IECC Committee Hearing Agenda
September 25th, 2019
2pm-5pm City and County of Denver, Room 4.I.4

1. Roll Call and Introductions
2. Discussion on previously Tabled Proposals
   a. #506 R401 & R407
   b. (P71) R406.4
3. (Discuss IECC Residential Proposals
   a. #410: R503.2 & R505.2
   b. #44: Appendix RA
   c. (P68)366: Appendix RA
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Proposal # 506 (Originally P74, was requested to be reworked)
Changes the points option to expanded C406 options.

**Public Testimony in Support:**
The intention is to bring a simple alternative to flex points proposal. This is more of an options approach like C406 on Commercial side. This would get the market ready to reach Denver’s goals. Feel this is a good intermediate change with Denver being uncomfortable bringing in the points options. Really straightforward options in this proposal. No major changes to the way you design.

**Public Testimony in Opposition: None**

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**
1. Is this requiring you to install 100% of lamps in house or 100% of lamps installed have to be at 75?
   a. In 100% of spaces.

**Original Motion: As Submitted**
**Reason:** We worked to find steps that will help builders to improve their efficiency and helps to get builders in line with what is coming in the 2021 code.

**Final Motion: As Submitted**
**Final Vote:** AS Passes 13-0

**Additional staff or committee comments for the record:**
Add CFM per square foot, Metric Option.

Proposal # P71 (Tabled to be heard with #506)
Denver’s energy code goals will require that the next version of Denver’s energy code be 27% more efficient than IECC-2018. This proposal modifies the ERI compliance path to meet that goal.

**Public Testimony in Support:**
Intent is to match the prescriptive path. Number may need to be re calibrated. The ERI path should be no less stringent than the prescriptive path.

**Public Testimony in Opposition: None**

**Committee Discussion:**
- 61 or less should be the number when finalized, will need to look at re calibrating.
- Discussion that analysis will be done by a sub group to determine the metric to be finalized on October 24th call for calibration.

**Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)**
**Modification:** Adopt revision with edit of score being 61 or lower (finalized after calibration issue is addressed)

**Final Motion: As Modified**
**Final Vote:** AM Passes 12-1

**Additional staff or committee comments for the record:** None
Proposal # 410
Update references associated with section and add Existing plus addition compliance (Prescriptive plus blower door).

Public Testimony in Support:
Intent of proposal is to leverage statement in existing home section that says your house after addition must be better than or equal energy performance of the existing home. This gives you methodology for how you get that baseline. Revisions were made to address Denver’s staff concerns.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. When doing an addition aren’t you inherently going to increase your leakage and costs? Does blower door have to be less than your original.
   a. If using one of the performance paths you would be doing a pre and post blower door test. Your addition can’t be leakier than the existing house.

Committee Discussion:
• Committee concern that this is already stated in the code.
• If someone wants to use prescriptive what happens with blower door test that makes this more feasible?
  o If you’re following prescriptive path it incorporates mandatory requirements which includes a blower door test. It would be nearly impossible to isolate the addition to determine the efficiency.
  o Revisions just simplified the numbers, left existing performance path. 402.3

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Reason: Feel this is helpful and cleans up the section for easier use. This is currently in a Denver policy that Denver operates off of.

Modification: Add Exception, and add Existing plus Addition ERI Path (Per submitted Revision)
Final Motion: As Modified
Final Vote: As Modified 10-0-3
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # P68
Appendix RA and Appendix T are counterparts in the IECC and the IRC; however, Appendix T has been updated and Appendix RA has not. This proposal replaces the content of Appendix RA with Appendix T.

Public Testimony in Support:
Two versions of the same appendix. Appendix T in IRC and Appendix RA in IECC. This just syncs up the updates made to Appendix T to apply to Appendix RA as well. Requires solar readiness which is not currently included in Appendix T.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Discussion:
• Storage Ready was not approved for Commercial.
• The changes weren’t made in the IRC so we are trying to get them to match and that makes sense.
• Some feelings that we shouldn’t force someone to install battery storage that may not be used for years.
Original Motion: Disapprove (D)
Reason: Based on previous action.
Final Motion: Disapproval
Final Vote: D Passes 12-0-1
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
Editorial RA103 instead of T103

Proposal # 44
The solar ready appendix in the IRC was changed last cycle but the changes were not incorporated in the solar ready appendix of IECC residential provisions. This corrects.

Public Testimony in Support:
Appendix RA should have been updated the same as Appendix T. This proposal just updates the two appendices to match.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: Feel this proposal is a good fit for Denver since it does not require solar readiness and storage requirements but cleans up the inconsistency in the code between Appendix T and Appendix RA.

Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 11-1-1
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None