savings and life-cycle savings, simple payback and cost impacts to each other, so if DOE determines a tiered approach is necessary it should look to other factors in its decision making. Basing a tiered approach on price (Alternative A) would be cumbersome. Price fluctuates based on many factors that are not correlated with energy use—inflation, cost of materials, cost of labor, aesthetic design choices, and scale of production. Price also depends on unit configuration. Further, it would be very difficult (and outside the scope of their role) for those responsible for plan review and verification of compliance to determine which units are assigned to which tier based on price. Differentiation by size (Alternative B) is objective, more precise, and easier to implement and regulate. Additionally, Alternative B provides the greatest net present value of consumer savings at the national level while also exhibiting the lowest reduction in shipments.

Furthermore, Alternative D, representing a no action alternative, is not a viable solution and is inconsistent with EISA requirements and the critical need for increased energy efficiency of manufactured homes. Alternative D does not provide any emissions reduction or energy savings benefits and would not improve indoor air quality and health of manufactured homes constructed in the future.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. If you have any questions concerning the Code Council's recommendations, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Gabe Maser  
Senior Vice President, Government Relations  
International Code Council  
gmaser@iccsafe.org

Ryan M. Colker, J.D., CAE  
Vice President, Innovation  
International Code Council  
rcolker@iccsafe.org