

IECC/DGC Energy Committee Hearing # 7 Minutes

June 23, 2022

2 p.m. – 5 p.m.

1. Roll Call: Quorum is 16, at 2:15pm, count is at 14.

Committee Member	In Attendance?
Aaron Esselink	X
Adam Lyons	
Allen Yanong	X
Antonio Navarra	
Bill Rectanus	
Bryan Kazin	X
Carol Pafford	Cannot attend
Chuck Kutscher	X
Chris Parr	
Curtis Underwood	Cannot attend
Chris Spelke (ONE VOTE)	
Ashleigh Wheeler	Cannot attend
Christy Collins	X
Chuck Bartel (Danny Boncich as sub)	X
Courtney Anderson	X
Elizabeth Gillmor	X
Eric Browning	X
Jamy Bacchus	X
John Burns	
John Dutch	
Jeff Crowe	
Ken Urbanek	X
Laura London	Cannot attend
Linda Morrison (ONE VOTE)	Cannot attend
Eric Rader	
Mike Walton	X
Mark Rodriguez	
Nathan Kahre	
Nate Huyler	Cannot attend
Paul Kriescher	X
Paul Schaffer (ONE VOTE)	
Robert Pruet	
Shanti Pless	
Alex Martin (ONE VOTE)	X
Kevin Eronymous	Cannot attend

2. Introduction of key proposals for IECC/DGC

a. [#28](#) Commercial Electrification Readiness

- Public Support:
 - Mark Jelinske: In favor and concur. Like that there is no mention of boilers. Conductors serving the electrical panels- will we be able to get cut sheets for this? What about distribution, transformer, servers, generator size.
- Public Opposition: N/A
- Committee Questions:
 - Danny Boncich: General agreement, but concerns about commercial cooking appliances, because we are not sure what commercial cooking appliances are going to look like in the next couple years. Are we sure we want to include commercial kitchen if we are not sure that it will be a part of electrification plan in the future?
 - Sean: We do know what a commercial kitchen looks like in electric. The reason commercial kitchens haven't been included is because of political reasons.
 - Chuck: Any consideration given to high peak demand?
 - Sean: In the readiness proposal, no, the readiness focuses on the basics, but this proposal does not account for demand flexibility The goal is to make it easier to electrify in the future.
 - Courtney: For the instantaneous water heater, does 10 feet make more sense to align with?
 - Sean: gives flexibility to not trigger GFCI requirements.
 - Elizabeth: In favor and how we would be advising our clients. Denver may have to think of polices that the electric alternative does meet that, how does that enforcement work? How it would be documented on a set of plans? Specifically commercial cooking.
 - Sean: Defer to city for how they want to show.
 - Jamy: Item 5- dwelling unit appliance, what does this apply to?
 - Sean: Electric dryers, kitchen equipment, space heating equipment, fire places
 - Jamy: Item 1 electric infrastructure: What are you sizing, just water heaters?
 - Sean: Should be for any of the equipment.
- Public Rebuttal Support:
 - Mark Jelinske: Where does this size conductor stop? Automatic transfer switch? Is it just one circuit feeding the panel?
 - Sean: Good point, since this is a new concept to the code, we tried to keep it as straight forward, but the infrastructure could go on from there, but with passing it in the code.
- Committee Discussion:
 - Ken Urbanek: Mark brought up a good point. The electrical panel

serving the panel, leads to up stream capacity, which makes sense.

