1. Roll Call and Introductions
2. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 4
   a. #133: DBC-IBC Section 419 (previously tabled)
3. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 7
   a. #68: DBC/IBC Section 705.2 – Withdrawn
   b. (P35)328 DBC/IBC Section 705.8
   c. #56: DBC/IBC Table 705.8
   d. #67: DBC/IBC 705.8.1
   e. #62: DBC/IBC 705.8.1
   f. #65: DBC/IBC 705.82
   g. P85: BC Section 707.5
   h. #61: DBC/IBC 712.1.12
   i. #59 DBC/IBC Section 713.4
   j. #60 DBC/IBC Section 713.5
4. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 10
   a. #142 DBC/IBC Section 1020.1
5. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 11
   a. (P44): IBC Section 1105.1
6. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 15
   a. (P108): IBC/DBC-IBC Section 1503.2.2
   b. (P112): IBC/DBC-IBC Section 1503.2.2
   c. (P105): IBC Section 1507.11-13.1
7. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 16
   a. (P166): DBC-IBC Section 1607.7.2 & 1607.15
   b. (P18): DBC-IBC Section 1609 & 1609.1.1.2
   c. (P17): IBC Section 1609 & 1609.1.1
   d. (P19): DBC-IBC Section 1609.3
   e. (P10): DBC-IBC Section 1613.2.2
8. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 18
   a. (P16)293: DBC-IBC Section 1810.3.5.2.2 Withdrawn
9. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 24
   a. #168: DBC-IBC Section 2405.6.1
10. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 27
    a. #344: DBC-IBC Sections 2701, 2801, 2901
    b. #275: DBC-IBC Section 2702.2
    c. #276: DBC-IBC Section 2702.2.9

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.

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
Proposal # 133
Live/Work Units sections is revised only to make the section more efficient. This Section is intended to have the same effect as the previous amendment but with language better coordinated with the IBC. The one exception to this is that DBCA Section 419.6 Means of egress is deleted and replaced with the slightly more restrictive IBC text.

Public Testimony in Support:
This proposal is a clean up with 2 exceptions, Denver has already passed some provisions for live work units regarding hazardous materials, this clarifies Groups permitted and prohibited from live work units. Unnecessary or redundant language removed.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:

1. Under section related to Fire Protection can you clarify your intent monitored fire alarm system. Concerned about multiple zones being required in multi family buildings.
   a. It refers to the fire code. Intent was to put the base code back in to the amendment but address something that wasn’t quite what we had in the amendment.

2. Why are we excepting R13 when it’s not a good system?
   a. IRC refers to this section and we do accept a D exception.

3. What was the intent?
   a. Intent is to mirror what’s in the code, with the exception of the smoke detector section.

Committee Discussion:

- Committee concerns about the reference in regard to automatic sprinkler systems not having a clear section of IFC.
- Committee concerns about the proposal being unclear in regard to the fire alarm system required for every unit or every building.
- “A monitored fire alarm system in accordance with 907.2.9.” There needs to be a reference.
- Concerns that this does away with a smoke alarm system and a heartier system.
- Committee concerns about the fire protection language not being approved by someone within the Fire Department.
- Some committee concerns about what criteria of live work we are addressing, whether it be glass blowing or in-home software development.
  - Some ideas that this could be modified to be more stringent for more hazardous occupations.

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Reason: Addition of reference adds clarity to what the code is trying to accomplish. Same wording that is in the base code.

Modification: 419.5 add reference to “where required by section 907.2.9”
Change 907.2.11.5 to 907.2.10 reference.

Vote on Modification: 5-2-1 Passes

Modification: Change from smoke detectors to “smoke alarm in accordance with IFC 907.2.10”

Discussion:
- 907.2.9.2 says single and multiple shall be installed in accordance with Section 907.2.10. Language here and within 907.2.9.2 is redundant.

