

**DGC Non- Energy Committee Supplemental Hearing #1  
 May 17th, 2022**

**1. Attendees:**

<b>Name of CCD Committee Member</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>In Attendance?</b>
Carol Pafford	City and County of Denver (CCD)	
Christy Collins	City and County of Denver (CCD)	X
Keith Fox	CCD	X
Antonio Navarra	CCD	X
Courtney Anderson	CCD	X
Eric Browning	CCD	
Tom Gleason	CCD	X
Austin Krcmarik	CCD	X
Tom Hootman	Form Flow Design	X
Kristen Salinas	Noresco	X
Darcie Chinnis	HLB Lighting	X

2. Meeting purpose: Not going to be able to discuss all proposals in hearing agendas – having offline discussions to vet proposals for advancement. Want to be transparent, recording meetings and posting minutes so members of the public can know what we’re talking about.

**3. Discussion and voting on **DGC Non-Energy****

- a. [#66](#) Graywater systems in city facilities
- b. [#83b](#) 801.3.7 Automatic Glare Controls
- c. [#84b](#) 801.3.11 Lighting Control Requirements for Presentations
- d. [#136](#) - 901.3.4.5 and 1001.X Outcome focused development: Benchmarking beyond energy
- e. [#127](#) 1001.3.1.10.1 Construction Waste for Demolitions

**4. [#66](#) Graywater systems in city facilities**

Discussion:

- a. Proponent: Kristen Salinas (Noresco)
- b. Summary: Provide clarification to further define where graywater systems can be utilized- surface irrigation, water closet and urinal flushing, and similar applications
- c. Keith Fox: CPD has a policy pertaining to gray water and Denver Department of Public Health has some requirements for Denver water, along with regulation 86 – we should

include or reference those along with this proposal.

- d. Kristen: mentioning other policies likely isn't harmful. Question for Eric/CPD to see if it's helpful to put in there and if it's enforceable
  - Christy: From an enforcement standpoint, everything that is permitted is at the state level. This is just further amplifying that these things are permitted at the state level and they're permitted in Denver and we would love for everybody to be doing them.
- e. Courtney: check for consensus about moving forward as long as Kristen and Noresco makes references to the other two policy documents
  - Group supportive of moving forward with updates

#### Action Item:

- a. Kristen and Noresco make references to the other two policy documents and move proposal forward

### 5. [#83b](#) 801.3.7 Automatic Glare Controls

#### Discussion:

- a. Proponent: Kristen Salinas (Noresco)
- b. Summary: Automatic glare controls – only thing changed was the table on page 2. Added a few notes to daylight spaces that we think should have automatic layer controls, includes gym fitness areas or enclosed swimming pools, worship facilities, laboratories, personal services areas, and exhibit spaces. Also removed the exception for the Convention Center. Broadening the list of applicability for automatic layer controls if this is an elective, they choose to do that.
- c. Darcie: There's some odd exceptions that are not applicable considering it's a state code. For example, there's exceptions for orientations that are in Southern Hemisphere locations. Also, language challenges: specular visible transmittance of fenestration assembly is not typically how they're rated. We would just typically see them in a VLT visible light transmittance rating. Suggest that we rely on VLT, which is the industry standard for shading transmittance.
- d. Darcie: Measure rate now states that it could be either occupant or control system controlled. But my suggestion is that we may want to separate those out in tables. Separate into occupant control versus control system. Automated controls as we would call it.
- e. Courtney: check for next steps - checked with group for support in moving this proposal forward pending updates made between Darcie and Kristen
  - Group was supportive of moving proposal forward with updates

Action Item:

- f. Darcie review updated tables for correctness and consistency
- g. Kristen work with Darcie to update tables
- h. Kristen move updated proposal forward

6. [#84b](#) 801.3.11 Lighting Control Requirements for Presentations

Discussion:

