



Oregon

John A. Kitzhaber, MD, Governor

Department of Consumer and Business Services
Building Codes Division
1535 Edgewater Street NW
P.O. Box 14470
Salem, OR 97309-0404
503-378-4133
Fax: 503-378-2322
www.bcd.oregon.gov

July 1, 2011

*Oregon Reach Code Committee
May 25, 2011
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/11reachcode.html>*

Members Present: Bill Clemens, Oregon Building Officials Association (OBOA)
David Cohan, Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA)
Joe Esmonde, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW)
Tom Payne, Oregon Home Builders Association (OHBA)
Franco Martinec, Port of Portland
Rob Yorke, Associated Builders & Contractors (ABC)

Members Absent: Jim Denno, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE)
Kate Turpin, SERA Architects

Guests Present: Johnathan Balkema, Oregon Home Builders Association (OHBA)
Michael Freels, Oregon Home Builders Association (OHBA)
Don Minor, Oregon Manufactured Home Association (OMHA)

Staff Present: Aeron Teverbaugh, Policy Analyst
Mark Heizer, Policy Analyst
Dana Fischer, Building Code Para-Technical

Introductions

Aeron Teverbaugh, Policy Analyst, called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. She welcomed the committee and guests, stating that this is the last Reach Code Committee meeting which wraps up discussions on the residential provisions. Andrea Fogue, Legislative and Green Buildings Manager took a few minutes to express the division's deep gratitude for the committee's work during the last year. She stated the committee has helped Oregon continue to be a leader in high performance construction. She also shared that the division is working on a marketing plan for the code.

Code Change Proposal [RC11res-25](#)

Ms. Teverbaugh explained that the division received amended code language from the proponent based on committee recommendations discussed at the May 11, 2011 meeting. Mark Heizer explained the amended language. The committee discussed the language and asked clarifying questions.

Motion to approve as modified code change proposal RC11res-25 which includes the division's recommended changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Code Change Proposal [RC11res-23](#)

Ms. Teverbaugh explained this proposal was voted on at the May 11, 2011 meeting.

Motion to reconsider and open for discussion code change proposal RC11res-23.

Motion passed unanimously.

Committee members discussed the energy saving issues previously discussed. Issues pertained to the different opinions on what the Reach Code is: a green code or high performance code. Home owners on a "well" water system may see a cost savings if a composting toilet system is installed. Franco Martinec noted that he had personal knowledge of the energy that could be saved by installing a composting toilet because he had considered the option. His property is well fed and he has to pump effluent uphill. He investigated a composting toilet in an attempt to offset the energy required for pumping water and effluent on his property. David Cohan asked the division to specifically state what the "Reach Code" really is. Ms. Teverbaugh explained the proposal was slightly modified to add a requirement that if a composting toilet is installed then a "recording statement" must be added to the property deed which will help notify future owners that a composting toilet has been installed.

Motion to approve code change proposal RC11res23.

Motion passed unanimously.

Space and Chase requirements

Ms. Teverbaugh explained that *space and chase* requirements for *renewable ready construction* was inadvertently left out of draft code. Johnathan Balkema read the suggested *modified language* to the committee. The committee discussed the language and their concerns on how the language would affect solar roof installations. It was suggested there should be a labeling requirement and that a label stating the "conduits use" be posted on the top and bottom of the conduit piping.

Joe Esmonde arrived at 10:00 a.m.

The committee continued to discuss possible draft language. It was decided that the division should take the modified language proposed by Mr. Balkema and add specific minimum dimensions for the chase or conduit. The committee also discussed an exception for when the solar resource was inadequate.

Motion to approve provisions in concept and direct the division to draft language that addressed the dimensions and labeling.

Motion passed unanimously.

Questions for Rule Advisory Committees to Consider When Adopting Rules

- Is the state or any unit of local government likely to be economically affected by the rule change? If yes, how and to what extent? *Yes.*
- Who else is likely to be economically affected by the rule change? How will they be affected? *For those builders that choose to utilize the code there may be an impact. For builders, designers etc., that opt to use the code the costs will be passed onto the customer. There may also be a positive impact because of incentives and lower operating costs.*

- Assuming there is a fiscal impact, estimate the number of small businesses and the types of businesses and industries affected by the proposed rules. *Based on the most recent data we have available, there are an estimated 14,400 construction businesses in Oregon according to 2006 Census data; of those, approximately 13,700 qualify as “small businesses” with 50 or fewer employees.. Not all these businesses would be affected because of the voluntary nature of the code.*
- Assuming that there is a fiscal impact on small businesses, please provide a description and specifically address all of the following:
 - A description of expected reporting, record keeping, and administrative activities required to comply with the proposed rules: *Third party verifications, energy star and post occupancy reporting where that project elective is selected, modeling audit, building departments may have increased plan review or inspection costs.*
 - An estimate of the cost of professional services required to comply with the proposed rules: *Since this is an optional code, this is undeterminable at this time.*
 - An identification of the equipment, supplies, and labor and increased administration required to comply with the proposed rules: *Code books, training, consultants, and design professionals.*

The committee acknowledged the work of the sub-committee and staff. Mr. Clements commented that everyone involved had a lot of expertise, and that it was good to have all the perspectives represented and that it had been very valuable. The committee echoed agreement that the diverse perspectives of the committee members had been valuable. Mr. Esmonde reiterated that it would be an important part of the Reach Code process to have information on the projects sent to BCD, perhaps as part of the surcharge reporting process. The committee agreed.

Staff expressed deep gratitude to the committee and appreciation that they had dedicated so much time and effort to the Reach Code development process.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.