Vote on Modification: 4-4 Chair will break tie Passes 5-4

Discussion:
Zoning has home occupation where code differentiates live work units.
Need to identify the different occupants under Zoning code. Need to really take in to account the zoning provisions that will affect this.
Daniel Krauz  
Brian Lukus  
Glenn Matthewson to work together to bring a revised proposal. Tabled until 9-12

Final Motion: Tabled 7-1-1  
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: Strike the word building.

Proposal # 68 Withdrawn

Proposal # P35  
This is an editorial revision. This provision allows increased area for the exterior openings and is commonly used to increase the area of the exterior openings facing an alley or yard with fire separation distance of between 5 and 15 ft where these fire separation distances are limited reflecting urban developments.

Public Testimony in Support:
- Proponent - 705.8 currently allows exterior openings LISTEN.
- Reformatted what we have in current code and just cleans it up.
- Many instances where space becomes limiting not having flexibility to allow openings, this proposal is a convenient way to allow that in certain cases.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. What’s special about Denver that this is applicable?  
   a. The way Denver interprets the separation distance is different. Clarification that ICC put together in commentary in regard to how we measure in relation to the floor is different than how we calculate here.  
   b. Many buildings on alley sides weren’t able to have the same flexibility with opening.
2. Does proposal acknowledge 13R system as being acceptable?  
   a. It allows 13 or 13R.

Committee Discussion:  
This places active suppression in place of .... If we approve this concept in the commercial logs today then 1-2 years later we will get a deferred shop drawings. Many bldgs. Approved this way, but once constructed systems don’t go in because designer didn’t know about them.

Discussion:  
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)  
Reason: This is better code language and adds clarity.  
Final Motion: As Submitted  
Final Vote: AS 6-0-1-1 recuse

Proposal # 56  
This proposal is to delete Denver’s amendments to IBC Table 705.8 since these amendments are not related to any physical, environmental or customary characteristics that are specific to the City and County of Denver. Furthermore, these amendments are less restrictive than the IBC and there is no justification to reduce the requirements of the IBC.

Public Testimony in Support: Deals with water curtain issue, nothing specific to Denver that requires this be in the code. Our amendment increases the percentage of opening and allows R13 systems much more lenient than the base code. If this were something with a lot of merit, it would have been brought to the national process, it has not been, and the code has gone the opposite direction. Nothing in existing buildings will be affected here.
Public Testimony in Opposition: Provision talking about water curtains in IBC... No correlation where you can provide it within. IF bldg. is sprinklered the water curtain is not going to come in to play.

5 foot is coming from Uniform Building Code, did not allow any openings, after 5.

Rebuttal in Support: The code doesn’t allow you to increase the openings.

Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

Reason: Denver amendment is more lenient than base IBC, no reason why Denver should be different.

Committee Discussion:

- Oppose motion – Charge is not to follow IBC, charge is to re substantiate what’s been in the Denver Building Code to unique conditions of Denver. We tend to revert to base... Since 1951 the same window water curtain requirement has existed.
- Openings 5-10 feet are what is being discussed here....
- Continued concerns for why if this is such a huge benefit, why has it not been taken to the national hearing.

Final Motion: A

Final Vote: As submitted Fails 2-9

Final Motion: Disapproval

Vote: 4-2-1-1 Passes

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # 67

This proposal is to delete a Denver amendment that is not necessary and is not related to any physical, environmental or customary characteristics that are specific to the City and County of Denver. The current amendment indicates that the provisions of 705.8.1 (Allowable area of openings) is applicable to openings with or without windows, duct openings and air transfer openings.

Public Testimony in Support: Trying to get rid of amendments not necessary in Denver. Building code never says the window has to have an opening in it. Unnecessary section.

Public Testimony in Opposition: This was to make sure designers could use this protection for garages. Specifically, to address ceiling mounted or upright.

Rebuttal in Support: NFPA 13 may have addressed at one point, but doesn’t anymore.

