

Survey Responses

19 March 2019 - 29 July 2024

Building Electrification "Reach" Code Concepts

Engage Olympia

Project: Building Electrification



VISITORS					
82					
CONTRIBUTORS			RESPONSES		
15			15		
15	0	0	15	0	0
Registered	Unverified	Anonymous	Registered	Unverified	Anonymous



Respondent No: 1

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: May 16, 2023 15:47:51 pm

Last Seen: Sep 21, 2023 15:22:48 pm

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

not answered

Q2. Comments?

I approve of this new requirement; Olympia is and should be a leader in climate related policies.

Q3. Comments?

I approve of this new requirement; Olympia is and should be a leader in climate related policies.

Q4. Comments?

I approve of this new requirement; Olympia is and should be a leader in climate related policies.

Q5. Comments?

I approve of this new requirement; Olympia is and should be a leader in climate related policies.

Q6. Comments?

I approve of this new requirement; Olympia is and should be a leader in climate related policies.

Q7. Comments?

I approve of this new requirement; Olympia is and should be a leader in climate related policies.

Q8. Comments?

I approve of this new requirement; Olympia is and should be a leader in climate related policies.

Q9. Comments?

I approve of this new requirement; Olympia is and should be a leader in climate related policies.

Q10. Comments?

I approve of this new requirement; Olympia is and should be a leader in climate related policies.



Respondent No: 2

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: May 16, 2023 16:06:36 pm

Last Seen: May 16, 2023 22:23:21 pm

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

not answered

Q2. Comments?

Regarding the reasons for excluding commercial kitchens from this code: I would recommend that more time is given to them to transition. Rather than by July 1, 2023, allow them 5 years to make this transition. Regarding having some exclusions for industrial/manufacturing processes: I recommend a requirement that they capture any carbon that is emitted by their fossil fuel use. Regarding emergency and healthcare occupancies exclusion: what is the objection to having onsite fuel storage? I assume the fuel storage would be in the form of solar powered, wind powered and or hydro-powered storage batteries? What is the issue with having these onsite batteries? The batteries could be charged with which ever non fossil fuel is available so that when the power fails, the facilities will already have fully charged batteries to run their heating systems. As it is, if they use fossil fueled generators for emergency heating, wouldn't they need to have onsite fossil fuel storage? So I don't understand the issue-fossil fuel storage vs charged battery storage.

Q3. Comments?

Perhaps this is covered elsewhere and in case it isn't, I would recommend a 10 year grace period for all buildings to convert to electricity and those that can't, should be removed and replaced with ones that can be electrified. The goal of having emissions be dropped down to 2015 levels is absolutely ridiculous and I wonder who came up with that date? A goal of 1980 levels is needed to mitigate climate change and a goal of 1950 to reverse climate change.

Q4. Comments?

Why is new gas equipment installation even being considered? If new equipment needs to be installed, then it is time to convert over to electricity. Installation of new gas equipment should simply be banned.

Q5. Comments?

not answered

Q6. Comments?

not answered

Q7. Comments?

not answered

Q8. Comments?

I am against these exceptions. If we have a deadline for full transition to electricity, ideally 10 years, we can then start building tide generated electricity equipment, ramp up our solar system manufacturing, and wind capturing equipment to meet the needs from this transition by the end of the 10 year deadline.

Q9. Comments?

not answered

Q10. Comments?

When in the future? 10 years, 20 years at the end of the century? In this situation, inform the owner that there is a 10 year deadline for making the conversion, even if it costs more than 25%, and if it is done now, some rebates will be provided to owners that have completed the retrofits.



Respondent No: 3

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: May 16, 2023 16:09:58 pm

Last Seen: Jul 06, 2023 21:25:20 pm

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

not answered

Q2. Comments?

I am not sure as a somewhat lay reader whether 'combustion equipment' is standard verbiage in this context. As a general supporter of this initiative, I worry about the appearance of loaded language on potentially hot button issues.

