

Recap of December 17, 2025

Open Forum on 2024 Code Adoption Project

Hosted by BCCC and City of Columbia Staff

Mr. Decker opened the meeting with introductions and basic instructions for flow of the meeting. Each of the Board of Construction Codes Commission members in attendance introduced themselves.

The following is a list of the items raised and discussed:

1. Seeking clarification on the timeline and the process toward adoption that is laid out?
 - a. We are currently in the open comment period and gathering input from the public with respect to the recommended amendments and the codes that were reviewed by the Building Construction Codes Commission. This concludes on February 17th or about that date and then a summary will be drafted of the comments collected along with positions of the BCCC to be forwarded with recommendations to City Council. No firm date has been set for the review by City Council at this time.
2. The impacts of the 2024 International Energy Conservation Code on Commercial projects has challenges and costs that are significant. The following sections were identified: C403.7.8; C405.13, & C405.15.
 - a. The BCCC has recommended amending out the section C405.13
 - b. The BCCC and City Staff are still pursuing the feasibility and ability to meet the demand of 405.15.
 - c. Section 403.7.8 is with respect to the occupied controls for ventilation in spaces where there may be periods of unoccupied time and limited need for ventilation at that time. This was reviewed and considered by BCCC during the review, with agreement to its benefit.
3. There is possibly a negative impact with securing large manufacturing plants to locate in City of Columbia due to the requirements of the 2024 International Energy Conservation Code and its requirements. Specific example of Oscar Meyer and if they had to install solar on property, its impact on land acquisition and installation costs.
4. Some estimated costs associated with building by a residential builder were presented comparing lightly the 2018 current adopted code requirements and the 2024 projected requirements. This resulted in \$6,500 to \$12,000 to a single-family home. The data was used to convey the point of affordability and energy code requirements are counterproductive to each other.
5. The same speaker, revisited the occupied control requirement for commercial buildings and gave an example of the cost impacts from the System components to the installation and testing to pass inspection as well as the maintenance after occupancy that is required. All of which adds cost to a project.
6. A clarification question was asked about application of codes to multifamily buildings, 3 stories or less in height.

- a. These are designed using the IBC for commercial buildings and the Residential component of the International Energy Conservation Code applies to meet energy requirements.
7. A BCCC board member discussed the process of review and the impacts of amending the energy code and its impact on the ability to utilize the Simulated Performance calculators that all builders in Columbia are currently using.
 - a. Changes to the IECC code in significant ways, such as removal of sections could ultimately render the preferred method of building to no longer be applicable and force builders to use a more expensive pathway.
8. Visitor asked about the process of review and what all went into the review during that period of this process.
 - a. Members of the commission answered and explained the process of review and what all was entailed and studied in brief format.
9. The impacts of the code, state legislation, and the outside influences on the code development process were discussed among the Board members and shared with the public. No specifics were identified, this was a very generalized discussion.
10. Board of Realtors reported the change in housing costs in 2025 year to date. Iteration was on being diligent and logical with the Boards recommendation due to the impact on affordable housing.
11. A local business owner asked if it was possible to adopt a portion of the 2024 Family of Codes, but not all of them at this time? This was discussed and included historical discussion of previous code cycles and the choices made then.
 - a. This was provided with it is possible, and may be recommended by BCCC at times. However, the decision of what to adopt and when is at the discretion of the City Council. This is reviewed during the process and when formal recommendation is made, it is often forwarded to City Council for review.
12. It was then pointed out that the changes in the 2024 International Energy Code will likely also increase the cost of designing buildings as there are many more requirements to be included and time to dedicate to these systems for both engineers and architects.
13. Further discussion of the section 405.15 in the International Energy Code occurred, which include examples of exceptions in the book and the requirement for meeting either on-site or off-site renewable energy sourcing could be implemented.
14. Electrical Contractor presented possible problems with requiring the advanced control systems in all buildings and the trickle-down effect that it will increase cost to the building owner. This included those that will have added service calls because they are unable to maintain or troubleshoot these systems when they are required to install them.

Closings were given by the host and additionally by the Community Development Director. Thanks were expressed by both attendees and staff for the productive and enlightening forum of the evening.