Rebuttal in Opposition:

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:

Committee Discussion:

Section also acknowledges duct openings

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

Reason: Proponents testimony

Discussion:

This could be policy not code.

Final Motion: As Submitted

Final Vote: AS 2-5-1 Fails

New Motion: Disapprove

Vote: D 5-2-1

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # 62

This proposal revises IBC 705.8.1 to reflect Denver’s long-standing interpretation of exterior wall requirements where a building has overhanging stories. Also, the commentary to the 2018 IBC includes a figure that incorrectly shows the fire separation distance of each story, and this proposal provides code language to clarify this.

Public Testimony in Support: Proponent – Has to do with overhanging stories and where you
measure fire separation distance. Between code table and commentary pictures is confusing as to where you measure this distance accurately. This clears up the accurate measurements that take in to account the over hang and exterior wall area.

Public Testimony in Opposition: Agree with description of proponent another wall section end up with 2nd floor parking garage, that 2 bay garage doesn’t have much adjustability.

Rebuttal in Support: If overhanging 2nd story is concrete slab you do have full height exterior wall below it, would be ok measuring to back wall. Hard to write codes to very specific instances.

Re Rebuttal: Denver has been consistent in the application of this, but in the commentary, it is in opposition of what Denver interprets.

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Have you done and gotten an admin mod?
   a. Yes. We also in design process make decisions to try to avoid admin mods.
2. Proponent youa re talking about interstitial space between exterior sofit that could be as much as a whole story or no less than floor ceiling assembly? If you measure from vertical IBC says that space is not dimensional.

Discussion:
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

Reason: If we are showing willingness to work with admin mods with odd situations then it’s good for the team to have code language that is easier to enforce regarding life safety.

Committee Discussion:
- Intent of code is clear, but definition is unclear and conflicts within the code. Prefer this interpretation over the ICC, but if this is how Denver enforces it would be better to have it spelled out in the code.
- This proposal was a result of Colorado Chapter submission to the national code hearings as a result of Denver’s interpretation.

Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS 5-3 Passes
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # 65
This proposal is to delete a Denver amendment that is not related to any physical, environmental or customary characteristics that are specific to the City and County of Denver. The current amendment revises the exception to IBC 705.8.2 to change the sprinkler requirements from NFPA 13 (Section 903.3.1.1) to NFPA 13 or NFPA 13R (Section 903.3.1.2) and, therefore, is less restrictive than the IBC.

Public Testimony in Support: This section is was discussed earlier, one application where this is needed. Applies to where footnote lists unprotected sprinkler column doesn’t apply to certain H occupancies. Our amendments add 13R. This paragraph is useless and should be removed.

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: Per proponents reason statement.
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 8-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P85
The purpose of this proposal is to add an exception to fire barrier continuity that has already been approved to be included in the 2021 IBC through the ICC Group A code hearing process.

Public Testimony in Support: This proposal adds a 3rd exception to continuity requirements for Fire Barriers. Exception 2 allows stair ways to have a lid if not extending to story above, no such exception for exit passage ways, this adds it. If this is good enough for a stair it should be good enough for exit passage ways. This has been brought to ICC and was approved at Group A hearings 2021. Just puts in the code what we are currently approving.
This is a great idea, and during course of construction or tenant finish or remodels this comes up. Great way to solve the problem here.

**Public Testimony in Opposition:**

**Original Motion:** As-Submitted (AS)

**Reason:** Stand on Reason Statement.

**Final Motion:** As Submitted.

**Final Vote:** AS Pass 7-0-1

**Additional staff or committee comments for the record:** None

**Proposal # 61**

This proposal deletes a Denver amendment that conflicts with a Denver IFC amendment, and substitutes this amendment with a pointer to the IFC amendment.

**Public Testimony in Support:** Currently have amendment for exit access stairways and ramps must be sprinklered and protected openings, this moves that to a different section and applies it to all vertical openings per 909 of the IFC. Right now it’s just required all the time on exit access stairways. Draft curtains are an architectural issue so we maintained the pointer to the fire code.