Q3. Comments?

This is well intentioned but have concerns about the potential invasiveness of enforcement. Moreover, a household HVAC replacement, a typical kitchen remodel, or basic plumbing of a water heater would clearly not hit this threshold, and yet I anticipate more forms/red tape/and oversight.

Q4. Comments?

I think this is lands as an obvious, punitive obstacle. Hypothetically, revenue would be generated by this requirement - where would it be directed?

Q5. Comments?

" This requirement would prohibit the extension of existing systems that utilize combustion equipment to serve the addition." I think if an existing system can accommodate an addition, the small marginal gas usage would be better than new installation of a redundant electric system. Otherwise good but should have an exception for this.

Q6. Comments?

not answered

Q7. Comments?

While the cost difference may not be excessively large, it might be significant. This will be a big cost driver and will come at some expense of overall housing affordability

Q8. Comments?

Generally support. But wonder if too restrictive

Q9. Comments?

not answered

Q10. Comments?

not answered



Respondent No: 4

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: May 16, 2023 16:54:04 pm

Last Seen: Feb 17, 2024 19:29:55 pm

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

not answered

Q2. Comments?

Nothing the city of Olympia nor the state of Washington can do will effect climate change. Quite virtue signaling with our money and use it to make life batter and safer for our citizens like your supposed to do.

Q3. Comments?

not answered

Q4. Comments?

not answered

Q5. Comments?

not answered

Q6. Comments?

not answered

Q7. Comments?

not answered

Q8. Comments?

not answered

Q9. Comments?

not answered

Q10. Comments?

not answered



Respondent No: 5

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: May 16, 2023 19:48:53 pm

Last Seen: Jul 30, 2024 03:29:40 am

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

not answered

Q2. Comments?

not answered

Q3. Comments?

not answered

Q4. Comments?

not answered

Q5. Comments?

not answered

Q6. Comments?

not answered

Q7. Comments?

not answered

Q8. Comments?

not answered

Q9. Comments?

not answered

Q10. Comments?

not answered



Respondent No: 6

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: May 16, 2023 22:19:12 pm

Last Seen: Oct 03, 2023 19:25:03 pm

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

not answered

Q2. Comments?

Agree

Q3. Comments?

Agree

Q4. Comments?

Agree!

Q5. Comments?

Agree

Q6. Comments?

Agree

Q7. Comments?

Agree

Q8. Comments?

Agree

Q9. Comments?

not answered

Q10. Comments?

Agree



Respondent No: 7

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: May 17, 2023 04:07:06 am

Last Seen: May 17, 2023 10:51:25 am

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

not answered

Q2. Comments?

This is a fad! There are so many better ways to combat climate change. Unless the electricity comes from a renewable the equation makes no sense. You generate the electricity, there is transmission losses from the power lines, further losses with your step down transformer. The NET of the system compares with gas. This "regulation" targets commercial buildings- which mostly are already electrically powered. Just another regulation that does very little. Instead, focus on insulation which has the best payback. I just saw a large commercial building built in Tumwater (across from the cemetery) and it has 2 X 4 walls! My guess is that it will have no spray foam, exterior insulation, weather sealing. Mandate minimum air changes per hour! Regulate the performance of the building instead of prescriptive codes. It really matters at the end when people start using the building.

Q3. Comments?

So if I remodel my house I have to change it over to electric? Bad direction. See previous comment.

Q4. Comments?

Do we have a problem with this now? Have buildings been blowing up?

Q5. Comments?

So if I have an existing heating plant that has excess capacity, and I improve the insulation of the structure so that the existing heating plant will handle the load - that is forbidden now? Bad policy!

Q6. Comments?

not answered

Q7. Comments?

not answered

Q8. Comments?

not answered

Q9. Comments?

not answered

Q10. Comments?

not answered



Respondent No: 8

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: May 17, 2023 08:34:00 am

Last Seen: Oct 02, 2023 22:26:46 pm

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

not answered

Q2. Comments?

