

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

PROPOSED CHANGE OF THE CONNECTICUT STATE BUILDING CODE AND FIRE SAFETY CODE

| | DE INICODA A TION | | | DATE SUBMI | TTED: |
|-----------|---|-------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| | DE INFORMATION | Duilding Code | □ Fire Cafety Code | | |
| | oposed change to: | ☐ Building Code | ☐ Fire Safety Code | | |
| Co | de section(s): | | | | |
| <u>PR</u> | OPONENT INFORM | <u>ATION</u> | | | |
| Na | me: | | Represei | nting: | |
| Tel | lephone: | | Email: | | |
| Ad | | | | | |
| | Street A | Address | Town | State | Zip Code |
| <u>PR</u> | OPOSAL INFORMAT | <u> </u> | | | |
| De | scription of change | and reason for change | (attach additional informati | on as needed): | |
| | | | | | |
| Pro | oposed text change, | addition or deletion (a | attach additional informatior | n as needed): | |
| | | | | | |
| Su | pporting data and d | ocuments (attach addi | tional information as needed | d) | |
| | • | • | Original material is considered research and, to the best of his | | |
| | | _ | ts source (if known) is as foll proposal submitted to model co | | |
| | I would like to ma | ke an in-person prese | ntation of my proposal. | | _ |
| Pol | laasa | | | | |
| I he | lease ereby grant the State olication and reprodu | | to the use of this material with | out benefit to me, | including, but not limited to, |
| | oponent's Signatu | uro. | | Name | |

PLEASE EMAIL (PREFERRED) TO DAS.CodesStandards@CT.GOV OR MAIL OR FAX (SEE BELOW)

Department of Administrative Services
Office of the State Building Inspector
450 Columbus Boulevard, Suite 1303
Hartford, CT 06103
Tel: 860-713-5900 Fax: 860-713-7410
Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer

CT Codes & Amendments - Proposed Amendment to 2021 IRC

APPENDIX AP Sizing of Water Piping System

Section AP101 General AP101.1 Scope.

AP101.1.1 Two Procedures This Appendix outlines two procedures for sizing a water piping system (see Sections E103.3, and E201.1, and E301.1). The design procedures are based on the minimum static pressure available from the supply source, the head changes in the system caused by friction and elevation, and the rates of flow necessary for operation of various fixtures. (remaining sections remain the same)

AP301 Selection of Pipe Size

AP301.1 The Water Demand Calculator Method. The water piping system for single- and multi-family dwellings with water-conserving plumbing fixtures, fixture fittings, and appliances shall be sized in accordance with the 2020 Water Efficiency and Sanitation Standard (WE-Stand) Appendix C.

AP301.2 Water Demand Calculator. The estimated design flow rate for the building main and principal branches and risers shall be determined by the IAPMO Water Demand Calculator available for download at http://www.iapmo.org/water-demand-calculator/

Why the IAPMO Water Demand Calculator?

Over 70 years ago the United States National Bureau of Standards developed a theoretically rigorous and convenient graphical approach for estimating the 99th percentile of water use in public facilities under the expedient assumption of congested conditions. Since then, the NBS approach (often called Hunter's curves) has been incorporated into design codes for plumbing systems around the globe. However, the performance of water fixtures and the uses of drinking water have changed markedly over the years. Experience now indicates that Hunter's curves often overestimate actual water demands. This can lead to over-sized plumbing systems which inflate construction costs and pose public health hazards due to prolonged stagnation and potential microbial (e.g., Legionella) contamination. There is widespread recognition of a need to update methods for estimating peak water demands in plumbing systems to better reflect today's high efficiency water fixtures and realistically account for non-congested conditions in a variety of end use applications (e.g., residential, commercial, institutional, etc). Benefits of updating the traditional NBS method for estimating peak water demands include reduced construction costs, greater protection from health hazards, and provision of safe sustainable plumbing systems that encourage water and energy conservation among a broad spectrum of end users.

The IAPMO Water Demand Calculator is a simple extension to Hunter's method that generates the full probability distribution of the water demand in a plumbing system. The computational methods for estimating water supply demand for single and multi-family dwellings are coded into the Water Demand Calculator and offered as an improved method to avoid over-design resulting from Hunter's Curve as the current method used in U.S. plumbing codes.

WDC Cost Saving Estimates from Stantec Architecture / Engineering Study

Cost Savings (US Dollars / Percent)

| NEW YORK CITY | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------|------|--|
| Single-Family Home Savings \$ / % | | | |
| Savings vs. | Copper | PEX | |
| UPC (\$) | \$401 | \$56 | |
| UPC (%) | 2% | 0.3% | |
| IRC (\$) | \$1,126 | \$81 | |
| IRC (%) | 4% | 0.4% | |

| PITTSBURGH | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|------|
| Single-Family Home Savings \$ / % | | |
| Savings vs. | Copper | PEX |
| UPC (\$) | \$299 | \$48 |
| UPC (%) | 2% | 0.4% |
| IRC (\$) | \$857 | \$72 |
| IRC (%) | 6% | 1% |

| OKLAHOMA CITY | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|-------|
| Single-Family Home Savings \$ / % | | |
| Savings vs. | Copper | PEX |
| UPC (\$) | \$277 | \$287 |
| UPC (%) | 2% | 3% |
| IRC (\$) | \$804 | \$74 |
| IRC (%) | 7% | 1% |

| NEW YORK CITY | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|
| 6-Unit Multi-Family Savings \$ / % | | |
| Savings vs. | Copper | PEX |
| UPC (\$) | \$3,995 | \$9,482 |
| UPC (%) | 3% | 8% |
| IPC (\$) | \$7,602 | \$9,012 |
| IPC (%) | 5% | 8% |

| PITTSBURGH | | | |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|---------|--|
| | 6-Unit Multi-Family Savings \$ / % | | |
| Savings vs. | Copper | PEX | |
| UPC (\$) | \$3,150 | \$8,509 | |
| UPC (%) | 4% | 12% | |
| IPC (\$) | \$6,156 | \$8,212 | |
| IPC (%) | 7% | 12% | |

| OKLAHOMA CITY | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|
| 6-Unit Multi-Family Savings \$ / % | | |
| Savings vs. | Copper | PEX |
| UPC (\$) | \$3,037 | \$7,821 |
| UPC (%) | 5% | 15% |
| IPC (\$) | \$6,033 | \$8,668 |
| IPC (%) | 9% | 16% |

| NEW YORK CITY | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| | Unit Multi-Family Savings \$ / % | |
| Savings vs. | Copper | PEX |
| UPC (\$) | \$52,409 | \$33,154 |
| UPC (%) | 8% | 5% |
| IPC (\$) | \$58,877 | \$26,494 |
| IPC (%) | 9% | 4% |

| PITTSBURGH | | | |
|--|----------|----------|--|
| 45-Unit Multi-Family Savings \$ / % | | | |
| Savings vs. | Copper | PEX | |
| UPC (\$) | \$40,686 | \$28,226 | |
| UPC (%) | 10% | 8% | |
| IPC (\$) | \$44,987 | \$22,535 | |
| IPC (%) | 11% | 6% | |

| OKLAHOMA CITY | | |
|--|----------|----------|
| 45-Unit Multi-Family Savings \$ / % | | |
| Savings vs. | Copper | PEX |
| UPC (\$) | \$38,800 | \$28,520 |
| UPC (%) | 12% | 10% |
| IPC (\$) | \$42,441 | \$22,761 |
| IPC (%) | 13% | 8% |