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. #501: DBC-IBC Section 714.5.1
   b. #502: DBC-IBC Section 715.1.1
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 24
   a. #168: DBC-IBC Section 2405.6.1
9. 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
10. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 29
    a. #20: DBC-IBC Section 2902.8
11. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 30
    a. (P45)340: DBC-IBC Section 3007.6.1
    b. #175: DBC-IBC Section 3007.6
    c. #176: DBC-IBC Section 3008
    d. (P30)323: DBC-IBC Section 3007.1
12. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 31
    a. #149: DBC-IBC Section 3105.5
    b. #150: DBC-IBC Section 3112.3
13. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 32
    a. #269: DBC-IBC Section 3202.2

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.

Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.
https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/799312877
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Access Code: 799-312-877
Proposal # 133 (Previously Tabled)
Public Testimony in Support:
Trying to match current amendments with 2018 IBC. Reformatted to make section 419 more clear and add Item 5. Reverting to IBC code with exception of amendments. Limiting occupant load for live/work units and change the occupancies that are restricted. Not carrying forward 419.11 that was an electrical provision. Feel it is not necessary after speaking with electrical department.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Not shown here, intent is to delete existing DBC amendments and replace with this?
   a. Yes, that is the intent.

Committee Discussion:
• Some discussion about removing Group F from the charging language due to there being an exception directly after that allows some Group F.
  o Some committee members feel this is typical code language to format this way with the Group general and then the exception.
• Some discussion about the use of 2 horse power for up to 3 devices, other sections of code and zoning state 3.
  o Ultimately the committee decided to leave as is.

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Modification:
To delete in its entirety section 419 of the Denver building code amendments.
Vote on Modification: Passes 7-0
Final Motion: As Modified
Final Vote: AM Passes 7-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # 501
Public Testimony in Support:
Pipe penetration in parking garages not addressed in code. Normally addressed with admin modifications right now.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: Based on proponent reason statement and to decrease number of admin modifications.
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 7-0-1
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # 502
Public Testimony in Support:
Protected opening in garages. This says if you have a parking garage edge of exterior wall doesn’t have to be protected.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: Based on previous action.
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 7-0-1
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None
Proposal # 142

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

Reason: Editorial change, numbering is changed. Value in these amendments from precedence perspective, treated single tenant office spaces with small assembly occupancies with degree of leniency regarding additional fire suppression protection. It is agreed from review perspective that there are not higher hazards with letting these elements remain unprotected.

Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 8-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # P44

Public Testimony in Support:
Adds requirement to provide power operated doors at accessible public entrances, pulling forward what will be in the 2021 code. Entrance doors are not regulated in code for accessibility for opening force, so difficult for people who need help to get in to a building. Denver has a long history of being one of the highest for accessibility. Doing this now we can get this in to more buildings. Only applies to certain buildings based on occupancy. Cost impact is small.

Public Testimony in Opposition:

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. About the 300-occupant load for A occupancies, based on A occupancy or based on total occupants of the buildings?
   a. Foot Note A addresses this with a formula to calculate. Use the least restrictive.
   b. Matches what’s in the 2021 code.
2. Is the foot note saying if you have 2 story office and 1 conference room 60 occupant load, this is not required?
   a. Total occupant load of 400 go to the least restrictive.

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

Reason: Important to impact the accessibility and this is a low-cost element that can have a positive impact on the community.

Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 8-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # P108

Public Testimony in Support:
Intended to modify existing amendment that deals with mechanical equipment on roof. Specifically, the support and roof membrane. As currently written 250 units sitting on roof top, legs have to be supported on sheathing and roof has to be flashed, which forces roofing contractor to penetrate the roof over 800 times and flash to all those legs. This proposal allows for small equipment 400# or less to be supported by legs that bare on the roof membrane as well as vibration insulation pads. Allows a more practical common-sense approach.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None

Committee Discussion:
- Concern about the section regarding roof warranty
  - Building code makes no reference to warranty. Don’t approve or deny based on warranty. Important from AHJ if we allow this installation, we want to make sure we are not allowing something that will void the warranty. This language was added
intentionally.

- With so many different systems, having this really helps the city reviewers and inspectors.
- In these units where there are several hundreds of these, they build curbs 8 inches up. Curbs aren’t required to have metal caps, so they are truly just an extension of the roof. These feet are much better.

**Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)**
**Final Motion: As Submitted**
**Final Vote: AS Passes 7-0-1**

*Additional staff or committee comments for the record:*
All methods must meet. Remove the word “be”

**Proposal # P105**
Removing an exception for roof replacements.

**Public Testimony in Support: None**
**Public Testimony in Opposition: None**
**Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None**

**Committee Discussion:**
- Concerns about ponding addressed in this proposal.
- This language is in re-roofing section of IBC. Also, language in IEBC where it should really belong. Putting it here would create a conflict.

**Original Motion: Disapprove (D)**
**Reason:** Instances with existing roofs where it is not possible to achieve minimum required slope without changing structure.
**Final Motion: Disapproval**
**Final Vote: D Passes 8-0**

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

**Proposal # P166**

**Public Testimony in Support:**
- Purpose is to take existing Denver fire truck loading and incorporate it in to 1607.7.2. Just taking info contained in current code and merging in to the new proposed section. Also, to clarify this loading is not to be used in addition to other live loads in the code.
- This just puts the Fire Truck info in the correct section. Should consider in Item 3 second sentence service loads is not a defined term, change it to nominal loads as that is a defined term.
  - Proponent comfortable with the proposed change.

**Public Testimony in Opposition: None**

**Committee Discussion:**
- Much needed revision.
- SEAC asks if Fire Department loads have changed, if they do change, they will need to be adjusted in this section.

**Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)**
**Modification:** Change Service Live Load to Nominal Load
**Discussion:** Nice to clean it up with changing this wording.
**Vote on Modification:** Passes 8-0
**Final Motion: As Modified**
**Final Vote: AM Passes 8-0**

*Additional staff or committee comments for the record:*
All strikes out in the lower part of the proposal, upper is new added language.
**Proposal # P17**

*Public Testimony in Support:*  
Purpose of this is to bring language in model code in accordance with process defined in 1609.3. Allowing the standard to address opening and exposure, but don’t want it to be used to define designed wind speed.

*Public Testimony in Opposition: None*

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

*Modification:*  
Strikes out basic wind speed says it can be determined in accordance with 1609 or ASCE 7. Not clear where you go to determine these speeds. Should add second sentence after ASCE7 “the basic design wind speed, V, shall be determined in accordance with Section 1609.3”

*Final Motion: As Modified*

*Final Vote:* AM Passes 8-0

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

**Proposal # P10**

*Public Testimony in Support:*  
Simply to update amendments to be in accordance with current IBC. This allows site class C to be the default class, with ground motions we have in Denver it’s not an issue, but to have code read consistent this is necessary.

*Public Testimony in Opposition: None*

*Questions from the Committee to Proponent:*  
1. Just changing number not adding anything in Seismic design category minimum.  
   a. It is not added just renumbering.

*Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)*

*Reason:* Reason Statement from Proponent.

*Final Motion: As Submitted*

*Final Vote: AS Passes 8-0*

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

**Proposal # 168**

*Public Testimony in Support: None*

*Public Testimony in Opposition: None*

*Committee Discussion:*  
- Exception is good for guard around skylight. We don’t want fire fighters falling through skylights.  
- Guards complying with OSHA document, not sure how many people have access to that document.  
- It might be better to refer to guard requirements established in the code.  
- Fire Code IFCA 1108.1 guard requirements would cover it. But it is already referenced in this proposal.  
- Fire Code also references the OSHA standard.  
- Some committee members feel we should reference IBC section on guard requirements.  
- Reflective signs required on the guards, but not on the curbs.  
  - In Fire Code reflective signs are required for both curbs and guards.  
- Fire Code Amendment goes in to detail about the curbs and guards.  
- Do they make adhesives to cover the curbs based on the type we are dealing with?
Committee unsure.
Concerns that you could violate the warranty of your roof by using certain adhesives to attach these signs or curbs.

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Modification #1:
2nd sentence change to “Shall be provided on guards and curbs per IFCA section 1108.1”
Vote on Modification #1: Passes 7-0-1
Motion: As Modified
Vote: AM Fails 0-8
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 8-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # 344
Public Testimony in Support:
Removing IPMC reference since Denver doesn’t adopt the IPMC.
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 8-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # 275
Bring alignment of emergency system with the 2018 IBC.
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: Disapprove (D)
Reason: Based on previous action regarding emergency systems.
Final Motion: Disapproval
Final Vote: D Passes 8-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # 276
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: Disapprove (D)
Reason: Based on previous action regarding emergency systems.
Final Motion: Disapproval
Final Vote: D Passes 8-0

Proposal # 20
Mop sinks inadvertently left out of 2016, this brings it back in.
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: Disapprove (D)
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
Committee Discussion:

- Exceptions seem to invalidate each other in regard to Group R Occupancies.
- Feel that we don’t need this. We don’t currently require service sinks where there are toilet facilities.
- Committee feels this needs to be re-worded because of the confusion.
• We have been operating with our current requirements so it’s not a big issue to fix.
  • Wording is from 2011 amendments.
  • Committee felt we should try to work through this and reword the proposal.