Transcription log of the 2024 Building Code Adoption Project Open Forum

Date: 12/17/2025

Panel: Aaron Decker, Brian Connell, John Page, Rob Schreiber, Rick Shanker, Fred Malicoat, Kas Carlson

Other staff in attendance: Phil Teeple, Clint Smith, Eric Hempel, Michael Bauer, Leigh Kottwitz

Mr. Decker: Ladies and gentlemen, as everybody's sort of finding their seats and getting comfortable, just a couple items here as to the format of this open forum. This is a question and answer type forum. So as the public, if you guys have a specific question related to a code change, we invite you up to the podium to ask your question or there are forms on the table at the back. If you're more comfortable and you want to just write that question down, you can complete that form and hand it to me and then I'll translate that over the mic and we'll talk about it. We do not have a set agenda of topics. This is taking input from the public as a part of our public comment period on the code adoption and a chance to talk about those specific inquiries and or questions and give you guys some feedback related to the changes in the codebook because sometimes there's quite a few changes that are overlapped with others and or just small minor clarifications that have big impacts.

There're too many changes to cover in one setting, so we want to invite what you want to know about or what you want to hear about at first and then we can open the floor for some other stuff if we get to that point. We'll do some quick introductions here at the beginning and then we'll we'll have you step up to the mic and please speak clearly into the mic.

I am audio recording this so that we can have a log of the questions as well as the discussions after them. We'll introduce the panel that's up here.

I'll start. My name is Aaron Decker. I'm the Building Regulation Supervisor here at the City of Columbia and the person in the office here with this code adoption.

Mr. Schreiber: Robert Schreiber, chair of the Energy Code Committee.

Mr. Connell: Brian Connell, I'm a regular member of the BCCC and I'm the architect.

Mr. Page: John Page, chair of the International Residential Code Committee.

Mr. Carlson: Kas Carlson, a member of the BCCC and also owner of C&C Construction.

Mr. Malicoat: Fred Mallicoat, the alternate for the Building Construction Codes Commission and Mechanical Electrical.

Mr. Shanker: Rick Shanker, electrical contractor. I'm on the Buildings and Codes Commission, chairperson of the Fire Code and also the Electrical Codes Subcommittee and rental and energy.

Mr. Decker: Well there's in attendance we have the Fire Marshal's office here as well as the Neighborhood Services office that were involved in the review of the 2024 code cycle and we have our city liaison with the Climate and Energy Commission that participated with us as well. So, thank you.

Ms. Hart: My name is Susan Hart. I live at 3719 Break Court. I'm president of Reinhart Construction and been involved in commercial construction about 35 years in Columbia.

I just had a couple clarification questions on timing, like when you are anticipating adoption of the 2024 codes and what that looks like from this day forward and what are other steps for public input during that process.

Mr. Decker: Okay, the code adoption process began back in November of 24 when the City Council asked or gave the directive to the Building Construction Codes Commission to review the 2024 model codes. During November through about March of 2025 we spent weekly meetings in reviewing those and looking at possible amendments and or recommendations to them.

After that we spent a while putting together the amendments and changing and getting them reviewed legally. Now we are at a point where we have placed everything on file with the City Clerk's Office per City Ordinance. That's a 90-day period.

That 90 days will expire on February 17th at this point and that's what we consider the public comment period for this code adoption. At that point we then have to take all of those comments, all of the discussions we've had, and all of the review, and compile what's going to be presented to City Council. So as far as a fixed timeline we're probably looking at sometime late spring for it going before City Council but I do not have an exact month or day because it depends on the next three months and this public comment period and what all happens during that time period.

Ms. Hart: Okay and then the amendments that are proposed are they on where those found again on is it be heard or where which where is that form that I could look and say which amendments that are being deleted or amended?

Mr. Decker: Okay so the due to accessibility ADA accessibility guidelines be heard is not set up to be compliant 100% so our city media asked us to create a web page so if you go to community developments landing page on Como.gov you'll see a link for the 2024 building code adoption project. There's also a little handout at the back on the table that'll tell you how to get to that. That's where you'll find the amendments and a very bullet point brief list of significant changes per book.

At the very bottom of that page is a direct link to the ICC website for the read-only version of the new text or the new code books and so you can actually connect the two that way to go through the code book because depending on where your interest lies and which change you're looking at its going to depend on what book it's found in.

Ms. Hart: Yes right and so the document that I'm referencing and doing became available from ICC November 17th which typically when codes change and when we're professionals design professionals or users of the code we wait for that significant changes document to be issued by ICC so that's what I've been using because that came available November 17th so I would suggest that's probably another good document for the city for the public to see that's really it's not everything that's changed in the code but it's in a very accessible format that shows which items are most readily used in the codes the things that we most likely come up against.