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

1. If you don’t have smoke control system you don’t need draft curtain?
   
   a. You would still need them per the building code. This just adds additional requirements from the fire code.
   
   b. NFPA doesn’t always require sprinklers with openings, depends on the case. Unenclosed vertical openings without ...

2. Are all vertical openings caught in 909 smoke control section?
   
   a. Only for high rise.

**Original Motion:** As-Submitted (AS)

**Reason:** Brings clarity and removes redundant language.

**Final Motion:** AS

**Final Vote:** AS Passes 8-0

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

**Proposal # 59**

This proposal is to delete Denver’s amendment to IBC 713.4 since this amendment is not related to any physical, environmental or customary characteristics that are specific to the City and County of Denver. Furthermore, this amendment is less restrictive than the IBC for a fire safety provision and the wording in the amendment is inconsistent with the IBC as discussed below.

**Public Testimony in Support:** Our current amendments are less restrictive here than the base code on a fire safety issue. We should go back to base building code. Denver is specific to what’s in the shaft. This is not needed.

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:** None

**Original Motion:** Disapprove (D)

**Reason:** Since 1959 base building code either type 5 or type 2 shafts are 1 hour rated. Type 2 B building construction talking about increasing rating to 2 hour, if intent is to prevent fire migration the shaft is going to collapse. No proof that this is causing a problem.

**Committee Discussion:**

- Committee likes that this separates the different construction types and elements.
- Difficult to understand logic of building 2 hour shaft wall through wood framed building is absurd.
- This is not unique to Denver.
- Makes sense to keep this in the code.
- In high rise provisions you’re allowed to have 1 hour shaft with sprinklers in the shaft in base code.

**Public Comment:**
This does not require sprinklers.

**Final Motion:** Disapproval

**Final Vote:** Disapproved 6-1-1

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

**Proposal # 60**
This proposal is to delete Denver’s amendment to IBC 713.5 since this amendment is not related to any physical, environmental or customary characteristics that are specific to the City and County of Denver. Furthermore, this amendment is less restrictive than the IBC for a fire safety provision and the amendment is inconsistent with other IBC sections as discussed below.

**Public Testimony in Support:** Our amendment is less restrictive than model building code regarding fire barriers. Wording is inconsistent with the code. This creates a condition that’s difficult to comply with another section of the code when you do what’s required here.

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**
1. In fire barrier provisions under supporting construction... Would you consider relocating instead of removing?
   a. If it stays it’s ok if it’s relocated. But that section mentioned is quite the same.

**Original Motion:** As-Submitted (AS)

**Reason:**
*Can’t go floor to deck if you have 2 hour fire rated shaft. Constructability issue.*

**Final Motion:** As Submitted

**Final Vote:** 1-6 Fails

**Motion:** Disapproval

**Vote:** 6-1-1

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

**Proposal # 142**
The purpose of this proposal is to carry forward the previous two amendments, but renumber them so that Exception 4 of the base building code remains.

**Public Testimony in Support:**

**Public Testimony in Opposition:**

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

**Committee Discussion:**

**Discussion:**

**Original Motion:** As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)

**Support:**

**Modification:**

**Opposition:**

**Final Motion:**

**Final Vote:**

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

**Proposal # P44**
The purpose of this proposal is to add a requirement for power-operated doors at public entrances that has already been approved to be included in the 2021 IBC through the ICC Group A code hearing process. This
addresses a need in Denver to provide better accessibility to buildings since it is known that many people – elderly, children and those with accessibility needs – have great difficulty, or find it impossible, to open entrance doors because of pressures, door configurations, door friction, wind, or weight of the door.