**Motion:** To Table and allow proponent to bring it back with new wording.
**Vote:** Table 8-0 Passes

---

**Proposal # P45**

Bring back in exception for fire access elevator lobbies.

**Public Testimony in Support:**

Intent is to go back to text of IBC, bring back exception for design flexibility for fire access elevator lobby in relation to the stair. Current affect of DBCA creates separate fire service access elevator lobby. Effects the efficiency of small floor plate residential buildings.

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

1. Requires 45-minute doors instead of the 20-minute doors with this change.
   a. Yes, corridor already has higher level of protection. Would be able to use corridor to access the stairs.

**Committee Discussion:**

• Concerns about what this does to our smoke control systems.
  o Same as non-fire service lobbies. Should match them.

• Last code cycle this was deleted due to concern about stand pipe systems.

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

**Reason:** Based on testimony of proponent.

**Final Motion:** As Submitted

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

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

**Proposal # 175**

**Public Testimony in Support:**

Cleans up current regarding fire service access elevators as it pertains to garages and open parking garages. Currently we don’t require enclosed lobby. Moves out of 3007.6 to 3007.6.2 in lobby exceptions. Require smoke partition, not rated door. Makes clear that this cannot be used for storage.

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

1. Are you intending to require stairways to have a door independent of the lobby?
   a. Not sure proposal requires that.

**Committee Discussion:**

• Concerns about area of refuge being used here. We have changed to area of rescue for verbiage. Could impact fire alarm requirements and other survivability sections of the code by using that term here.
  o Area of refuge should not exist here because these buildings are sprinklered.

• Concerns about amending the stand pipe section. Currently Denver doesn’t require 2 doors for enclosed parking garages. Suggest adding an exception for enclosed parking garages.
  o Enclosures containing stand pipes are allowed to access through the lobby.

• Want to allow enclosed garages to have access through the lobby.

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

**Modification #1:**

509.4.2 Incidental Uses when Building is Sprinklered – Instead of Section 710.5.2
in accordance with section 509.4.2” instead of with smoke partitions
Strike all after smoke partitions down to Section 710.5.2

**Vote on Modification:** Passes 6-0-2

**Modification #2:**
Add Exception for Enclosed Parking Garages 3007.9.1 (MCG will create wording for this modification)

**Vote on Modification:** 6-0-2

**Final Motion:** As Modified

**Final Vote:** AM Passes 6-0-2

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

---

**Proposal # 176**

**Public Testimony in Support:**
Currently have amendment that deletes occupant evacuation elevators. We put this back in the code, so this section needs to stay so that people know how to achieve that.

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

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

**Reason:** Proponents testimony

**Final Motion:** AS

**Final Vote:** AS Passes 6-1-1

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

---

**Proposal # 149**

**Public Testimony in Support:**
Eliminating this amendment as it is more of an interpretation of code and should be addressed in policy.

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

**Committee Discussion:**
- Put in code under canopy provision noncombustible base code required fire wall between it or canopy to be fire rated. If you remove this, you will lose the fire rating and the requirement for fire wall in between.
  - This has been in the code for decades if we take this out, we will get a lot of modifications.
- Has not been seen to affect fires in Denver.
- Base building code says non combustible frame is required for awning, does not say that for canopies.
- Does fire department regulate canopies just like awnings?
  - No.
- Concerns that this should say non combustible construction types you don’t need a rating or separation.
- Committee discussed just leaving Item B
- Concern that once you attach canopy to the building it becomes part of the roof so it would then need to be rated.
- Under canopy does not address fire rating.
- Committee Member discussed the fact that proponent is looking to put this in to policy. But policy is not yet written.
  - Feelings that it is best to leave this amendment as is and just add the canopy framing language proposed in the modification.

**Original Motion:** As Modified

**Modification:** Bring all struck out language back in and add language in Item G about Canopy
Framing based on wording in 1011.7

**Vote on Modification:** Passes 7-1

**Final Motion:** As Modified

**Final Vote:** AM Passes 7-1

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