1. Roll Call and Introductions

2. Discussion and voting on IBC/IEBC Staff Block Vote packaged proposals not finished in previous hearing (All proposals that are marked with an X on the summary spreadsheet)
   The following proposals were pulled from the block vote for individual consideration and will be heard at a future time: #100, #133, #82, #12, #62, #60, #142, #149. The following proposals were tabled to be heard at the end of the block vote agenda: #126, #99. The following proposals were tabled to be heard on the individual agenda with item P35: #56, #65 and #67.

3. Discussion and voting on Denver Building Code Administration provisions (DBCA)
   a. 15: Section 103.5
   b. 17: Section 131
   c. #318: Section 139
   d. (P14): Section 140.7
   e. (P15): Section 141.1 and .2
   f. #470: Appendix S

4. Discussion and voting on All Gender/Gender Neutral Restroom Proposals
   a. #181: DBC-IBC Section 2902
   b. #182: DBC-IBC Section 2902
   c. (P111): IBC Sections 2902.1.4 and .7
   d. #319: IPC Section 403 (may be heard by IPC committee, tbd)
   e. #320: IPC Section 403
   f. (P110): IPC Section 403.1.1 and .2

5. Discussion and voting on 2 urgent proposals per staff
   a. P32: IBC Section 403.5.1
   b. P34: DBC-IBC Section 1005.3.1 and 1005.3.2

Please note that any items that we do not get to in this hearing will be automatically transferred to the next scheduled hearing date and will be the first items on the agenda for that hearing.

IBC/IEBC Committee Hearings go-to-meetings for those who can't make it in person

Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.
https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/799312877

You can also dial in using your phone.
United States: +1 (571) 317-3122
Access Code: 799-312-877

New to GoToMeeting? Get the app now and be ready when your first meeting starts:
https://global.gotomeeting.com/install/799312877
Request #87 be pulled
Proposal #99 (Previously Tabled)
Final Motion: AM
Final Vote: AM Passes 11-0

Proposal #126 (Previously Tabled)
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
This just provides clarification in terms of simply referencing the revised code and zoning sections, adding language for home occupation to define live work more clearly.

Final Motion: AS
Final Vote: AS Passes 10-1

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal #15
Public Testimony in Support: Proponent – Adding Use and Occupancy to the DBC admin chapter. Is already in existing, just bringing it here to match the IEBC.
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Is #2 something that is currently in the IEBC?
   a. Denver amended IEBC section 101.4.2. It is in the admin section of IEBC, we delete them so it’s necessary to add them back in to the admin provisions of the Denver amendments.

Final Motion: AS
Final Vote: AS Passes 10-0-1

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal #17
Public Testimony in Support: Proponent- We were asked to move provisions into policy and to put them in Denver building code when appropriate. Issuing permits to homeowners so this 131.4 comes from the current policy just moving it in to the code. We don’t require contractors to sign for permits so that was removed. Also adds language about accessory dwelling units.
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Committee Discussion:
We don’t want homeowners pulling Accessory Dwelling Unit permits, just want to make sure that’s clear.

Policy sates Accessory Dwelling Unit are not considered single unit dwelling so this would not apply.

Would they be able to work in the ADU? No, last proposal stated it has to be a tenant.

One problem we see is People live-in single-family home they want to pull Accessory Dwelling Unit to rent out to someone else. No problem with someone working on their home, the concern is in that 12-month period under Accessory Dwelling Unit you may live there and do work, you’re not the one putting yourself at risk. You rent out now and then you are putting other people at risk. Due to this, it may be worth it to put in (excluding Accessory Dwelling Unit)

Basically if you have 1 lot and 2 houses, you can’t live in both, so you are doing the work and
someone else is living in the other, you would be putting them at risk by doing the work yourself.

Intent of the code is that work should be completed by a licensed contractor.

**Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)**

**Modification #1:** Including detached garages “but excluding Accessory Dwelling Units” after single unit dwelling

**Vote on Modification #1:** Passes 11-0

**Modification #2:** Add sentence towards top of policy that states Accessory structure is not Accessory Dwelling Unit

**Discussion:**
Maybe consider adding a definition of ADU, go straight to the problem, fix the definition.

As proponent if you did that then Accessory Structure lot drops off the map, prefer not to intermingle accessory dwelling unit. Starts a whole other debate.

**Final Motion: As Modified**

**Final Vote:** AM Passes 11-0

**Additional staff or committee comments for the record:**

**Proposal # 318**

**Public Testimony in Support:** Proponent-Asked by public works to add section to require a sign to be posted at the boundary of a project that has project name and contractor name and contact. If someone sees something, they have easy access to the information to report if needed.

Measurements and such came from Public Works.

**Public Testimony in Opposition: None**

**Committee Discussion:**
The content of info is from public works people; this is what they came back with. Not sure why they asked for estimated completion date. If asked to remove I would say No.

If we do this, it seems simple, it will alleviate a lot of phone calls to police, a lot of times the contractors will easily fix something without zoning, enforcement or police being called.

You could have contractors fielding all types of calls. Concerned with who would be fielding the calls.

It could be a general phone number and call emergency services for issues that require. By having date can save us a lot of phone calls.

By default, is sign allowed in the right of way.

Could be provided it doesn’t encroach on pedestrian walkway.

Sign could be on zone lot.

**Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)**

**Modification:** Add Address

**Vote on Modification:** Passes 11-0

**Discussion:**
Questions about the color of the signage. Matches the other signs we currently requires, needs to be left as.

**Final Motion: As Modified**

**Final Vote:** AM Passes 10-1

**Additional staff or committee comments for the record:**

**Editorial Change:** Add {PW} in front of this section to denote it was submitted by Public Works.
Proposal # P14

Public Testimony in Support: Proponent – Admin Section for other inspections. Currently requires engineer or architect to put special inspections on drawings or documents, it is removed here because it is addressed elsewhere in the code. Cleans up potential conflict currently only requires structural special inspections; other sections require for all special inspections.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

Reiterated support of necessity of this amendment, clean up and inadvertently omit other special inspections.

Final Motion: As Submitted

Final Vote: AS Passes 11-0

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P15

Public Testimony in Support: Proponent – Admin section- this one gives special inspection and structural observations. 141.2 all strike through is currently in, will amend to allow structural observations where they thought required by base code. Base structural observation, if we go with base code, no ability to call for this inspection. 2018 code Chapter 17 this is now in they can call for inspection whenever they see fit. It’s in base code now, no need for this to remain. Current amendment structure Chapter 1 stricken and replaced with Chapter 1 of amendments, Chapter 1 amendments references Chapter 17 of building code, we can call for special inspection for commercial and residential right now. This just makes it clear for everyone that this applies to commercial and residential. Chapter 17 has exemptions for things where inspections are not needed. We will call on things we need to. Looks like a change just clarifying current practice.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:

1. Where would other special inspections be listed in the code? Is this the only place structural observations where special inspections?
   a. Special Inspections could be in different areas of code. Special Inspections is specific to those inspections called for in Chapter 17.

2. What if someone asked for Fire or Other?
   a. Fire Resistance, Fire Stopping, more than just structural. Beyond Chapter 17 it would fall under other inspections.

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

There are items where special inspections are necessary, homes built under IRC quite large structures so it makes sense to change this to incorporate those structures.

Final Motion: As Submitted

Final Vote: AS Passes 11-0

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # 470 (Tabled to July 8th Meeting)

Proposal # 181

All Gender Restrooms (Group of Proposals)

Public Testimony in Support: Another proposal to go with this 182 is all improvements but doesn’t include multiuser option. 3rd proposal
P111 will work into discussion. Proposal builds on gender neutral by modifying gender neutral to all gender terminology. Adding option to provide all gender multiuser toilet facility in place of separated male/female facilities. To help with enforcement it restructures the code language by consolidating it. Replaces dated language with all gender terminology. To best position Denver to all gender this recognizes that design metrics do not exist and that wholesale shift poses significant complications and may be met with strong opposition. This takes a conservative approach. Puts Denver on forefront of toilet inclusiveness.

