

**Comments Received During the Stakeholder Feedback Period for
Draft 1 of the ENERGY STAR California Program Requirements:
Single-Family New Homes v3.4 and Multifamily New Construction v1.4
and Revised Implementation Policy for all California Versions**



ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for California, SFNH Version 3.4 / MFNC Version 1.4 & Revised Implementation Policy Comments Received

Table of Contents

Organization Name: ARCXIS	3
Organization Name: ARCXIS (Ei).....	5
Organization Name: Beazer Homes USA, Inc.....	7
Organization Name: Meritage Homes	9



ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for California, SFNH Version 3.4 / MFNC Version 1.4 & Revised Implementation Policy Comments Received

Organization Name: ARCXIS

Respondent Last Name: Williamson

Respondent First Name: Estee

Comments:

General

[Add comments]

Definition of California SFNH Version 3.4 and MFNC Version 1.4 Program Requirements

- 1) Do you have feedback on the proposed new performance targets of the ENERGY STAR Single-Family New Homes (SFNH) and Multifamily New Construction (MFNC) Program Requirements for California (i.e., [for SFNH](#), an Efficiency EDR ≥ 5 points or a Compliance Margin $\geq 10\%$ above the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards; [for MFNC](#), a Compliance Margin $\geq 10\%$ above the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards)?
 - a. We would like to request the EPA to change the Program Requirements for eligibility as it relates to this specific item: "An Efficiency Energy Design Rating (EDR2 Efficiency) that is ≥ 5 points better than that of the Standard Design corresponding to the home, as defined by the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and determined by a CEC-approved software program." We would like to request to change this from 5 points to 3 points. This is to align with the previous two versions of ESTAR (3.3 and 3.2) which required 3 or better points, this will be more financially feasible for Builders to participate in the Program while still maintaining the EPA's desire for the Program to reflect above-code construction.

- 2) Do you have additional general feedback on this topic?

[Add comments]

Revision of Implementation Policy

- 1) Is the revised implementation policy, which is tied to the permit date of the home / building and the edition of code being enforced by the Authority Having Jurisdiction, an appropriate and enforceable approach to ensuring that certified homes and apartments are more efficient than code? If not, what alternative definition might be more appropriate?

We would like to request the EPA to not revert back to Permit Date to determine Version because we went away from that specifically back in 2018 when Version 3.2 was initiated. This is because the Building Departments in CA have a strict/continual way of approving permits with short timelines whereas other states will allow a project to be built to one original Permit Date received at the beginning of the project and never require new permits pulled. This puts a financial burden on CA Builders specifically to pull permits ahead of January 1, 2024 and then build all of the lots within 6 months to a year which may not be possible, with the alternative being an ESTAR version-split community that significantly impacts pre-determined budgets for the success of the project. ESTAR-version split communities also creates challenges for Builders to market homes with different features throughout the same community.

However, if the above is not accepted, we would like to request that Permit Date ONLY affects v3.2 projects right now since that is the version that the EPA allowed additional grandfathering on. At the very least we would like to request the use of Approval Date for at least versions 3.3 & 3.4. As stated above in part a, this is because the Builder should be able to rely upon this metric so they can plan their budgets and uniform features for their whole project.



ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for California, SFNH Version 3.4 / MFNC Version 1.4 & Revised Implementation Policy Comments Received

- 2) Do you have additional general feedback on this topic?

[Add comments]

Removal of Eligibility for Townhouses to be Certified Using the MFNC Program

- 1) In light of the fact that the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards require whole-building modeling and only define a TDV energy budget (not an Efficiency EDR) for all multifamily building types, EPA is proposing to no longer allow townhouses to be eligible for certification using the MFNC program. Instead, all townhouses will be required to be certified using the SFNH program. Is this change in eligibility for the MFNC program warranted?

[Add comments]

- 2) Do you have additional general feedback on this topic?