**Public Testimony in Support:**

**Public Testimony in Opposition:**

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

**Committee Discussion:**

**Discussion:**

**Original Motion:**  As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)

**Support:**

**Modification:**

**Opposition:**

**Final Motion:**

**Final Vote:**

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

---

**Proposal # P108**

Small equipment units such as that shown in Figure 1 are commonly used on multi-family residential buildings; often resulting in hundreds of units on the rooftops. The current Denver Building Code Amendment would require every leg to penetrate the roof membrane and bear on the decking, creating hundreds of points of potential failure at the penetrations. The amendment proposal adds an exception so that small, lightweight units can bear directly on the roof membrane if such installation does not affect the roof warranty and when such installations are also in accordance with the manufacturer’s installation requirements. This common-sense approach allows for roof maintenance and future re-roofing without having to uninstall every unit where the legs penetrate the membrane.

**Public Testimony in Support:**

**Public Testimony in Opposition:**

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

**Committee Discussion:**

**Discussion:**

**Original Motion:**  As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)

**Support:**

**Modification:**

**Opposition:**

**Final Motion:**

**Final Vote:**

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

---

**Proposal # P112**

Small equipment units such as that shown in Figure 1 are commonly used on multi-family residential buildings; often resulting in hundreds of units on the rooftops. The current Denver Building Code Amendment would require every leg to penetrate the roof membrane and bear on the decking, creating hundreds of points of potential failure at the penetrations. The amendment proposal adds an exception so that small, lightweight units can bear directly on the roof membrane if such installation does not affect the roof warranty and when such installations are also in accordance with the manufacturer’s installation requirements.

**Public Testimony in Support:**

**Public Testimony in Opposition:**

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

**Committee Discussion:**

**Discussion:**

**Original Motion:**  As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)
Proposal # P105
Low slope roof systems shall have a slope of one-fourth unit vertical in 12 units horizontal. This requirement is clear on new construction, however in section 1511.1 exceptions #1 it states that this is not required on roof replacement of roof recovery. We are requesting that if the current roof substrate does not already have a minimum of 1/4" slope then IBC 1057.11-13 I be enforced. Currently there is no clear requirement.

Public Testimony in Support:
Public Testimony in Opposition:
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
Committee Discussion:
Discussion:
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)
Support:
Modification:
Opposition:
Final Motion:
Final Vote:
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P166
Coordinate and consolidate Denver specific Fire Department vehicle design criteria with the 2018 IBC live loading provisions of Section 1607.7 regarding heavy vehicle loads and the live loading requirements of IBC Table 1607.1.

Public Testimony in Support:
Public Testimony in Opposition:
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
Committee Discussion:
Discussion:
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)
Support:
Modification:
Opposition:
Final Motion:
Final Vote:
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
Proposal #
Proposal # P18
To remove language from the Denver Building and Fire Code Amendments that is no longer necessary as it is now in the body of the design standard.

Public Testimony in Support:
Public Testimony in Opposition:
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
Committee Discussion:
Discussion:
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)
Support:
Modification:
Opposition:
Final Motion:
Final Vote:
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P17
The removal of the language noted above, disallows the use of IBC Section 1609 or the ASCE 7-16 standard in determining the basic wind speed to be used in design. Graphical errors in the maps, especially as related to the Special Wind Region along the front range of Colorado, are known and may result in non-conservative wind design pressures if used in design.

Public Testimony in Support:
Public Testimony in Opposition:
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
Committee Discussion:
Discussion:
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)
Support:
Modification:
Opposition:
Final Motion:
Final Vote:
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P19
The Code references the design standard ASCE-7-16 for use in evaluating wind loads on buildings and other structures. Previous editions used a series of maps to define basic wind speeds. The Structural Engineer’s Association of Colorado undertook a project to recognize the effect of the mountain front range on wind speeds. The result of this project was the report referenced in the amendment, “Colorado Front Range Gust Map- ASCE 7-10 Compatible” dated November 18, 2013. These maps were based on actual climate data and were evaluated and accepted by the general membership of the Structural Engineers Association of Colorado.