The multiuser- all gender restrooms did go through group A at the national code hearings, they will be adopted in 2021. If we don’t do it now, it will be in a few years from now.

In regards to fixture calculation we are changing distribution of sexes, if you do single user facilities, (not proposing for multiuser group toilet rooms) you could have reduced number of fixtures. These would be areas that are large and not just one stall and one urinal. Make gender neutral all gender to be more than a way to designate and sign, it would actually be a way to distribute fixtures, not necessarily calculate.

Current gender-neutral language conflicts with 2021 gender neutral moves us more towards inclusiveness. Currently only for single user not multiuser.

There is another proposal in regard to Gender Neutral restrooms, would ask that committee allow other proponent to present that proposal.

Committee would like them to be heard together P111 and #181 and voted on separately.

**Motion:** Move to table #182 until P111 and #181 have been heard and voted on.

**Proposal # P111**

**Public Testimony in Support:** Proponent - similar to #181 a lot less text in this one. The difference between what we currently have, and this proposal is what was approved in the 2021 adoption process at the national level. Provisions for enclosures are the only exception. In 2021 IPC and IBC there are no provisions for an additional level of privacy for multiuser toilet rooms. Typical toilet stalls are what you would find in these multiuser toilet rooms if we adopt 2021. This proposal requires you to have a compartment with full height doors. Plus, proposal doesn’t include urinals, all are toilets in fully enclosed compartments. Spent 9 days in Belgium, they have these types of toilet rooms today and there are different levels of quality, you just have to screen the urinal from the lavatory.

Moderator– 2021 did not approve any privacy provisions only the all gender restrooms.

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** Privacy may be different, but elements discussed are also in 181. The fixture calcs are not included in this one does not include a single user toilet room. Does allow you to calculate for male and female for multiuser. It’s a real incentive to do separate 25% more fixtures.

**Rebuttal Testimony in Support:**
2902.1.4 Multiuser Fixtures does cover the fixture calculations.

**Rebuttal Testimony in Opposition:**
Code structure calculation for fixture # required. Missing exception for single user toilet rooms.

**Re Rebuttal Testimony in Support:**
Multiuser either sex could be single lavatory toilet facility.
As the tall person in the room the privacy is a huge factor. Unintended consequence tall man accused of snooping. Support of the privacy thing. Should have been considered in 2021.

Both proposals have added language for 181 addresses urinals, not allow bank urinals in order to provide privacy.

Committee Discussion:
So you’re saying equal in terms of privacy.
Yes. Lots of clarifying language to help with interpretation.

Public Testimony in Opposition: A lot of similarities, 2021 was brought into each amendment. P111 brings it in more as is, where 181 tries to tailor it and provide more specification and increase privacy and clarification. Use of either sex facilities available when you have gender neutral language, inconsistent. It doesn’t address the ceiling height in regard to the door height. 181 adds privacy element extends to the ceiling. Requires enforcement to enforce adequate privacy.

Rebuttal Testimony in Support:
2902 Privacy requires that the walls go from floor to ceiling (P111) ceiling height is irrelevant. Provides more capacity for both sexes, doesn’t allow urinals. I don’t think a woman would want to use a urinal. If they are all toilets, they can be used by either sex, not be occupied.

Rebuttal Testimony in Opposition:
Privacy provisions are the same in both, when you calculate you can put male female, multiuser 3 fixtures. Separate you would have 6 fixtures. Reduced number of fixtures based on how you calculate multiuser or single user.

