



## IECC/DGC Energy Committee Hearing # 9

July 19th, 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	X
Carol Pafford	
Chuck Kutscher	X
Chris Parr	
Curtis Underwood	Cannot attend (7/19 or 7/26)
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
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	X
Nathan Kahre	
Nate Huyler	Will be late
Paul Kriescher	X
Paul Schaffer (ONE VOTE)	
Robert Pruett	

Shanti Pless	
Alex Martin (ONE VOTE)	
Kevin Eronymous	

18 voting members present, 16 total votes

## 2. Voting of key proposals for IECC/DGC

### Commercial

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

(Proposal and public comments were heard at previous meeting)

Motion to approve as amended:

**Approved as amended (15 for, 0 against, 1 abstain)**

- b. [#P40](#) Commercial Partial Electrification Space Heating

Motion to hear P40 and P38 together but vote on them separately

**Motion passed (16 for, 0 against, 0 abstained)**

#### Public comments (for):

- The mayor had a state of the city a few days ago and believes in the need to combat climate change. Council unanimously voted to pass energize Denver. City council implores to pass these proposals. (Public comment from council member).
- Rocky Mountain Institute in favor of proposals that lead to electrification. This is a good step forward.
- Wanted to appreciate the hard work of the committee. We are in support of proposals that lead to buildings with lessened emissions and that require a higher degree of efficiency that cannot go all electric.

#### Public comments (against):

- This proposal required picking winners and loser in terms of water heating technologies. If it must pass, I recommend it not being modified too much.

#### Committee questions:

- How are the heating replacements chosen? - This is building off of energize Denver where the decisions for replacements have already been made?
- What is appendix TE? - The modeling to an energy target, one of the modeling paths the committee approved in the last meeting.
- Why does exception 3 only allow flexibility for electric resistance and not gas, while the water heating proposal gives you flexibility with both? – One of them is right and the other is wrong. We need to make sure it is right in both of them.
- What does exception 5 mean? – The working group felt that 5W is not enough to do electric resistance heating.
- What supplementary heat is being referenced in exception 5? – Supplementary heat

that is hybrid (working together), not supplementary for when a heat pump cannot keep up in certain instances.

- Do we still need to cross out electric resistance as we did in C403.4.1.1? – It does still allow gas for supplementary heat which is why electric resistance was crossed out.

Rebuttal (for):

- N/A

Rebuttal (against):

- If this has to pass, I think it is done pretty well. It is picking winners and losers and there may be interpretation issues.

Discussion:

- Changing exemption 3 to remove “electric resistance in” would help.

**Motion to modify exemption #5 and add “A budget”**

**Vote passes (16 for, 0 against, 2 abstaining)**

- Does plenum area count as conditioned floor area? – Depends on where you define your envelope.

**Motion to add exemptions #8 and #9**

**Vote passes (15 for, 0 against, 1 abstaining)**

**Motion to approve as amended**

**Vote passes (15 for, 0 against, 1 abstaining)**

- c. [#P38](#) Commercial Partial Electrification Water Heating

Public comments (for):

- Council member vote for P40 was also for P38.

Public comments (against):

- The most efficient non-electric water heater is specifically excluded. This allows for the less efficient water heating option. We can use C406 and I don’t think this proposal is it.

Committee questions:

- Was any consideration given to using a mixing valve? – The issue of raising tank temperature to raise capacity was talked about but we have not looked in the plumbing code as far as using mixing valves.
- For gas exemptions that we are allowing what is the improvement that we are making? – Energize Denver was driven by “what are the cost-effective choices to electrify now?”
- Did the committee discuss how process water heating might fit into this? There aren’t many pool heating replacement options. – This doesn’t apply to boilers. Boilers don’t count as instantaneous and storage water heating equipment.

Rebuttal (for):

- N/A

Rebuttal (against):

- Similar to P40, picks winners and loser.

Discussion:

- We should change “water heating equipment” to “service water heating equipment”
- Do we think the modifications are helping us to align with Energize Denver?

**Motion to approve modifications**

**Vote passes (16 for, 0 against, 0 abstaining)**

**Motion to approve as amended with the intent to also change “service” to “portable”**

**Vote passes (15 for, 0 against, 1 abstaining)**

**Residential**

- d. [#47](#) R408 Residential Prescriptive Path

Public comments (for):

- Support with some reservations. Would like to have seen in the commercial side.
- If you are just looking at this alone, I don’t think it gets us exactly where we need to be although I am in support of the concept.

Public comments (against):

- N/A

Committee questions:

- For projects that are going all-electric, they would be meeting one of the two electric options. If they’re doing electric water heating, they would not be able to take any credit for going to the premium electric heating, was that intentional or was that an oversight? – It was intentional. There was a general desire to see the efficiency come out of the building rather than the equipment.

Rebuttal (for):

- N/A

Rebuttal (against):

- N/A

Discussion:

- What is the difference between R408.10.2 and R408.10.3.? – When we did the modeling, there was a difference in savings from using a heat pump water heater depending on whether it was a conditioned space.

**Motion to approve as written**  
**Vote passes (13 for, 1 against, 1 abstaining)**

- e. [#31](#) ERI Path

Public comments (for):

- In support, it is nice and simple
- Rocky Mountain Institute is also in support

Public comments (against):

- N/A

Committee questions:

- Can you expand on the types of models used to come up with the ERI? – The scores were based on the city’s goals and 50 was set as the goal for the 2021 cycle, more than modeling.
- 

Rebuttal (for):

- N/A

Rebuttal (against):

- N/A

Discussion:

- What would an all-electric property meeting the ERI of 55 look like? – A building thermal envelope consistent to one in the table. You can trade off certain aspects because you have the performance model.

**Motion to modify by adding “prior to renewables”**

**Vote passes (14 for, 0 against, 1 abstaining)**

**Motion to approve as amended**

**Vote passes (11 for, 0 against, 3 abstaining)**

- f. [#67](#) Minimum Renewables

- Not addressed due to time constraints.

***Meeting adjourned 5:04PM MT***