Any ban on natural gas may be subject to preemption by the federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act, which was clarified in the recent ruling at the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. See CA Restaurants' Association v. City of Berkley, 2023. <https://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/opinions/2023/04/17/21-16278.pdf>

Q3. Comments?

Any ban on natural gas may be subject to preemption by the federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act, which was clarified in the recent ruling at the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. See CA Restaurants' Association v. City of Berkley, 2023. <https://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/opinions/2023/04/17/21-16278.pdf>

Q4. Comments?

not answered

Q5. Comments?

Any ban on natural gas equipment may be subject to preemption by the federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act, which was clarified in the recent ruling at the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. See CA Restaurants' Association v. City of Berkley, 2023. <https://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/opinions/2023/04/17/21-16278.pdf>

Q6. Comments?

not answered

Q7. Comments?

Any ban on natural gas equipment may be subject to preemption by the federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act, which was clarified in the recent ruling at the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. See CA Restaurants' Association v. City of Berkley, 2023. <https://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/opinions/2023/04/17/21-16278.pdf>

Q8. Comments?

Any ban on natural gas equipment may be subject to preemption by the federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act, which was clarified in the recent ruling at the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. See CA Restaurants' Association v. City of Berkley, 2023. <https://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/opinions/2023/04/17/21-16278.pdf>

Q9. Comments?

Any ban on natural gas equipment may be subject to preemption by the federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act, which was clarified in the recent ruling at the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. See CA Restaurants' Association v. City of Berkley, 2023. <https://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/opinions/2023/04/17/21-16278.pdf>

Q10. Comments?

Any ban on natural gas equipment may be subject to preemption by the federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act, which was clarified in the recent ruling at the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. See CA Restaurants' Association v. City of Berkley, 2023. <https://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/opinions/2023/04/17/21-16278.pdf>



Respondent No: 9

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: May 17, 2023 13:57:40 pm

Last Seen: May 18, 2023 03:13:27 am

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

I strongly support this proposal. Natural gas absolutely must be phased out

Q2. Comments?

The exemptions are smart and well thought out.

Q3. Comments?

Also very well thought out!

Q4. Comments?

As someone with anxiety specifically surrounding stuff like gas leaks and explosions, I particularly appreciate this one

Q5. Comments?

Excellent

Q6. Comments?

Also very well thought out!

Q7. Comments?

Absolutely love heat pumps, such a great investment towards a clean energy future

Q8. Comments?

not answered

Q9. Comments?

Love the balance struck between updating important things and being realistic about timeline/cost

Q10. Comments?

Wonderful! Can't wait to see foolish culture-war conservatives complain about how we're "banning gas stoves". Don't listen to them! You're doing great! I strongly support these changes



Respondent No: 10

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: May 17, 2023 14:21:30 pm

Last Seen: Feb 20, 2024 22:15:21 pm

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

I'm all for giant measures to cut greenhouse gases, but as you've recently learned it won't work unless you have the people affected onboard. Has that been done?

Q2. Comments?

I like it. It shows an understanding of the effects of this change.

Q3. Comments?

Very good.

Q4. Comments?

Good for all: good for safety and for economical use.

Q5. Comments?

Right.

Q6. Comments?

So smart. Again, saves money in the long run.

Q7. Comments?

Again, very smart. Impressive.

Q8. Comments?

Yep.

Q9. Comments?

Sounds reasonable. Not as obvious for me. One needs to know the situations buildings are actually in to make a good decision. Should there be a group assigned to make that determination?

Q10. Comments?

Yes. This is crucial. We need to start thinking 50 years ahead.



Respondent No: 11

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: May 18, 2023 11:06:09 am

Last Seen: May 18, 2023 18:00:16 pm

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

This is an excellent idea/project in that it is feasible and can be done without much blow back. The degree of difficulty is not like shutting down a coal plant in Kentucky.