Questions from the Committee to Proponents:
1. Would you be willing to change language to All Gender instead of Uni Sex?
   a. Yes
2. Would you be willing to change calculations?
   a. Yes, I believe it’s already there. Fixture calc based on single user and multiuser.
3. As far as fixture calculations, are you willing to clarify that issue and bridging that gap between the 2 proposals?
   a. As far as water closets required, I have no problem adjusting that.
4. Will each of these compartments be required to be sprinkler? If you have to run more flow for these being fully enclosed compartments?
   a. You would need more sprinkler needs in each room, but wouldn’t need bigger water pumps and things of that nature. It won’t change anything.
5. Can we clarify calculations based on each sex? We are saying gender neutral, but we are calculating based on different sexes?
   a. It would be 1 per 25 and 1 per 50 after that.
6. Would each compartment have a toilet and a lavatory?
   a. – Can have lavatory and or urinal, but neither would count towards fixture calculation unless single user toilet facilities.
7. In 111 the only way to do urinals is a close compartment.
8. This is a design option. You can still build conventional restrooms this is simply a design option. What I wrote I would interpret if you want a urinal it couldn’t be in multiuser toilet facility, you can’t put it in there. it would have to be in a separate facility. 181 allows urinals in
the compartment not towards fixture count 25% if in its own stall. If both, it would not count.
P111 doesn’t allow urinals.

9. Are these changes based on your understanding of the appropriate way?
   a. Based on research on the inclusiveness that LGBTQ movement is looking for. Gender Queer - both male and female, spectrum. Intersex – 2% of population.

**Committee Discussion:**

Currently we take the fraction and calculate up. Right now, we are under single, once we do this assembly has to be fractioned up first and then assembly.

As far is fixture calculation it’s still on male female model, that’s what we’ve had to come up with required fixtures. The proposals do change the fixture calculation.

In the Plumbing code toilet facility consists of a toilet and a lavatory.
Feel we might need some further clarity if it requires a lavatory as well.

Single user toilet facility, for multiuser also called multiuser toilet facility but allows toilet compartments.

2021 allows you to have urinals as long as they are screened from the rest of the users.

Think we should go conservative route and not allow banks of urinals.

**Motion:** Suggestion to let staff coordinate 2 codes to get where we want to land. We would fix any discrepancies with MCG.

It sounds like P111 started with base of 181 and just tweaked it.
   No. I think there are changes in 181 that are not necessarily directly related to All Gender Restrooms, my proposal sticks to multiuser. Stayed away from all other sections. 181 is more detailed.

**Committee Motion:** Table and ask proponents to bring this back. 2nd
Whole of #4 be moved to July 8th. Give homework to come back with one proposal Gender Neutral Restrooms.

**Direction for Proponents:**
Like idea of the terminology of All Gender. Forward thinking. Very much into sustainable design and saving resources wherever possible. Once you create all gender option it doesn’t matter if you have more for men or women allows you to reduce the number of fixtures you need. Ripple effect savings. Reduction in sq. footage. Change could be environmentally correct way to proceed. We are way behind on this. Should consider what Masoud is saying about maintenance issue a small section below where we can easily. Gives architect some design options. So taller people don’t seem creepy, don’t mandate a wall if there’s another way to do this. I think marrying the 2 could be a great thing.

Agreeing with what was previously said. I would add that it’s important that additional items that were part of 181 should come through to final proposal that address other areas, are important. They should not be dropped or there will be gaps. For example: In 181 addressed items relevant
from DDPHE was worked with specific items captured, address multiuser toilet rooms that might require a small number of fixtures. Might be uncomfortable for there to be 4 toilets in a smaller room. Relevancy to the experience for the user. Would suggest you solicit some female perspective to this issue. Like thoroughness of 181, I think the combo is best idea.

Transitional signage should be placed at each public entrance.

Not a proponent of having urinals due to privacy concerns. I think taking those out of the equation is the right thing.

Disagree with not allowing them at all, appropriate signage could solve that issue.

Water conservation should be a consideration. Stretch code is wanting urinals to go away for sustainability factors.

Maybe you can add a urinal in the compartment with the toilet.

Low water flush urinals could be an option to conserve water.

   Already mandated, but still not as much conservation.

Think about inclusiveness and all genders are we getting to that if we have compartments that only men can use. Not sure it speaks to inclusiveness if we have closets only men can use. If 2 choices in one stall.

Table all of Agenda Item #4 until July 8th. 9-0 Passes