

---

**From:** Zemel, Felix (DPS)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 14, 2016 2:47 PM  
**To:** Carley, Stephen (DPS)  
**Subject:** Fwd: 8th Edition Code-Energy Provisions

---

Felix I. Zemel  
Department of Public Safety  
**Technical Director / Acting Chief of Inspections -- Building**

Sent from my iPhone. Please excuse any errors and/or typos.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Leah Kosnack Fennell <leah.fennell@state.ma.gov>  
**Date:** June 14, 2016 at 2:42:50 PM EDT  
**To:**  
**Subject:** 8th Edition Code-Energy Provisions

Mr. Zemel -

I would like to express my opposition to the proposed adoption of the 2015 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC), as an amendment to the eighth edition of the Massachusetts State Building Code, 780 CMR.

The 8th Edition amendments include new energy conservation provisions which require among other things:

- 1) a lower HERS rating for new construction;
- 2) one or more electric vehicle 40 amp wired circuits for electric vehicle charging, depending on number of dwelling units in the building;
- 3) certified testers for whole house or duct air leakage; and,
- 4) more energy efficient fenestration (U-factor lowered from .32 to .30); and,
- 5) for new construction buildings, plans will require that a zone of the roof area be designated as the SOLAR-READY ZONE for the future installation of a solar photovoltaic or solar thermal system, with limited exceptions.

After careful review of the proposed requirements of these amendments, I have great concerns. I am opposed to the adoption of the provision for the reasons stated below:

### 1. Authority

It is my opinion that the proposed requirement for electric vehicle charging stations referenced above does not fall under the scope of the powers and duties of the BBRs as provided by M.G.L. ch. 143, sections 94 and 95. It is unrelated to the BBRs's mandate of life safety/public safety and does not provide for energy conservation of the home.

### 2. Cost

The majority of new single family and two-family homes are built with a 200amp electrical service in which the entire panel is in use. A provision that mandates an open 40amp slot be provided would more often than not require either the addition of a sub-panel or an upgrade to the electrical service to 300amps, an additional cost of approximately \$1,000.

### 3. Applicability

It is extremely likely that the vast majority of those who purchase an electric vehicle, either now or in the near future, will live in an existing structure that is highly unlikely to have an electric vehicle charging station. Consumers who choose to purchase an electric vehicle do so with the full knowledge that it will someday need to be recharged and will make the necessary changes to their home. It is in most cases no more expensive to add an electric vehicle charging station to an existing home than to a new home.

Further, as other technologies such as fuel cells advance, the demand for electric vehicles may never reach the level that seems to be assumed by the proposed mandate.

Regarding new single family homes - Builders are very responsive to the market and the demands of their customers. They will provide electric vehicle charging stations voluntarily as demand escalates. The current demand for electric vehicle charging stations is extremely low but if it does increase, builders will quickly prepare their homes with the necessary infrastructure as part of their normal standard features.

### 4. Summary

In short, it makes no sense to require electric vehicle charging station infrastructure in new 1 and 2 family homes when it will add cost to the home, may never be used, and is easily added post-construction if the homeowner chooses to do so. Furthermore, as noted above, the BBRs does not have it within their powers and duties as authorized by the Legislature to issue such a mandate as part of the Building Code.

Sincerely,

**Leah Kosnack Fennell**  
Shepley Marketing Director



