1. Roll Call and Introductions

2. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Staff Proposals
   a. #502: DBC-IBC Section 715.1.1
   b. #503: DBC-IBC Section 410.11
   c. #504: DBC-IBC Section 1507.18

3. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 31
   a. #150: DBC-IBC Section 3112.3
   b. #22: DBC-IBC Section 3103

4. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 32
   a. #269: DBC-IBC Section 3202.2

5. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 33
   a. #93: DBC-IBC Section 3307

6. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Appendix Chapters
   a. #13: DBC-IBC Appendix L
   b. #11: DBC-IBC Appendix N
   c. #125: DBC-IBC Section 202 (Definitions relating to Appendix Q)
   d. #485: DBC-IBC Appendix Q
   e. #486: DBC-IBC Appendix Q
   f. #487: DBC-IBC Appendix Q
   g. #488: DBC-IBC Appendix Q
   h. #P1: DBC-IBC Appendix R
   i. #165 DBC-IBC Appendix R
   j. #162: DBC-IBC Appendix S
   k. (P41): DBC-IBC Appendix S
   l. (P9): DBC-IBC Appendix S
   m. #163: DBC-IBC Appendix T

Please note that this agenda includes all remaining IBC-IEBC items spread over 2 hearings.

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 # 93
To align the Denver code with the national codes and revert to IBC model code language. Additionally, the intent is to stop the practice of neighbor notices completely in the IRC since there is no language addressing this in the IRC. The Policy is dated September 9, 2013. The revision clarifies notices needed for scrapes or shoring or engineered benching when required by the shoring policy.

Public Testimony in Support:
- This practice is onerous on customers and staff, requires numerous resubmittals for neighbor notices. In the residential committee it was felt that we needed to keep neighbor notices. IRC doesn’t require notices only required in IBC for excavations. This proposal says contractor can provide an affidavit instead of requiring neighbor notices.
- Staff spends a lot of time to review certified mail receipts to ensure that everyone was sent to the right place and that it was received. If it wasn’t received there is a form, they have to write out for the project to wait 21 days. Causes multiple resubmittals for these neighborhood notices. We are changing from adjacent to adjoining neighbors.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Engineered benching but not prescriptive benching?
   a. Yes, only engineered benching. Prescriptive is not impactful, engineering benching is impactful.
2. What is the difference in engineered and prescriptive?
   a. We had to draw the line somewhere. The risk is greater because of the cut of the soil.
3. What is the value of adding HOA in the language?
   a. If you are next to a condominium or apartment, HOA would represent owner instead of contacting every owner.
4. If required for benching, wouldn’t we still get rid of most of the workload associated with notifications?
   a. Yes, it would get rid of the large impact these notifications have on our workload.
5. IRC already voted down a similar amendment, IRC refers to IBC so utilizing this referral to get the notifications taken out of the code.
   a. This changes what is required, the IRC amendment was looking to remove neighbor notifications all together.
   b. Would need some correlation.
6. In IRC Meeting there were more residential people on the committee, were they in support of Disapproval?
   a. It was disapproved 7-2-1

Committee Discussion:
- Committee member feels both benching should be included.
- Assumption is slope cut has degree of stability.
- #86 in IRC was the proposal to delete all neighbor notification provisions, this proposal
just looks to change the requirements of those notifications.

- Concerns that this may be better in the IRC as the main concerns seem to be residential.
- Some suggestions that we leave the code language for IBC and put this language in to IRC.
- Committee feedback that this has been in the code for a long time and doesn’t seem right to put in to the IRC without speaking with the IRC Committee.

**Discussion:**

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

**Support:**

**Modification #1:**
Delete “or non-prescriptive”

**Reason:** So, it applies to all shoring and benching.

**Vote on Modification:** Passes 7-0

**Modification #2A:** Keep adjacent and not use adjoining in the amendment language. IRC buildings only have to notify if they are adjoining and not adjacent.

**Reason:** Commercial structures are large and pose more risk to adjacent properties.

**Vote on Modification:**

**Modification #3:** Add to 3rd exception “For buildings regulated under the IRC”
Delete last sentence

**Reason:** Seems to be regulatory and should be in administrative section.

**Vote on Modification:** Passes 7-0

Ultimately the Committee decided that language for Modification will be worked on with proponent based on the intent.

**Final Motion:** Table, bring back with changes.

**Final Vote:** Passes 7-0

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

**Overview of 5 Appendix Q Proposals:**

- This set of proposals is to delete Appendix Q. Model code has caught up to Denver for Access Controls. Most items in Appendix Q are now in 1010 of IBC, there are other chapters that include some items from Appendix Q. Some admin in to policy or create a permitting guide. Most of these proposals describe where things are going that Denver desires to keep in the code.
- There were 4 proposals that took licensing and relocated it from Appendix Q. There are still some highlighted parts as things that were not proposed to be placed back in the code. The lingering stuff would need to be put in to policy or guide.
- Intent is to completely remove Appendix Q. No intent to change application, no technical changes.

**Committee Discussion:**

- For those elements identified to be put in to a guide, Denver has planned to create these after adoption.
- Want to be sure there are no technical changes here.
  - Agreed there have been no technical changes identified.

**125, 485, 486, 487, 488 Moved to be voted on as a Block As Submitted.**

**Appendix Q Block Vote:** AS Passes 7-0
Proposal # 503
The overall goals of this proposal are as follows:
1) Provide space in all buildings for recycling and compost collection.
2) Provide equal occupant access to the dedicated recycling and composting spaces as is provided for waste collection.
3) Provide vehicle access for refuse pickup
4) Provide greater potential for sanitation within interior refuse collection areas.
Public Testimony in Support:
This was a request to address refuse collection at buildings. More direction for composting and recycling. Goals as listed in proposal reason statement were addressed in proposal.
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Can you confirm if Denver is going to be adopting IgCC as a stretch code?
   a. That is the goal, it will be voluntary at this time.
2. Any effort to coordinate volume and quantities with Denver Fire?
   a. Only the square footage of building area to be identified for all 3 areas of refuse.
Committee Discussion:
• Denver Fire concerns about how the volume and quantities ultimately affect the provisions.
• Would be worthwhile to put this in to code, even though it is a bit odd.
• Not a huge cost impact and it does help reach Denver’s goals.
• Concerns about the sizing.
  o Minimum room size should speak to general collection area.
• Adds time to review and cost to construction.
• Not sure this is appropriately placed in this section.
• Concerns about floor drain language included.
• Suggestion 304.3 of IFC should be referenced here. Container Size and Type.
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: Based on testimony.
Support:
Modification:
Minimum Room size in the exception should be Minimum Collection Area.
Under floor drain
420.11.2 Add a sentence that it’s sloped to drain.
Item 5 in compliance with IFC Section 304.3
Vote on Modification: Passes 6-0-1
Final Motion: As Modified
Final Vote: AM Passes 6-1
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # 504
The purpose of the proposed amendment is to add new requirements to the code for a roof
covering material that has not previously been categorized by the code.

**Public Testimony in Support:** None

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

**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 # 150**

The amendment as written does not make allowance for electronic document review procedures now allowed by the department. Clarification that existing factory-built structures without DOH approved plans must comply with the IEBC was needed.

**Public Testimony in Support:**

Regarding manufactured or factory-built structures. Proposing that we strike language and reference administrative sections of the code.

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

1. 3rd category of building, off site constructed and brought to job site to be set on foundation, Group RX Occupancy sleeping units. Is that something we should consider in this?
   a. Possibly, but it might make more sense to bring that in to a separate proposal.

**Committee Discussion:**

- Committee concerns that there is no wording for these inspections to be done by third parties.
- Discussion on school in Cherry Creek that is manufacturing homes, but we have to send Denver inspectors instead of utilizing Centennial inspectors.
- Built here or Denver and inspections are required the AHJ would have the ability to do the inspections with Building Official approval.
- Some thoughts that State of Colorado building standards should be referenced here.
- Some committee members feel that this proposal has some really good points, but needs more.

**Motion:** To Table

---

**Proposal # 22 (Withdrawn)**
Proposal # 269
The proposed revision is intended to harmonize the Denver Building Code requirements for door encroachments into the public right-of-way with those of the Denver Revised Municipal Code, Section 49-345. The land area within the described boundary is that which historically was defined as Fire Zone 1 and Fire Zone 2. Fire Zone 1 is wholly surrounded by Fire Zone 2.

Public Testimony in Support:
This attempts to address the confusion between Fire Zone 1 and Fire Zone 2. Took an older version of code that defines the boundaries of these two fire zones and dropped that in to Denver’s amendments.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Do these zones still exist, we have built in these zones?
   a. They were intended to prevent the entire city from burning down. Think they still apply.

Committee Discussion:
- Some committee concerns that we should not be regulating things related to public works.
- It would make it easier on customer service.
- Restating someone else’s code here, just increases the volume of your code.
  o But this section does address encroachments in base code.

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Modification:
Add “unless otherwise permitted by the Public Works”
Vote on Modification: Passes 6-0-1
Final Motion: As Modified
Final Vote: AM Passes 4-3
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
Make sure this is coordinated with other sections of the code.

Proposal # 13
Proposing not to adopt Appendix L Earthquake Recording Instrumentation

Public Testimony in Support:
Technical but useless appendix about seismic design. It requires acceleographs and they take a lot more ground motion that we will not see here.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Final Motion: AS
Final Vote: AS Passes 7-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None
Proposal # 11
Proposing not to adopt Appendix N Replicable Buildings

Public Testimony in Support:
Brand new appendix, onerous in that it was developed by large corporate builders. This allows them a third-party plan review and that review has to be accepted along with local amendments. It circumvents us having review control over these projects. Intended to speed up plan review process and in doing so the infringe on the rights and responsibilities of the jurisdictions.
One of the charging elements of this code adoption process was to establish justification for amendments. This gives a record of why we did not adopt Appendix N

Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: Proponents testimony.
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 7-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # 165
To adopt the most current language from the State of Colorado C.R.S. Title 9, Article 5 statute with amendments for clarification on local (City and County of Denver (CCD)) enforcement; and to edit inaccurate references within the C.R.S.

Public Testimony in Support:
Adopts by reference articles for accessible housing. The amendment process at that time left some errors in terms of reference standards. This proposal cleans up the inaccurate references from state statutes. This proposal also defines the accessibility standard as referenced in the building code. Currently, city had interpreted the intent of the revised statutes to mean the most current version of the ANSI standard. Upon further review the statute does not say that and it is up to the jurisdiction to define the standard they will require compliance with.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: Needed because of confusion out in the industry, good clarification.
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 6-0-1
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # P1 (Withdrawn)
Appendix R currently references the wrong version of the current version of ANSI ICC/A117-1 (ICC/ANSI A117.1-1998). This proposal corrects the version.

Proposal # 162
The purpose of the proposed section and text additions is to clarify terms that were used elsewhere in the body of appendix S and to clarify the performance characteristics of systems and components. Reason: The reason for the changes is to improve upon the current language
and to further clarify the performance of existing systems.

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition:
Recommend this be voted down in favor of Proposal #470 that was approved.

Original Motion: Disapprove (D)
Reason: Based on action in Proposal #470.
Final Motion: Disapproval
Final Vote: D Passes 7-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # P41
The purpose of the proposed changes is to clarify the definition of emergency loads. The way it reads having those loads on any distribution section of the double fed switchgear would comply, when DEN actually has specific emergency taps or gear for those loads. This would help clarify that we want elevators and all of the associated elevator equipment such as lighting also on emergency power, so they continue to function properly during an emergency

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition:
Request that bottom items be changed. Emergency should be deleted from those statements. Title should be changed to Emergency Power Airport Terminal Buildings.

Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None

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

Committee Discussion:
Discussion:
Support:
Modification #1:
Proposed modifications from opposition.
Vote on Modification #1: Passes 7-0
Modification #2: Underlined sentence removed. “Emergency power shall be…”
Vote on Modification: Passes 3-2-2
Final Motion: As Modified
Final Vote: AM Passes 5-1-1
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
Editorial Correction: Emergency moving walkways and all associated equipment.

Proposal # P9
The existing amendment language is technically unachievable and cannot be enforced – “prevent ACCUMULATION of smoke in ANY AREA of the airport terminal buildings”- these captioned words are the objectives that are impossible to meet.

Public Testimony in Support: None
Original Motion: Disapprove (D)
Reason: Based on previous action.
Final Motion: Disapproval
Final Vote: D Passes 6-0-1
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # 163
The purpose of the amendment is to maintain the previous adoption of the swimming pool and spa barrier requirements of section 305 of the International Swimming Pool and Spa Code (ISPSC) and also to re-reference to the 2018 version. Appendix T also continues to fully reproduce section 305 and it maintain two previous changes including Denver’s 60-inch-high barrier requirement rather than 48 inches. A minor change to 305.2 clarifies in the heading that it includes indoor pools. The other portions of ISPSC are deleted as they were previously.

Public Testimony in Support:
- This proposal is requesting adopting 305 formally and using the rest as a reference.
- Intent is to maintain 2016 language.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Modification: Keep existing language and remove references.
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 7-0

Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None