[Add comments]



ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for California, SFNH Version 3.4 / MFNC Version 1.4 & Revised Implementation Policy Comments Received

Organization Name: ARCXIS (Ei)

Respondent Last Name: Trester

Respondent First Name: Cassandra

Comments:

General

[Add comments]

Definition of California SFNH Version 3.4 and MFNC Version 1.4 Program Requirements

- 3) Do you have feedback on the proposed new performance targets of the ENERGY STAR Single-Family New Homes (SFNH) and Multifamily New Construction (MFNC) Program Requirements for California (i.e., [for SFNH](#), an Efficiency EDR ≥ 5 points or a Compliance Margin $\geq 10\%$ above the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards; [for MFNC](#), a Compliance Margin $\geq 10\%$ above the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards)?

- b. We would like to request the EPA to change the Program Requirements for eligibility as it relates to this specific item: "An Efficiency Energy Design Rating (EDR2 Efficiency) that is ≥ 5 points better than that of the Standard Design corresponding to the home, as defined by the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and determined by a CEC-approved software program." We would like to request to change this from 5 points to 3 points. This is to align with the previous two versions of ESTAR (3.3 and 3.2) which required 3 or better points, this will be more financially feasible for Builders to participate in the Program while still maintaining the EPA's desire for the Program to reflect above-code construction.

- 4) Do you have additional general feedback on this topic?

[Add comments]

Revision of Implementation Policy

- 3) Is the revised implementation policy, which is tied to the permit date of the home / building and the edition of code being enforced by the Authority Having Jurisdiction, an appropriate and enforceable approach to ensuring that certified homes and apartments are more efficient than code? If not, what alternative definition might be more appropriate?

We would like to request the EPA to not revert back to Permit Date to determine Version because we went away from that specifically back in 2018 when Version 3.2 was initiated. This is because the Building Departments in CA have a strict/continual way of approving permits and alignment with state code cycles. Changing this now puts a financial burden on CA Builders for any home permitted after January 1, 2024 as well as causing homes in a single community to have communities with multiple versions of Energy Star that significantly impacts pre-determined budgets for the success of the project. ESTAR-version split communities also creates challenges for Builders to market homes with different features throughout the same community.

However, if the above is not accepted, I would like to request that all communities started pulling permits prior to Jan 1st 2024 to be granted the current version 3.2 conditions of approval including 2022 CA code permits certified under version 3.3.

- 4) Do you have additional general feedback on this topic?

[Add comments]



ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for California, SFNH Version 3.4 / MFNC Version 1.4 & Revised Implementation Policy Comments Received

Removal of Eligibility for Townhouses to be Certified Using the MFNC Program

3) In light of the fact that the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards require whole-building modeling and only define a TDV energy budget (not an Efficiency EDR) for all multifamily building types, EPA is proposing to no longer allow townhouses to be eligible for certification using the MFNC program. Instead, all townhouses will be required to be certified using the SFNH program. Is this change in eligibility for the MFNC program warranted?

I agree

4) Do you have additional general feedback on this topic?

.



ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for California, SFNH Version 3.4 / MFNC Version 1.4 & Revised Implementation Policy Comments Received

Organization Name: Beazer Homes USA, Inc

Respondent Last Name: Shanks

Respondent First Name: Brian

Comments:

General

[Add comments]

Definition of California SFNH Version 3.4 and MFNC Version 1.4 Program Requirements

- 5) Do you have feedback on the proposed new performance targets of the ENERGY STAR Single-Family New Homes (SFNH) and Multifamily New Construction (MFNC) Program Requirements for California (i.e., [for SFNH](#), an Efficiency EDR ≥ 5 points or a Compliance Margin $\geq 10\%$ above the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards; [for MFNC](#), a Compliance Margin $\geq 10\%$ above the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards)?

≥ 5 EDR points is more aggressive than the prior two program updates CA 3.3 & 3.2. CA 2022 T24 is also more efficient than its predecessor. The combination of the efficiency requirements of CA 2022 T24 and the proposed efficiency improvements in CA SFNH 3.4 and MFNC 1.4, in a diminishing pool of “cost-effective” efficiency improvements, will further inhibit affordability and erode homeownership opportunities. Our request is for the CA ENERGY STAR® program to maintain the same above code gap of ≥ 3 EDR for SFNH and MFNC as in prior iterations.