So if I would say sections that I had issues with at the podium today would those be entered into the public record for during that discussion to be put forward as amendments is that

yes a summary of today will be entered in put forward with the context that goes before council okay then I would ask officially that section c403.7.8 the occupied standby controls that that section of the 2024 code would be deleted I think some of the design professionals that work with that I think those occupied sensors and things would really be onerous to our commercial projects and really not user friendly either in certain regards section for c405.13 energy monitoring I think that the size of the building is too small because in the code section it is saying that it would be for buildings not less than 10,000 it would be 10,000 square feet I think that it should go back to 25,000 square feet we just can we are under construction and completing the new elementary school for CPS. CPS is one of the few commercial clients in Columbia that utilize energy monitoring typically they do on the electrical side I just on the new elementary school we did the gas monitoring which is been very expensive it was about \$5,500 for the gas monitoring and Ameren was like people don't usually do this in Central Missouri so it was a little bit strange but and it's in this code that it would say not just electrical but it's all I think all utilities on that is what the way I'm interpreted and I'm not an engineering professional I'm just a I'm a contractor that has to install them so the other item that I think is really something that I think should be looked at is section c405.15 the renewable energy systems section of this I feel like this whole section should be not adopted as part of our code this is saying that buildings shall be provided with on-site renewable electricity generation systems with a direct current nameplate power rating of not less 0.75 watts per square foot and that would be in my interpretation any buildings that are 5,000 and larger I'm not sure if someone else has interpreted this I wasn't sure if those is a working kind of panel or what so I wasn't really prepared for all the documents but I that's my interpretation of the code I think that that is not really possibly you know we make solar ready for buildings but actually asking for a building to have a solar system there or if you cannot do it then you buy off-site renewable energy so in I had a mechanical engineer do an interpretation on a new 70,000 square foot building for one of our major businesses in Columbia and just to do the solar was about \$350,000 to do the solar panels and things on site and it was going to have to be the building didn't allow for it to be put on the roof structure so it was interpreted to be right next to the building and so about 350,000 or they would have to buy 75,000 kilowatts of renewable energy per year which I'm not quite sure how that even happens so let's see at that point that's the items that I have initially thank you.

Mr. Decker: To respond to some of those. As we went through this review process we did consider several elements of the energy code. There are pathways that are available to design professionals to meet compliance and if you modify those pathways it can either render them unable to be used and benefited from and or force a stricter and more stringent and costly build. This could include an algorithm that can then reach compliance for that system based on the changes. So right now, commercially we don't have a lot of businesses that use what they call the simulated performance pathway; they all go the prescriptive pathway for the majority of the buildings, however the 24 code has really expanded the simulated performance pathway. If you start eliminating requirements from it, you end up affecting that performance pathway to a point where the calculators that are out there and available for free would be useless. When you strike that stuff out of the code, it changes that algorithm and so we have to consider when we're looking at what elements are being addressed. Both commercial and residential, so it has migrated in the last two code cycles in that direction.

Mr. Carlson: We had talked in all our meetings how the residential side we really could not mess with, because you could side if you changed it but I did not realize that they had gone to that in the on the commercial side.

Mr. Decker: Yeah and then looking at 405.13 that you had referenced, that actually is one that was recommended to be withdrawn in our amendments that are posted. The group recommended eliminating this requirement as one that would not be applicable.

Mr. Carlson: Although we have recommended not to adopt that, it doesn't mean anything. What we're here for, case I'm mistaken, is to hear your inputs and whatever or however the chips fall we want to hear from everybody just because it may interrupt a computer model it doesn't mean that we won't consider it and as the buildings and codes Commission is that correct Brian?

Mr. Page: Brian I'm not sure how to answer that well we could we can only recommend we don't pass the ordinance the City Council so whether it's buildings and codes or energy committee or whatever we all make recommendations I think we're here just to hear all the concerns not necessarily solve all the problems tonight is that correct

Mr. Connell: I believe that is correct

Mr. Decker: With regards to 405.15; yes, that is an evolving discussion at this moment. There are some elements that we are still exploring as far as feasibility of implementation of that requirement and as that evolves I will keep the public, and I will keep everybody up to speed. We have to finish doing some background to make sure that implementation is possible before we can make a formal recommendation on that.

Mr. Land: (Paul Land handed out aerial pictures of Oscar Meyer property) thank you pictures of your last vacation this is nice Paul Aaron we don't have the ability to put this on the screens, do we?

Mr. Decker: No, I do not at the moment. What it is, a Boone County internet parcel map of the cul-de-sac at Waco Road it looks like you have written down at the bottom Oscar Meyer. I'll let you kind of elaborate on what it is.

Mr. Land: My name is Paul and I'm a commercial real estate broker in this community for nearly 40 years. Everything you hear about the housing shortage and the housing affordability applies to commercial properties too. I only deal with office industrial and retail properties in this community. They come in all shapes and sizes and varieties. What I have before you is a handout and for the general public is an aerial view of the Oscar Meyer plant. If you look at that aerial view of that, there must be 50 or 60 roof penetrations in that roof. If we adopt an energy code that requires solar systems on the roof of these properties, we will never be able to recruit these kinds of companies to this community again. If communities nearby Columbia don't adopt this code, those companies will move to those communities. Columbia will lose out on the tax base. Columbia will lose out on employment opportunities, and I think that's a concern about this code. Look, I have to rely on architects and engineers to help guide me through a project. I can tell somebody the price of a building. I can tell them the price of a property, but I have to rely on those design and the people those design people I don't know how old this how many pages as code is, but I bet it's 400 pages isn't it only pretty close so I'm not going to read something like that on an internet. I would like to see a 400-page code available at this building, and one at the public library. I like my architects and engineers and, in my room, and hearing me to be able to guide me to the sections they think are going to increase the cost of construction or impracticality. If this code contains a requirement or an encouragement that roof panels be used on a building, like the one I've just displayed to you, that's a real sore spot. Not only

that, but you have to maintain these roofs over time. If we have solar panels on there, we have spent a lot of time going back and figuring out how to navigate all that and they do need replacement from time to time. So, I think maybe it would be okay with my thought to delay this a bit so we can get a little bit more background research on this maybe. It's okay to see how this affects larger communities before we adopt it within our own community and I'd like to answer any questions you may have. All right I'm done preaching thank you.

Mr. Decker: Thank you, so just a point of clarification there is a copy of all of the 2024 International Family of Codes available in our clerk's office. If you're looking for a hard copy you can request access there; if you'd like to set up appointment to flip through them, I have several in my office as well if you set that up at a time. And they are available online as read-only versions for free.

Mr. Land: Would it be possible to get a copy on file at the public library?

Mr. Decker: That would be a discussion with the public library and we can talk to them about it. I'll reach out to them. Is there anybody else that would like to come up?

Ms Carlson: Rhonda Carlson, Leviton, Willow Creek, C&C construction. I can't tell you I have really prepared comments and probably not very intelligent comments, but I will say probably for over 20 years have been beating the drum of affordability and I do have two questions and I don't know you may be able to answer them. How many communities have adopted the 2021 code?

Mr. Decker: The 2021 code I believe in the state of Missouri, there were about somewhere between four and eight communities that adopted the 2021 code there are currently six to eight communities that have moved on and adopted the 24 code.

Ms Carlson: Okay, currently okay and how many have adopted the 2018 code?

Mr. Decker: I don't have that number exact it's much it's a much larger number at this point there were a lot of communities that went to the 2018 back when it came out.

Ms. Carlson: Okay, well I will tell you that the 2018 code did cause a substantial increase and many of them were energy related but I do appreciate the safety things that do change in the code, but our business model for all of the years that we've been in business are building affordable houses and not at the taxpayer's burden. And just in our cursory looks at the difference between the 2018 and the 2024 code on average for a house of 1500 to 1600 square foot; which we don't build very many of most of ours are 1200 to 1300 square foot; it's going to cost us on average between 6500 to \$12,000 per house on those homes. Now if you're building a two to three thousand square foot house, I don't know where that is but if you're going from a two-by-four to two-by-six wall; the window changes you can't no longer buy if you're buying in bulk off the shelf. You will have to custom order your windows to get the U values therefore that will extend the building timeline which is a cost value to do the seer values etc. They're going to cause us to do a larger size, by volume, furnace which is going to have us redesign some of our furnace areas which is going to have to replan the size of the houses, so that's just a small probably to some people not a big deal but in affordability you are taking away people's choices and when you take away people's choices. If you're going to talk energy code, then they get to buy an existing house that may not be as energy-efficient as a 2018 code house so I'd like people to take that into consideration and that is probably all I'm going to say at this time. thank you.