- a. Proponent: Kristen Salinas (Noresco)
- b. Summary: requirements for presentation lightening systems. Defined day lit spaces this is only control requirements for presentation lighting.
- c. Darcie: Did proposal previously include the light level requirements that are in AB and C so the lux and footcandle requirements, or is that in addition?
  - Kristen: all this information is in 801.5.3 already – not new information, just moved to a new location, so all information is together
- d. Darcie: I think that's an important distinction. If it's moving it from another part of the code, I would take less issue with it. If it's introducing lux requirements, which is this kind of an indirect way of dealing with this, I would not be in support of introducing LUX requirements into the code here.
- e. Courtney: does this relocation of language seem acceptable?
  - Darcie: Fundamentally it's not an issue of daylight so it seems strange providing minimum and maximum illuminance levels on presentation services in response to a daily control measure. Daily control should be about mitigating glare onto those surfaces, not necessarily about providing minimum or maximum uniformity and light levels onto the surfaces. It's two fundamentally different issues.
- f. Tom H.: This is meant to be a daylight provision, but it doesn't read like one.
- g. Kristen: it's in two different spots, so we were hoping to combine them. Lighting presentations and daylight performance requirement that has information about the reflectance
- h. Kristen: It sounds like we have two different things to discuss. #1 keep the existing language? #2 Is there any way to increase the stringency there and do we want to do anything about it?

- i. Darcie: My recommendation would be to keep the existing language. I think it that what is struck down below about controls defines what fixtures are associated with that presentation or display and need to be controlled separately, which I think is appropriate. I would not support performance metrics above about light levels
- j. Courtney: it sounds like we're not asking Kristen to update the proposal, but we're rejecting this proposal is that right?
- k. Keith: If we go with what was talked about, we'd have to have a different proposal to delete that section, right? The upper part because it's currently in the amendments.
- l. Courtney removed language above table 801.4.1.2A (Daylit Spaces)
- m. Courtney: is everyone in favor of rejecting this proposal?
  - Group was all supportive of rejection of this proposal

Action Items:

- n. Proposal rejected – no additional action needed

7. [#136](#) - 901.3.4.5 and 1001.X Outcome focused development: Benchmarking beyond energy

Discussion:

- a. Proponent: Kristen Salinas (Noresco)
- b. Summary: Beyond benchmarking. Trying to figure out some options for additional benchmarking we included operational water and waste. In line with what Energy Star Portfolio Manager offers in terms of ongoing benchmarking. There was a key component here about occupant education and engagement. Obviously when you benchmark great you have that information, but we wanted to make sure that that information was relayed back to the occupants so that we can improve, or a project could improve on their ongoing usage for water and waste.
- c. Courtney: clarifying question about 50% diversion and 75% diversion goals
  - Kristen: 50% construction and demo waste diversion rate and 75% is ongoing diversion rate
- d. Christy: what's feasible to achieve? 75% diversion doesn't seem unworkable for some project types. Is there a better value to assess value by?
- e. Kristen: How is this going to be enforced?
- f. Christy: Code enforcement we can figure out. The city can do spot checks or have third party checks. I don't think as part of these conversations we need to be deterred by the long-term

vision of how post occupancy enforcement takes place. This one is clearly saying the requirement is to have a policy be developed. Also, C&D and ongoing diversion are two separate issues, so those values don't necessarily need to mirror each other

- g. Christy/Courtney: would be valuable to get input from CASR Resource Management team
- h. Christy: want to see people have to try/put in effort to achieve. We want people to be trying and thinking differently – 50 vs 75% diversion
- i. Austin: Could you could you thread both and say a minimum of 50% with a goal of 75%?
- j. Courtney: I would like to take this back to the CASR team and then return to this group
  - Group supportive of sharing this proposal with CASR Resource Management team

#### Action Items:

- k. Courtney share this proposal with CASR Resource Management team and get their feedback, and then move proposal forward

### 8. [#127](#) 1001.3.1.10.1 Construction Waste for Demolitions

#### Discussion:

- a. Proponent: Kristen (Noresco)
- b. Summary: Further defined the waste management plan, included demolitions, and we specified what type of permit you would be pulling. Added roofing and then also included renovations and additions over 2500 square feet and demos over 1000 square feet. We wanted the plan to be posted so that people could comply with the plan and if there were substantial changes to the plan they would resubmit their goal and how they're achieving that to the building official. Also added information about materials that should be recycled and then with a either a new building or an existing building that was being renovated, we requested that a recycling chute be available for sorting purposes.
- c. This was reorganized part of it is in Chapter 9 and then part of it is in Chapter 10 with operations. One is planning and the other one is actual diversion.
- d. Courtney: check for consensus on moving this proposal forward
  - Group supportive of moving this proposal forward

#### Action Items:

- e. Kristin/Noresco move proposal forward