Q2. Comments?

I will leave the trails in your capable hands.

Q3. Comments?

Good ideas.

Q4. Comments?

Just continue

Q5. Comments?

I will Leave the details in your hands. The exceptions and back up requirements should not derail the project but code variances for these are understandable.

Q6. Comments?

Obsolete controls are part of the problem.

Q7. Comments?

Great idea.

Q8. Comments?

not answered

Q9. Comments?

not answered

Q10. Comments?

not answered



Respondent No: 12

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: May 18, 2023 11:16:19 am

Last Seen: May 18, 2023 15:45:38 pm

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

not answered

Q2. Comments?

From doing our due diligence in preparing for the code change, it will affect our company (Kaufman Construction and Development) on multiple different levels. The building price will be increasing roughly \$24-\$32 PSF on new construction that will have major impacts on our upcoming projects and private parties projects that we are designing. Thus, adding these increased costs will make the project unfeasible from a financial perspective. Construction costs need to be built into subsequent lease rates, which will increase rental rates. When costs increase for business owners, this impacts their ability to provide vital services to the local economy (i.e. jobs, housing, services), resulting in increased costs for everyone they serve or ultimately making them choose a different location which may be more financially feasible. In summary, the increased costs will drive away business for both us and the Olympia area.

Q3. Comments?

The buildings in our portfolio that still have gas as their main source of heat in the warehouse portion and are not forced to have the cost of solar and electric vehicle charging stations installed, and insulation requirements are becoming more valuable to us as their cost basis is much lower and thus making it more affordable for renting.

Q4. Comments?

We already do this.

Q5. Comments?

not answered

Q6. Comments?

not answered

Q7. Comments?

not answered

Q8. Comments?

not answered

Q9. Comments?

not answered

Q10. Comments?

not answered



Respondent No: 13

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: May 19, 2023 10:13:33 am

Last Seen: Oct 06, 2023 20:46:12 pm

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

not answered

Q2. Comments?

not answered

Q3. Comments?

not answered

Q4. Comments?

not answered

Q5. Comments?

not answered

Q6. Comments?

not answered

Q7. Comments?

not answered

Q8. Comments?

not answered

Q9. Comments?

not answered

Q10. Comments?

not answered



Respondent No: 14

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: May 22, 2023 13:55:27 pm

Last Seen: May 22, 2023 20:43:07 pm

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

I am in favor of energy code updates that hasten the transition to all-electric buildings (with important flexibility for specific uses). Electrification of new construction will be key to meeting important carbon reduction targets.

Q2. Comments?

I am in favor of these requirements. The exceptions outlined here are reasonable and generous, and take the livelihoods of those relying on manufacturing and food production into account.

Q3. Comments?

I am in favor of this requirement. The risks of NOT having such a requirement seems to be a loophole in which buildings are built all-electric, but adjoining building projects that could be termed "additions" would be allowed to have combustion equipment, decreasing the potential positive impacts of electrification.

Q4. Comments?

I am in favor of this. This requirement harms nobody, and only serves to increase safety as well as decreasing greenhouse gas emissions.

Q5. Comments?

I am in favor of this requirement.

Q6. Comments?

I am in favor of this requirement. In addition to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, this requirement increases efficiency which decreases operational costs for both building owners and tenants.

Q7. Comments?

I am in favor of this requirement. This requirement improves efficiency in the transition to electric heating and cooling. The ability for existing heating systems to remain as backup is generous and stops the wording from sounding too draconian, which has the potential to turn people off.

Q8. Comments?

I am in favor of this requirement. This is a sane and thoughtful way to limit exemptions that improves efficiency and incentivizes electrification.

Q9. Comments?

I am in favor of this requirement. Too many exemptions limit the potential positive impact of electric water heating.

Q10. Comments?

I am in favor of this requirement. This is, overall, more efficient than retrofitting any other way, which benefits everyone.