Ms. Hart: All that sat through City Council meetings and never go to the podium. I'm like gonna get used to this. Maybe I don't know, now I want to go back to the occupied, that section 403.7.8 the occupied standby controls, and I I heard your comments Aaron that you had. I just want to make sure that when we look at this section that we can design them,

install them, but if the building is small enough say 5,000 to 10,000 square feet. There are a lot of individuals that have a building like that. That when you get into some of these HVAC requirements on when it's not occupied. The system has to turn off, the set points have to go down that's a building automation control system and we install those a lot. Jason Grunder's here, we do them all the time on commercial buildings but they're usually for larger sophisticated clients like the University of Missouri or Columbia Public Schools that have dedicated personnel to manage that so we can spend a lot of money putting in these sophisticated control systems which there's only two or three control companies so the price is expensive. There's not a lot of competition in that market. So, if we put those in a building 10,000 square feet who's going to monitor that; who's going to run that automated control; who's going to do that; so, I just want to make sure that if we put something in the code. You know what has happened a lot of times is we spend a lot of money we put those things in sophisticated systems but then they're on a building of a size that doesn't have the type of personnel that can monitor. So, then it becomes like enforcement; you can have as many wonderful rules in the codes and things, but the enforcement of them becomes problematic because we have limited resources at the city. For that and you know for an automated control system when we put something in; like finishing a school job or the university. We have a commissioning agent that we pay to come in and do that and so that adds cost because the commissioning agent is not cheap. That engineers walks along with us as we do the punch list and they make sure that the HVAC system the electrical systems are running as designed. They do an official commissioning report that's expensive, and then we want to make sure after it's done. Who's going to make sure it keeps running because then someone overrides it and all these wonderful things to make sure that the top outlet of a duplex outlet turns off at 6 p.m. at night. So the energy is not being used there, like who's gonna say it doesn't get overridden and then not enforced. So, I just again on these really sophisticated systems, also I want to make sure on certain things like the ceiling fans on here. There's a in the commercial code there is new specifications on the ceiling fans that can be utilized on our jobs. There is really only one company that sells those ceiling fans that can be used on our jobs. And they are very expensive. Let's make sure the benefit outweighs the cost.

Mr. Decker: Pulled up the energy code on the computer screen if someone wanted to review it.

Discussion with the crowd about the font and size of the print on the monitors in the room.

Ms. Carlson: Since your allowing people to talk twice. I do have a question: If we have a 3 plex or someone wants to build an 8 plex, would that be considered commercial?

Mr. Decker: The IRC governs one- and two-family and townhouses. Buildings otherwise with dwelling units in them are under the commercial IBC code. 3 Stories or less are sometimes different than the larger apartment buildings.

Ms. Carlson: So an apartment building would be required to meet the solar requirements that we were just discussion or commercial buildings?

Mr. Decker: Residential requirements for commercial energy codes are different than those for all commercial buildings as a residential structure.

Mr. Carlson: Just to clarify between residential and commercial energy codes. Are the energy codes looked at differently when building a residential building?

Mr. Decker: yes the residential requirements for apartment buildings varies when you are talking about buildings 3 stories or less and others taller than that.

Mr. Carlson: As the energy code was reviewed, both the residential and commercial. We hammered out the different components and tried to put numbers and analyze them. We had to keep in mind that the residential side couldn't be modified much as it would affect the calculation methods used to build today. I did not realize that the commercial side was becoming more calculation-based methods.

Mr. Shanker: I wanted to make a comment that Aaron already made and wanted to point out that the changes with all the codes and the cost of changes. There are a lot of other codes that are affecting cost of building as well. It is important to take a look at the appendices as there are a lot of suggested changes associated with all the codes.

Mr. Trabue: Tom Trabue, I am an engineering consultant in the community. Just as Kas eluded to, we did not know what to expect tonight. Thank you for doing this and opening this up tonight. I would like to hear a little about what you guys did and how the review process when and what you addressed on the commercial side and what was identified that may be adopted. If you guys don't mind doing that. I would encourage to have another opportunity like this so we can come more prepared.

Mr. Page: I will speak a little bit, I have been on this commission for 30 years and have grown old and grey doing it. A lot of people think that code development is about code experts sitting in a room and talking about code and building, but a lot of it is about lobbyists. We have had stuff come into the code and then disappear. I do struggle with that because we are in this for safe housing. We as builders are wanting safe and affordable housing. I am really struggling with the energy code with respect to the residential side. I have been saying this a really long time and can't understand why you would ask the public to spend \$10,000 to save \$100. We never formally adopted it as a codes commission due to HB 939 and its impact of rolling the code back to 2009. That when through the House and to the Senate and then stalled due to the Chiefs/Royals/and Budget. Perhaps John Martin could speak to this instead as to whether this is being brought back to life. I am really hoping that HB 939 does come back and I would never vote for this energy code as it is a disservice to the public. I think safe housing is great, but it needs to be affordable. The Energy Code and Affordable housing do not go together.

Mr. Shanker: The City Council assigns the BCCC to review the codes and then make recommendations. The National Electric Code is full of great ideas. Our Fire Marshall has graciously provided a list of why fires in City of Columbia have started. We do not have a lot of fires due to electrical issues. HB 939 is no longer the same number and has been reassigned a new number. Last few weeks we talked about this and legislative actions at the state level and I learned a lot. We will need to keep an eye on the codes that are coming forward at the state level.

Comment from the crowd that was not into a mic or able to be heard in the recording. Some discussion about legislative actions and procedures.

Mr. Touhy: I am Brian Touhy, a member of the Board of Realtors and my wife owns a home building company here in City of Columbia. My question is, why are we doing this. The median house price has increased over the past year. This will only exacerbate that increase event more. Just from January to November the median house price has increased 12% (or 3 times the rate of inflation). The median house price for single family homes since 2021 has increased 41%. How will you be able to obtain more affordable housing if we keep adding to the code and increasing the cost of construction.

Mr. Decker: To touch on that, thank you for that comment. The code process at the national level is reactionary. There are many codes involved in the process and the new code

requirements are improvements based on society. The IFC as an example now has codes for lithium batteries which is in reaction to the increase in electrification. Look at the development and the many different ways to supplement concrete. Structurally these require changes in codes to keep up with the changes in product development. A lot of times the code is reactionary to a significant product change or event that requires protection and safer buildings moving forward. The code adoption process is not just about energy, but also about maintaining pace with the development and growth of products and methods in society. It is not always about the cost, it is also about the safer building. To answer why are we doing this, it is to evaluate what codes and changes are necessary to be able to keep our community safe and provide better and safer buildings.

Mr. Miller: Eric Miller, I am a local architect business owner. I would like to expand on what you were saying just now. Is it possible to adopt a portion of the 2024 code and not adopt all of the 2024 Code? I recognize that safety is important apart of the codes. What part of the Energy Code is about safety. John, you gave a very passionate explanation. Thank you. I last served on this commission during the 2012 Code Cycle. The expectation that you are seeing is that we are seeing changes that just don't make sense. This is recognized as your recommendation to City Council and may or may not take it every time. That is why these forums are important to be heard. The energy code is the driver this cycle. It seems like we have been pushed into a process that has been headed in this direction for some time. I wonder about the 2026 codes and where they are at.

Mr. Decker: The 2026 codes are not out yet, they are just finishing up the 2nd round and will have to still go through a third round. There are communities that adopt only parts of the codes and others that leave some areas out. It does appear through the history of City of Columbia, that they keep the code books together as they move them forward. That is a decision for the City Council to make.

Mr. Miller: So is there any comments with respect to the Energy Code and the review and adoption of it from the committee. Was there anyone that sat on the committee and was it said that they were just not going to look at it? Was there anyone that can confirm that it was decided to not examine the energy code and recommend it as is?

Mr. Schreiber: Yes and thank you for your question. I come from the residential side but we did look at the commercial side. We are trying to save money on the energy cost. They have been amended to increase the percentage year over year to save on energy use. The code becomes more efficient each cycle to achieve less energy production and consumption. The startup cost of solar compared to natural gas is more expensive, but the long term payoff is more beneficial over time.

Mr. Miller: We have spent a lot of time talking to a lot of contractors and engineers about designing buildings to the new energy code and it is going to have a significant impact on the implementation of the new Energy Code. This substantial change will impact on how we design buildings and will take more time and energy to design them to meet the code. There are very stark differences between the 2018 code where we have been and the 2024 Energy Code, which are frankly frightening. Yes, it is change. But if you can not pay for the solar in a ten-year period, is it really affordable. And long term, you will lose. This is coming from a person who has solar on their building. Currently there are no incentives for these changes. Also, we are currently seeing rising prices for different utilities. Frankly this code could be amended and should be amended.

