# IECC/DGC Energy Committee Hearing # 4 Meeting Minutes

March 3, 2022
2 p.m. – 5 p.m.
City and County of Denver

## 1. Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee Member</th>
<th>In Attendance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Esselink</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Pafford</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Parr</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Spelke</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy Collins</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Bartel</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Yanong</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Anderson</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Gillmor</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Browning</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamy Bacchus</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Burns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Urbanek</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Lyons</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate Huyler</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Underwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Crowe</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Morrison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Walton</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Kahre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Kriescher</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Schaffer</td>
<td>One vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pruett</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Navarra</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanti Pless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Kutscher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Rodriguez</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Rectanus</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Kazin</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Kancir</td>
<td>One vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Werner</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Sanderson</td>
<td>NON-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22 Voting Committee Members Present

2. Introduction of key proposals of IECC/DBC-Residential and DGC Ch.4 (non-voting)
   
   a. **#67** R404.4 Minimum renewable energy system
      
      - Sets a minimum level of onsite renewable energy with the option to fulfill with offsets.
      - Since it is residential, we don’t need a table. Instead, the single target is in the code.
      - Comment – It was not clear if this applies to new residential buildings.
      - Comment - An example of how this applies would be nice. Perhaps a project with a larger budget would be able to afford this.

   b. **#47** R408 Additional Efficiency Options
      
      - Replaces a package-based approach for a credit-based approach.
      - With a credit-based approach, all projects will be aiming for a same level of efficiency.
      - Savings were based on modeling for national prototypes.
      - There are 26 credit options.
      - Question – R408.10.3 – Does it say water heating is not allowed in conditioned space?

   c. **#31** R406 Energy Rating Index Compliance
      
      - Does two things. First, it cleans up R406. Second, it calibrates the EIR target to Denver’s goals.
      - Protects the building from trading off too much of its efficiency for renewables.
      - The greenhouse gas impact is very similar to what we would see in R408.
• The language mirrors the language in the building performance pathway in the past.
• How is it possible to get a 10% energy efficiency increase without construction costs? – Its using a code based ERI score. Its much more restrictive than this approach. That’s where the no impact is coming from.
• The language that has been proposed (...the most recent publication of the ANSI/RESNET/ICC standard...) seems problematic from a legal perspective by adopting standards that haven’t been established.

3. Discussion and voting on IECC/DBC-Residential and DGC Ch.4
   a. #P45  C505/ R505 - Change in Occupancy
      • Support:
        • This kind of approach is important for the reuse of buildings. It’s a logical approach without losing opportunities for efficiency.
      • Opposition:
        • N/A
      • Committee Questions/Comments:
        • When would the opportunity present itself for a change of occupancy for new construction? (In regard to first section in R505.1) – What this sentence is saying is that in the event of a change of occupancy, it must comply with provisions of new construction.
      • Rebuttal (Support):
        • N/A
      • Rebuttal (Opposition):
        • N/A
      • Discussion:
        • If you reverse the two sentences under R505.1 General, it reads much better.
        • Motion to approve with the intent to modify.
        • Vote Passed (16 for, 1 opposed, 5 abstained)
b.  **#23** R402.1 General Prescriptive path

- **Support:**
  - N/A
- **Opposition:**
  - N/A
- **Committee Questions/Comments:**
  - Can you tell us a little about the value .27/.25? The .27/.25 values are based on our climate zone u values for windows that are available in our market.
  - The .25 is incentivizing reducing the amount of windows in the house to help reduce energy loss.
  - Can you explain the reasoning for the deletion of footnote f? – Window U values are readily available at these levels. That footnote specifically tries to address gas bill.
- **Rebuttal (Support):**
  - N/A
- **Rebuttal (Opposition):**
  - N/A
- **Discussion:**
  - Revisions on footnote
- **Motion to amend**
  - Vote (18 for, 0 opposed, 3 abstained)
  - Motion to approve as amended with the intent to modify further grammatically
  - **Vote Passed (18 for, 0 opposed, 3 abstained)**
  - Subcommittee to further modify - Eric Browning, Allen Yanong

c.  **#7** R403.3 Duct and Air Handler Location

- **Support:**
  - I would suggest increasing to R-12 instead of R-8
- **Opposition:**
  - N/A
- **Committee Questions/Comments:**
• N/A
• Rebuttal (Support):
• N/A
• Rebuttal (Opposition):
• N/A
• Discussion:
• N/A
• Motion to approve both IECC and DGC proposals as written.
• Vote Passes (16 for, 1 opposed, 4 abstained)

d. #46 R403.3.5 Duct Testing
• Support:
• N/A
• Opposition:
• N/A
• Committee Questions/Comments:
  • Does the standard not clarify that the test is not exclusive for the ducts? – Not explicitly.
• Rebuttal (Support):
• N/A
• Rebuttal (Opposition):
• N/A
• Discussion:
  • Why not leave a in the body language and then leave one exemption (b). – The language in the current code is an exemption. To be consistent with the way the code is currently written.
• Motion to approve IECC and DGC proposals as amended.
• Vote Passed (16 for, 0 opposed, 4 abstained)
e. 11.2 R403.1.3 Continuously Burning Pilot Lights
• Support:
• N/A
• Opposition:
Committee Questions/Comments:

- How available are non-continuously burning pilot light water heaters? – They are readily available and are installed every day.
- When equipment is being replaced, what additional costs are brought up when vents need to be replaced? – Atmospheric water heating have increased safety concerns.

Rebuttal (Support):

- N/A

Rebuttal (Opposition):

- N/A

Discussion:

- Motion to approve as submitted.
- Vote Passed (11 for, 1 opposed, 8 abstained)

Meeting adjourned at 5:06 MT

Note: Subcommittee for proposal #83 Ken Urbanek, Chuck Bartel