Public Testimony in Support:
Public Testimony in Opposition:
Proposal # P10
These changes update the section numbers and default Site Class requirements in the DBC to be consistent with the changes adopted by the International Code Council for the 2018 IBC. Uniformity between the DBC-IBC and the IBC is essential for clarity in applying the code where language in the IBC is consistent with physical, environmental, and customary design and construction practices specific to the Denver area.

Public Testimony in Support:
Public Testimony in Opposition:
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
Committee Discussion:
Discussion:
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)
Support:
Modification:
Opposition:
Final Motion:
Final Vote:
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P16
The 2018 IBC revised this section by changing “diameter” to “specified diameter”, which is a clarification that is necessary to avoid this term from being interpreted as a nominal diameter, an as-built diameter, or something else. This change brings clarity and consistency to the application of requirements of this section. The 2018 IBC also added grouted-in-place deep foundations to this section to clarify that the same requirements apply to these types of foundations. There is no reason for Denver’s current amendment to be different from the IBC regarding these items, so this proposal brings Denver’s current amendment to be in line with the IBC.

Public Testimony in Support:
Public Testimony in Opposition:
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
Committee Discussion:
Discussion:
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)
Support:
Modification:
Opposition:
Final Motion:
Final Vote:
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # 168
The Exception was added based on discussion with Denver Fire Prevention Bureau to allow skylights, light-transmitting plastics, and light-transmitting skylight glazing to be constructed on top of 8-inch minimum height curbs or Guards complying with OSHA 29 CFR1926.502. Self-luminous or reflective signs are also required on guards based on IFCA Sec. 1108.1 so that firefighters can be alerted to these roof top construction elements.

**Public Testimony in Support:**

**Public Testimony in Opposition:**

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

**Committee Discussion:**

**Discussion:**

**Original Motion:** As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)

**Support:**

**Modification:**

**Opposition:**

**Final Motion:**

**Final Vote:**

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

---

**Proposal # 344**

Denver has not adopted the International Property Maintenance Code. This proposed amendment modifies sections of the IBC where it is referenced.

**Public Testimony in Support:**

**Public Testimony in Opposition:**

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

**Committee Discussion:**

**Discussion:**

**Original Motion:** As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)

**Support:**

**Modification:**

**Opposition:**

**Final Motion:**

**Final Vote:**

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

---

**Proposal # 275**

The intent of this deletion is to bring the function of the emergency system back into alignment with both the 2018 IBC and the National Electrical Code. As currently written in the DBCA, elevators and platform lifts in a building are required to be installed on the emergency system of the generator rather than on the standby system per IBC 2702.2 as written prior to the 2016 DBCA change. There is the potential that the starting inrush current from the large elevator motors could trip the breaker ahead of the emergency system, disabling power to the emergency lighting, fire alarm and detection system, and exit signs during a building evacuation condition. By placing the elevators on standby power as currently written in the IBC Section 2702.2, it will ensure that the elevators do not accidently disable the emergency lighting, fire alarm and detection system, and exit signs during a building evacuation condition.

**Public Testimony in Support:**

**Public Testimony in Opposition:**

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

**Committee Discussion:**

**Discussion:**

**Original Motion:** As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)

**Support:**
Proposal # 276
The intent of this deletion is to bring the requirement for both the Emergency and Standby systems in high-rise buildings back into alignment with both the 2018 IBC as written and the National Electrical Code. As currently written in the 2016 DBCA 2702.2.9, only Emergency power is required in high-rise buildings, with the additional requirement for Standby power deleted. The 2018 IBC 2702.2.11 as written requires both Emergency and Standby power to be provided in high-rise buildings.

Public Testimony in Support:
Public Testimony in Opposition:
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
Committee Discussion:
Discussion:
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)
Support:
Modification:
Opposition:
Final Motion:
Final Vote:
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: