



IECC/DGC Energy Committee Hearing # 8 Minutes

July 7, 2022

2 p.m. – 5 p.m.

City and County of Denver ([via Zoom](#))

1. Roll Call

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

Shanti Pless	
Alex Martin (ONE VOTE)	X
Kevin Eronimous	Cannot attend

18 voting members but 16 votes

2. Introduction of key proposals for IECC/DGC

a. #6 C406

General public (support):

- In favor of overall concept of allowing designers to come up with ways to comply. There are issues (heat pump requirement) but in support of the general proposal.
- Encouraged to see Denver have more ambitious proposals. Good step forward to all electric as soon as possible.

General public (opposition):

- None

Committee questions:

- What is the process to further calibrate the proposal? Answer: No further calibration is expected.

General public rebuttal (support):

- None

General public rebuttal (opposition):

- None

General discussion:

- Table C406.1 – Is there a reason the reduced lighting power is not framed similar to on-site renewable energy? Answer: Lighting technology is advancing fast and any cap we placed would limit the advancement of that technology.
- C406.12.2 Heat pump equipment language being adjusted with suggestions.
- There are going to be buildings that are going to meet the definition of an all-electric building that are not going to meet this requirement. If we make electrification too hard, we will have buildings that will choose another route. Suggest splitting C406.12 into a two-point threshold.
- Suggest changing exception to apply to all building types, not just multifamily.
- Suggest having 12.1 be the less strict all-electric with section 12.2 being the original language.

Motion: To add section 2.4 and modify the exception.

Vote: Motion passes 14 for, 0 opposed, 1 abstain

Motion: To break section 406.12.2 into two separate thresholds.

Vote: Motion passes 14 for, 0 opposed, 2 abstain

- Working group to establish the two-point threshold needs to be established.

Motion: To form a working group to set the values for section 406.12 on table C406.1.

Vote: Motion passes 15 for, 0 opposed, 1 abstain

- The new modifications create a redundancy with section C406.2.6. Before the modifications C406.2.6 would have precluded you from getting points in C406.12.

- Can we get rid of C406.2.3 if we included cooling and cold temp? Answer: If you wanted to incentivize cold temp cooling.
- The language in 406.12 still seems very unclear and unsure what we would be voting on. Answer: Voting for as written and the table being modified but a sub-committee.

Motion: To approve as modified.

Motion: To table until subcommittee makes modifications (takes precedent over previous motion).

Vote: Motion passes 14 for, 0 opposed, 1 abstain

Subcommittee to modify: Courtney Anderson, Elizabeth Gillmor, Chuck Bartel, Allen Yanong, John Arent, Caitlyn/Jamy Bacchus

b. [#P19](#) pEUI

General public (support):

- Table PT103 perhaps the descriptions could be altered. For example, apartments (R-2). Do you mean apartments or all of R-2? There might be unintended consequences or confusion with the descriptions.

General public (opposition):

- None

Committee questions:

- What is the intent to the descriptions (to proponent): Answer: The intent was to provide clarity because the occupancy types are broader than in the table. We might adjust apartment to multifamily since ownership should not alter the intent.
- Why are the model rules not included in the proposal? Answer: It came down to the fundamental reality that this is a new modeling approach. There was the desire to ensure the rules and procedures were able to be modified to respond to the market and the city's needs.

General public rebuttal (support):

- None

General public rebuttal (opposition):

- None

General discussion:

- Want to address the occupancy type descriptions (proposal modified)
- Is the intent of restaurant/bar to capture kitchen energy use.

Motion: To approve as modified.

Vote: Motion passes 11 for, 0 opposed, 4 abstain

c. [#18](#) Appendix G

General public (support):

- Similar to proposal 19, we should clarify the building descriptions to remove confusion.

General public (opposition):

- None

Committee questions:

- None

General public rebuttal (support):

- Healthcare hospitals is probably the most pertinent issue with the building descriptions.

General public rebuttal (opposition):

- None

General discussion:

- The building descriptions are pulled directly from ASHRAE 90.1. Still suggest we modify the descriptions such as the previous proposal. (Descriptions modified)
- As an energy consultant, it is easier to go to a team with a Building Performance Factor they need to meet instead of having an additional factor (regulated vs non-regulated loads).
- Is CASER reviewing this number or is this part of a review from the City of Denver? Answer: The buildings are subject under Energize Denver.
- As far as enforcement goes, you could have a building that has an estimated EUI over or under what is permitted and that is allowed.
- There is no code compliance. The question is - did you document it or not? If you miss it, hopefully the owners will see it.

Motion: To modify table 407.3.

Vote: Motion passes 12 for, 0 opposed, 1 abstain

Motion: To approve as modified.

Vote: Motion passes 13 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstain

d. [#20](#) Site Energy for Appendix G

- Proposal will be introduced but there we will have no discussion due to there being around 10 minutes left in the hearing. We will go straight to discussion on this proposal at the next hearing.

General public (support):

- None

General public (opposition):

- None

Committee questions:

- None

General public rebuttal (support):

- Healthcare hospitals is probably the most pertinent issue with the building descriptions.

General public rebuttal (opposition):

- None

General discussion:

- Suggest striking out description language from table SE103.3

Motion: To modify table SE103.3.

Vote: Motion passes unanimously (13 votes)

Motion: To table the rest of the proposal.

Vote: Motion passes 12 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstained

Hearing adjourned: 4:59pm (MT)