Mr. Carlson: In my years of reviewing the code, the Energy code has always been separated out by itself. We look at commercial and residential separately. We do look at the cost and

changes and then after weeks of reviews we make motions and suggestions to weigh the factors moving forward. The comparison of the residential to commercial side of the energy code is night and day different. They are very different and the impacts are very different. We have had to accept on the residential side that no amendments can be made to the residential side since it will affect the simulated performance pathway and that would cause builders to have to build to the prescriptive path and be more expensive. So we have accepted that we are unable to change the requirements of the residential energy code. We vote it up or vote it down and then City Council decides to move forward or not based on other influential factors. We made the motion to not adopt the 2021 code and it was worse than these others. And we did not adopt the 2021.

Mr. Miller: Don't get me wrong, I am here to speak on behalf of affordability. And the cost to try to achieve net zero is not that. The code in 2021 was targeting that and it was smart to not adopt. This is however a large step and it is going to make the industry a lot of money, is it the best decision for the City of Columbia?

Mr. Page: From a historical standpoint, I have seen it several times where we have made recommendation to the City Council and they did not follow our recommendation. We are a very logical group and sometimes it is not always that way with the City Council since they are pulled in many different directions. Bottom line is they will do what they want to do.

Mr. Land: I am not point the finger, I am considering you a solution. What do you need from us to present uniform ideas and to be ready to bring things to the table. This is a great opportunity and it has been very positive and is great since it is conversational. I would like to see this occur again when we can bring more prepared information to the table.

Mr. Schreiber: Aaron, I have a question. It seems like a lot of the questions on the commercial side are about on-site renewable energy sources. I thought there was a way to count some off-site renewable into the requirement of the code?

Mr. Decker: The code section 405.15 that is the question, we are still digging into that one and be prudent as we are still investigating that availability to be able to enforce that code requirement. As of right now, as it is written, there are requirements that are available in the code and we need to make sure that the options to meet this requirement are available. Example of the USPS building and Garage across the street that blocks its ability to obtain solar enough to meet the code. We need to make sure all the pathways to meet this code are possible and we need to double check this against what is available at this time so that we are prepared.

Ms Hart: (10:30) Some of those off-site options are the following, but with those 6 options and after years in the industry, these options are not very clear.

Mr. Decker: An example of direct connection is like connecting to the Truman Solar Grid for off site power since that goes back through our utility and to the customer, or being directly wired into that solar farm are options. We are currently being logical about making sure that these options are all available before forming that recommendation to move forward.

Mr. Miller: Do you think that the information and if it is possible will be ready and decided by the time a recommendation is needed to be presented to City Council?

Mr. Decker: Yes, I believe at this point and time, we will be ready to present when the information is ready to be presented to City Council. We are working diligently and some of the answers will likely affect how this is presented when the time comes. We will likely be having some BCCC meetings in the future after the new year to continue to formulate this.

Mr. Grunder: Jason Grunder, Meyer Electric. This is my opinion based on the impact of this code: An example would be the Yoga studio that I just finished 15 years ago would have cost

\$1,000 in lighting and I just put in \$5,000 in lighting. The problem is that I am going to get called back when it doesn't work correctly and that is going to continue to cost the buildings in the future because they don't know how to manage these systems themselves. It is an ongoing cost.

Mr. Miller: I understand the codes more recently have been pushed by special interest. I can remember a time when the codes were about life safety. We need to start pushing back against the ICC against the social engineering in the codes and keep the codes focused on Life Safety. I encourage the BCCC to vote your conscious and vote logistically.

Mr. Shanker: I disagree, this is "a Code" not a minimum code. If this was a minimum code, people would be outraged if we did more than the minimum code. You can't teach everyone to use common sense, like using a hair dryer in the bathtub. I think it is "a code" not a minimum code. If it was a minimum standard, we would be crazy to not adopt the whole thing.

Mr. Page: Rick, I beg to differ with you, it is a minimum code. You can do better than this, sometimes people are confused and think it is a maximum code.

Mr. Decker: Is there anyone else in the crowd that would like to ask questions or seek clarification. I would like to introduce you to Clint Smith, our Community Development Director. Thank you all for coming out and participating.

Mr. Smith concluded with a wrap up and thanked all for attending.