Respondent No: 15

Login: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: Jun 01, 2023 02:09:50 am

Last Seen: Jun 01, 2023 07:26:28 am

IP Address: [REDACTED]

Q1. General comments?

Thank you for recognizing the urgency of an energy transition to clean energy. I appreciate the leadership being shown with this reach code. It is pioneering work, and pioneering work will make it so much easier for those who follow. Good regulatory groundwork like this is critical. We don't have unlimited time and there is so much to do if we want to continue to live in a world where humans can thrive, businesses can prosper, and the natural world that supports us can maintain its critical functions.

Q2. Comments?

The proposed definition of commercial cooking appliance says "For the purpose of this definition, a food service establishment shall include any building or a portion thereof used for the preparation and serving of food." A residential home kitchen would appear to meet this the definition of a food service establishment. For example, my home kitchen is in a portion of a building (my residence) used for the preparation and serving of food. Consider defining food service establishment as any building or a portion thereof used for the commercial or institutional preparation or serving of food. Also, technically, since "and" is used between preparation and serving of food. A building preparing food not serving it would not be a building used for the preparation AND serving of food. You really need something like preparation and/or serving of food.

Q3. Comments?

I am in favor of the requirement that substantial improvements to existing buildings be all-electric. "Substantial damage" is does not appear to be defined in this section. If it is not defined elsewhere, I think it needs to be because. It is a technical trigger that overrides the usual definition of substantial improvement. Without a definition for substantial damage, its application would really be arbitrary. It is very vague. Also where it says... "The term does not, however, include either:" Since the preceding paragraph contains two terms, "substantial improvement" and "substantial damage" it is not clear which of them is "the term" Once could argue that it is the term substantial damage because it comes right before.

Q4. Comments?

I'm certainly in favor of reducing and eliminating leaks in old gas piping for safety reasons and because uncombusted combusted gas leaked into the environment is a more potent greenhouse gas that carbon dioxide. I'm glad that the exception is included that For the purposes of demonstrating compliance with this section, unexposed pipe joints and welds shall not be required to be exposed for examination during the test. That seems too impractical and expensive.

Q5. Comments?

I think this is really good language "C502.1.1 Combustion equipment. Additions shall not be permitted to contain combustion equipment and new equipment installed to serve additions shall not be combustion equipment."

Q6. Comments?

not answered

Q7. Comments?

This part "Existing space heating combustion equipment that serves the same cooling zone shall be configured as supplementary heat in accordance with Section C403.4.1.1." Seems like it is requiring keeping existing gas heating as supplementary heat. It uses the word "shall" which means it is mandatory to keep the old gas heating. Wouldn't it be more in keeping to use the word "may". The existing space heating combustion equipment MAY be kept. That would allow the equipment to be kept, but not make keeping it mandatory. Example: What if someone wants to get rid of the old gas heating altogether and go all electric? This "shall" language would require keeping the old gas units, which is contrary to the general intent of this regulation.

Q8. Comments?

I think this is a very important and potentially effective provision.

Q9. Comments?

not answered

Q10. Comments?

Getting electrical services upgraded to modern standards that support energy transition is critical. Failing to upgrade service capacity when replacing it is a lost opportunity. I don't think the language in this section is specific enough to be applied in any consistent and reasonable manner. It seems like draft language and not something specific enough to give guidance for enforcement. It is so vague and ambiguous that it would be difficult to enforce. At the same time I recognize it is difficult to craft a rule that fits all situations while still being specific. Another comment. This section omits smart panels. Smart panels is an approach growing in importance to address the widespread problem of under-sized services in building electrification. For example, a smart meter can lock a car-charging circuit when an electric dryer circuit is running. That way you don't have to size the service and panel to serve all possible loads simultaneously. It allows more to be done with existing resources. Smart metering should be encouraged and addressed because it lowers the cost of electrification and makes more efficient use of existing building infrastructure resources.
