



Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Consumer and Business Services

Building Codes Division

1535 Edgewater Street NW

PO Box 14470

Salem, OR 97309-0404

(503) 378-4133

FAX (503) 378-2322

bcd.oregon.gov

December 4, 2009

Oregon Commercial Energy Conservation Advisory Committee
Thursday, May 28, 2009
Meeting Summary

****NOTE:** *The following is a summary of the committee's discussion.*
To review the meeting in its entirety, the archived video of the meeting is available
on the committee's Web site at the following link: <http://www.bcd.oregon.gov/committees/10cec.html>

Members Present: Martin Brown, City of Wilsonville, Building Official
Skai Dancey, Oregon Health and Sciences University (OHSU)
Jeff Harris, NW Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA)
Jim Klopfenstein, Mechanical Board Member
Tim Nicol, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW)
Samir Mokashi, American Institute of Architects (AIA)
Ron Lowen, Best Heating
Nathan Philips, National Electrical Contractors Association (NECA)
Bruce Soihl, Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA)
Marci Wichman, United Association of Plumbers and Steamfitters (UA290)

Members Absent: Andy Dykeman, Lease Crutcher Lewis
Jim Edelson, Governor's Energy Efficiency Working Group (EEWG)

Guests Present: David Cohan, Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA)
Michael Rosenberg, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL)
Kelly Fough, Holophane
Gary Curtis, Ecos Consulting

Staff Present: Wendy Beard, northwest regional coordinator
Gabrielle Schiffer, sustainability coordinator
Shane Sumption, fire and life safety code specialist
Mark Campion, inspector
Alan Seymour, Department of Energy
Shauna Parker, rules coordinator
Dana Fischer, building code para-technical

Wendy Beard, northwest regional coordinator, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. She provided some housekeeping reminders with regards to parking. She also reminded those individuals wishing to provide comment that they must first approach the testimony table and identify themselves by stating

their name and who they are representing. Ms. Beard then noted that the regularly scheduled meeting on July 24 has been rescheduled to July 30.

Shane Sumption, fire and life safety code specialist noted the items the committee will need to review, in order to finish their discussion on envelope provisions. He further explained that a main topic of discussion will be the two air leakage proposals, and that they differ in their approach.

The document used during today's discussion is [2007 OSSC Envelope](#).

1312.9 Air Leakage

Mr. Sumption asked for a committee member to begin the discussion on air leakage.

Nathan Philips commented he is unclear as to why there are two alternatives, one detailed and the other a broad outline, but is leaning toward the first alternative.

1312 Vestibules

The committee discussed different issues pertaining to what size a vestibule should be and what the correct threshold should be for the state of Oregon. The committee voiced several concerns.

Nathan Philips expressed concern as to why there are two alternatives listed in this section. Martin Brown questioned the intent of exception 3, which has a requirement for structures less than 10,000 square feet in size. Mike Rosenberg, an audience member representing Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA), pointed out that a change occurred in the national standard that removed the exception from what they consider climate zone 4 (climate zone 1 for Oregon). He suggested that exception 3 be removed completely and that both climate zones be listed in exception 5.

Mr. Brown asked if exception 4 is too restrictive. The committee continued to discuss how the language should read in regards to the requirement for structures less than 1000 square feet in size, and voiced concern that this requirement will require many current businesses to install a vestibule but that the structure may not have space for one. The consensus is that 1000 square feet is too small.

Jeff Harris asked if the correct threshold really is 10,000 square feet and if this would work for the whole state. Mr. Philips replied he believes exception 3 is acceptable. Alan Seymour, who represents The Department of Energy, commented the intent of this exception is to require a vestibule at the front entrance of a structure, but back entrances would not need one. The committee continued to discuss different scenarios of threshold size and the effects it could have on different size structures. One comment was the size of the structure could be determined by the occupancy which then could determine the threshold size.

Mr. Philips believes model code should be followed as close as possible. He has spoken to mechanical contractors who expressed they don't believe there will be a big impact on HVAC systems. Structure lobbies are impacted by vestibules, not the rest of the building. Energy is impacted at the lobby entrance. Jeff Harris believes a way to fix this is to make a very clear distinction between climate zone 1 and climate zone 2. He suggested making each zone generic and deleting exception 4.

Mr. Sumption summarized the committee's discussion stating the consensus is to keep the first proposal.

1312.9.1 Fenestration and doors

Mr. Philips asked if the numbers listed in this section refer to product standards that manufacturers are manufacturing to. Gary Curtis, an audience member representing Ecos Consulting, answered that yes, the National Fenestration Rating Council (NFRC) is equivalent to the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM), Air Leakage Standard. The American National Standards Institute/Door and Access Systems Manufacturers Association (ANSI/DASMA) standard is what garage door manufactures manufacture to. Mr. Sumption asked if the section came from an ASHRAE standard. Mr. Curtis considers this section "housekeeping" which helps industry catch up with what manufacturers have been doing for some time.

1312.9.2 Loading dock weatherseals

Mr. Lowen expressed concern, explaining that although most vehicles that use large dock doors are uniform in size and can fit the seal that is installed around dock doors appropriately, cargo doors usually service vehicles of many different sizes and have the potential to leak air because they do not fit the seal appropriately. Mr. Mokashi believes the exception in this section explains itself and can be understood by most people.

Mr. Harris summarized that the committee is suggesting three changes to this section. One: delete cargo doors, two: define loading dock doors where semi-truck trailers can back up into a space, and three: an exception for unconditioned or semi-conditioned spaces.

BREAK

1312.9.4 Recessed lighting fixtures

Mr. Sumption explained that although the language in this section has been changed, it is not a new requirement and has been in the code.

Mr. Philips asked why there are three IC ratings for fixtures, when they are located in a box where they do not come in contact with insulation. Mr. Seymour answered that he has seen this situation before, and the question is whether there is enough area around the box to dissipate enough heat. Mr. Harris also stated that Underwriters Laboratories (UL) issued a ruling that they could not guarantee the UL listing unless a box is IC rated. Skai Dancey commented that earlier the committee felt suspended ceilings were not an acceptable method of insulating space and asked if this issue plays into this idea. Mr. Harris answered that an IC rating would not be required if recessed cans were installed below a suspended ceiling.

1312.8 Moisture Control

Mr. Seymour commented that some changes have been made to Chapter 14 of the structural code. He suggested that the language on walls and moisture control be deleted and a reference added, referring the reader to 1405.3 where the two topics are discussed, since there are new requirements pertaining to both the tables and climate zones. He handed out to each committee member, a document to help move the discussion along.

The committee discussed the proposed language at length and voiced concerns on how to move the language forward since it relates to the Oregon Structural Specialty Code (OSSC). Mr. Sumption explained that staff will be responsible for making the “housekeeping” changes associated with Mr. Seymour’s proposal since the language changes what has been discussed and approved during the current Structural Code Committee’s review of Chapter 13 in the OSSC.

The committee continued to discuss the language and asked Mr. Seymour to explain in more detail the “exceptions” listed in the proposed language.

The committee concluded their discussion.

Mr. Rosenberg offered to have committee contact him if they have any questions about the mechanical provisions, prior to the committee’s next meeting.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.