- 6) Do you have additional general feedback on this topic?

[Add comments]

Revision of Implementation Policy

- 5) Is the revised implementation policy, which is tied to the permit date of the home / building and the edition of code being enforced by the Authority Having Jurisdiction, an appropriate and enforceable approach to ensuring that certified homes and apartments are more efficient than code? If not, what alternative definition might be more appropriate?

Due to the permitting process in CA, the considered revision/reversal is not tenable. Our request is to continue the current process that includes Plan Approval Date as a basis of program implementation.

- 6) Do you have additional general feedback on this topic?

[Add comments]

Removal of Eligibility for Townhouses to be Certified Using the MFNC Program

- 5) In light of the fact that the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards require whole-building modeling and only define a TDV energy budget (not an Efficiency EDR) for all multifamily building types, EPA is proposing to no longer allow townhouses to be eligible for certification using the MFNC program. Instead, all townhouses will be required to be certified using the SFNH program. Is this change in eligibility for the MFNC program warranted?

[Add comments]



ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for California, SFNH Version 3.4 / MFNC Version 1.4 & Revised Implementation Policy Comments Received

- 6) [Do you have additional general feedback on this topic?](#)

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of our reasonable requests



ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for California, SFNH Version 3.4 / MFNC Version 1.4 & Revised Implementation Policy Comments Received

Organization Name: Meritage Homes

Respondent Last Name: Hughes

Respondent First Name: Ian

Comments:

General

NA

Definition of California SFNH Version 3.4 and MFNC Version 1.4 Program Requirements

- 7) Do you have feedback on the proposed new performance targets of the ENERGY STAR Single-Family New Homes (SFNH) and Multifamily New Construction (MFNC) Program Requirements for California (i.e., [for SFNH](#), an Efficiency EDR \geq 5 points or a Compliance Margin \geq 10% above the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards; [for MFNC](#), a Compliance Margin \geq 10% above the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards)?

We request EPA consideration to change the eligibility requirements for “An Efficiency Energy Design Rating that is \geq 5 points better than that of the Standard Design corresponding to the home, as defined by the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and determined by a CEC-approved software program” to change from 5 to 3 points. This aligns with ESTAR V3.3 & 3.2 requirements of 3 or better points.

- 8) Do you have additional general feedback on this topic?

NA

Revision of Implementation Policy

- 7) Is the revised implementation policy, which is tied to the permit date of the home / building and the edition of code being enforced by the Authority Having Jurisdiction, an appropriate and enforceable approach to ensuring that certified homes and apartments are more efficient than code? If not, what alternative definition might be more appropriate?

Request EPA consideration to not revert back to Permit Date to determine Version since this processed have already changed to accommodate V3.2. Builders, such as ourselves, are looking to maintain continuity in our communities and to make program participation feasible. By reverting back to Permit Date, builders are forced to pre-pull permits ahead of 1/1/24 and build within 6 months to 1 year or face having to offer to different home features within the same community and additional impacts to previously established project budgets.

- 8) Do you have additional general feedback on this topic?

We request EPA to consider the above or alternatively that Permit Date ONLY affects v3.2 projects right now since EPA allowed provisions for grandfathering projects. At minimum – please request the use of Approval Date for at least v3.3 and 3.4 for project budget and community feature continuity.

Removal of Eligibility for Townhouses to be Certified Using the MFNC Program

- 7) In light of the fact that the 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards require whole-building modeling and only define a TDV energy budget (not an Efficiency EDR) for all multifamily building types, EPA is proposing to no longer allow townhouses to be eligible for certification using the MFNC program. Instead, all



ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for California, SFNH Version 3.4 / MFNC Version 1.4 & Revised Implementation Policy Comments Received

townhouses will be required to be certified using the SFNH program. Is this change in eligibility for the MFNC program warranted?

NA

8) Do you have additional general feedback on this topic?

NA