- Sean: Some engineers would understand it that way but that was not specifically as intended. The code language can get complicated since there are so many electrical pieces.
 - Motion to modify- Ken: remove “conductors” and “or receptacle” and change within 12” to “the same space” and add “Said junction box shall allow the appliance or equipment within the same place of the fossil fuel equipment that it replaces” in C405.14.1 and remove “water heating” in C405.14.1.1, and change C404.10 exception 2 to 10 feet.
 - Eric: We do not have quorum but asking to committee to continue.
 - Courtney seconds.
 - Vote: 13 for, 0 opposed, 1 abstaining
 - Motion to approve as modified:
 - Vote: 13 for, 1 opposed, 0 abstaining
- b. [#63](#) Residential Electrification Readiness
- Committee Question:
 - Jamy: Can you tell me more about the identifying spaces for water heaters?
 - Sean: Physical space is needed to electric water heaters. Manufacturers require a minimum amount of air; hence the cubic ft call out. Could be divided into a 2.1 and 2.2 if there are concerns about clarity.
 - Elizabeth: Could understand how this could be interpreted. Would like this also to change for proposal 28 for commercial.
 - Committee Discussion:
 - Motion to modify: Ken- to match the same edit we made on the last proposal (28).
 - Elizabeth seconds.
 - Vote: 14 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstaining
 - Motion to approve as amended
 - Vote: 14 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstaining
- c. [#30](#) Commercial EV
- Public Support:
 - Mark Jelinske: Follows national level changes. Capable new spaces only or required spaces only or a smaller number of spaces was negotiated in zoning. Make it clear how C406 bonus points would be calc’s with this as the baseline. Trying to address multiple occupancies which can get complicated.
 - Public Opposition: N/A
 - Committee Questions:
 - Allen Yanong: Good move to clarify what we currently have the Denver amendments. We have an amendment in the IBC that applies to the universal chargers.
 - Mike: We did consider it and coordinated based on the IBC language.

- Sean: These are the definitions are in the NEC except EV charging station. Worst case would be to add a definition clarifying charging station is an EVSE.
- Allen: Is this less restrictive that is currently there? Is that the intent? If a project doesn't add parking spaces, then it shouldn't apply.
 - Sean: Should only apply to new parking only.
- Chuck: There's a real need for this but what are the next steps? I think we need to see that once a car is charged, then it moves and doesn't stay.
 - Mike: can be very difficult to put in the code but it is an important piece. Hard to figure out what the answer is in the code.
- Allen: Looking to increase the EC installed and reduce the amount of ready spaces. Is that the intent?
 - Mike: EV ready is not as useful as intended so installed is the preference.
 - Why did EV ready go to 0 %?
 - Mostly looking at what is classified by group I. It was a less useful than the other building types.
 - Looks like there is a residential section that R-3 and R4 are covered, why is in the commercial code? It on page 579 of amendments.
 - Low-rise r-3 and r-4 creates the need to still address them. Need to make sure that these align.
 - C405.10.1.2 – was strike but no comparable section was added.
 - Mike: Trying to provide the maximum amount of flexibility on whoever is developing the site has the option of where to put it.
 - Sean: Not a clear distinction between employee vs customer parking and the most useful level 2 charging is for the employee parking.
 - How does this work with the universal stations?
 - All of these percentages also apply to the accessibility spaces.
 - Reference to 1107 at the bottom of this proposal.
- Public Rebuttal : N/A
- Committee Discussion:
 - Elizabeth: On the MF side removing that remainder/ easing that remainder is the way to do. It hindered buildings from doing more electrification because the panel space would have to go to EVs. Like some of these changes.
 - Allen: The crux of the councilman's proposal was not to limit to it to accessible spaces for universal charging.
 - Eric: Concerned about the IBC proposal language usage of universal charging.

- Sean: The section that struck in the IBC proposal, the ADA requirements were struck so they are no longer codified.
 - Eric: For privately funded projects, we do not enforce ADA federal requirements. We do have disclaimer language stating we do not review to ADA.
 - Motion to approve with consideration if modifications are needed to provide coordination with the IBC proposal P42.
 - Vote: 11 for, 0 opposed, 2 abstaining
- d. [#65.1](#) Residential EV
- Public support/opposition: N/A
 - Committee Questions:
 - Eric: The term “lot” that is used under on-site parking space.
 - Mike: we are not using the term “zone lot”
 - Mike: Change to R404.3- double check numbering
 - Motion to approve as written:
 - Vote: 12 for, 0 opposed, 2 abstaining

Meeting Adjourned at 4:20pm