1. Roll Call and Introductions
2. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Staff Proposals
   a. #40: DBC-IBC Section 308.5.5 (Family Childcare Homes/ Modifications made in IFC Committee)
   b. (F59): DBC-IFC Section 1013.6 (Proposed to be hear by IBC from IFC Committee)
3. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Previously Tabled Proposals
   a. #93: DBC-IBC Section 3307
   b. #150: DBC-IBC Section 3112.3
4. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Appendix Chapters
   a. #164: DBC-IBC Appendix Adoption Table
   b. #112: DBC-IBC Appendix J
   c. (P156): DBC-IBC Appendix U
   d. (P27): DBC-IBC Appendix U
   e. (P28): DBC-IBC Appendix U
   f. (P20): DBC-IBC Appendix U
5. Discussion and voting on IEBC/DBC-IEBC
   a. #159: IEBC Section 202
   b. #267: DBC-IEBC Chapters 4-6
   c. (P11): DBC-IEBC Section 404.3 & 606.2.3 & 405.2.4
   d. #157: IEBC Section 1203.4
   e. #187: DBC-IEBC Section 1402-1407
   f. #78: IEBC Appendix A
   g. #77: IEBC Appendix C
6. Discussion and voting on remaining IBC/DBC-IBC Proposals
   a. #504: DBC-IBC Section 1507.18 (Proponent Requested this be heard at the end of this agenda)
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Discussion on Proposal #40 to show the modification made by the IFC Committee.
Committee ok with #40 and it’s modifications.
Discussion on Proposal F59 -

Proposal # F59
Both the referenced amendment sections and the IFC base Code sections should be deleted. In the base Code, 1013.6 is only applicable to externally lit exit signs; these signs are not permitted by Amendment 1013.3. The amendment should be deleted because the graphic requirements are already contained within UL 924; there is no need to repeat them. The pictogram amendment language in the is section is in conflict with unamended IFC 1013.4 which manages an EXIT sign.

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

**Reason:** Necessary for consistency with Fire code.

**Final Motion:** As Submitted

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

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

---

**Proposal # 93 (Tabled from Last Hearing)**

**Committee Discussion:**
- Continued discussion on whether notifications should be to adjoining or adjacent.
- Committee concerns about the delay of permits because of the time period these notices have to be served before permit can be issued.
- Some committee members feeling adjoining is better and that adjacent is vague.
- Some committee members feel this just gives room for people to complain when they get these notices and ultimately the project will be approved by City of Denver according to the correct code and compliance.

**Discussion:**

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

**Support:**

**Modification #2:**
- 3307.1.1 Buildings Regulated by IRC – Leave wording as is.
- 3307.1.2 All other Buildings – With original 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:** Exceptions need to apply to both sections.

---

**Proposal # 150 (Previously Tabled)**

**Public Testimony in Support:** None

**Public Testimony in Opposition:**
- Admin section does not specify the number of drawings that should be submitted. It should say in accordance with permitting guide. That is where quantity of drawings is stated.
- With this revision both sets of plans would be required to be stamped.

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

**Committee Discussion:**
- Committee concerns that maybe we ask for electronic submittals for these projects.
Committee feels it would be better to remove both areas where this proposal states “in accordance with the Administrative Section of this Code” based on the fact that number of drawings required is included in a guide not the administrative section.

**Original Motion:** A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)  
**Modification:** Remove the first reference to the administrative section of the code.  
**Final Motion:** As Modified  
**Final Vote:** AM Passes 8-0  
**Additional staff or committee comments for the record:** None

**Proposal # 164**  
**Public Testimony in Support:** Mostly editorial but does have some impacts. In the Table it has been revised to just say Adopt instead of “Adopt as guideline” as that make the Appendix unenforceable. Also, changes to say Adopt as Amended where appropriate. If Denver adopts it will not be as a guideline and will be enforceable by the City.  
**Public Testimony in Opposition:**  
**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**  
**Committee Discussion:**
- Concerns that this says Adopt as Amended for Appendix J and that hasn’t been discussed.  
  - Would be corrected editorially.  
**Original Motion:** As-Submitted (AS)  
**Final Motion:** As Submitted  
**Final Vote:** AS Passes 8-0

**Proposal # 112**  
**Public Testimony in Support:** None  
**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None  
**Original Motion:** A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)  
**Committee Discussion:**
- Concerns with reason statement stating grading “where grading is an issue” Feel it should be clear where this is applicable.  
- We already have a Denver amendment to require special inspections where they deem necessary. This proposals reason statement has provisions for special inspections which is not necessary here.  
- Feel these requirements may be unachievable in some projects.  
**Motion to withdraw ASM**  
**New Motion:** Disapproval  
**Final Motion:** Disapproval  
**Final Vote:** D Passes 5-0-3
Proposal # P28, P27, P20 and P156 Proposed by Committee to be heard together.
This proposal adds 3 new mass timber construction types.

Public Testimony in Support:
This proposal adds 3 new mass timber construction types. This will be included in the 2021 ICC. Asking that Denver adopts ahead of the national code. Will save on admin modifications. These buildings support Denver’s sustainability goals. Wrote as an appendix for this proposal so that when it becomes part of the ICC code it can be easily removed.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Was proponent present at the code hearings?
   a. No
2. Are you aware of what the intent is with periodic special inspections?
   a. Do not have knowledge of what was intended with that term.

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

Committee Discussion:
- Some concerns that “Periodic Special Inspection” is vague.
  - Unclear how often that would be required.
  - Periodic is used often in the code. Table 1705.3 Special Inspections uses the same Section title “Periodic Special Inspection”
  - Possibly incorporate a percentage that would be required to be inspected.
- In regard to Item #2 some committee members think it is intended to capture the tightness of this type of construction. Believe Item #2 should stay in the table.
  - Some discussion that we should not take out Item #2 when we don’t fully understand the intent and don’t know enough about this type of construction.
- Concerns that #1 in the table should not say Timber deep foundation systems.
- Concerns that if we define periodic inspections with a percentage, we should consider doing the same for Continuous Special Inspection.
- In the table where it says connections should be assembly connections.

Modification #1:
P156 – Item 2 be included in the 20%
Vote on Modification: 4-4 Chair must vote 5-4 Passes

Modification #2:
P156- Add footnote “Periodic and special inspection shall mean minimum 20 % inspections of all connection assemblies or as specified by the engineer of record or as approved by the Building Official”
Vote on Modification: 4-4. Chair must vote 5-4 Passes

Modification #3:
#1 in the table, should just be foundation systems. Remove “Timber Deep”
Vote on Modification: Passes 8-0

Final Motion: Vote on P156 As Modified
Final Vote: AM 6-1-1
P156, P20 and P27
Public Testimony in Support:
Approved in April and will be included in 2021 code. These pertain to special inspections as those are different for Tall Wood.

Final Motion: As Submitted P27,P28, P20
Reason: Per proponents’ testimony.
Final Vote: AS Passes 8-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # 504
Public Testimony in Support:
Category in roofing code that is not specified in the code. This membrane common on garden roofs, reflective pools, roof decks. Not recognized in code, but it is a proven system that is common. Designed to be structural waterproofing. Better to have membrane stuck to the deck than to build up layers that may be weaker.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Questions about the standard referenced CAN/CGSB-37.50-M89
   a. It is a Canadian standard.
2. Are there other manufacturers that can provide systems that meet this requirement?
   a. Supporting information includes other manufacturers that are able to provide this type of system.
3. Do other manufacturers allow installation with zero slope?
   a. Yes
4. Is this just for paver systems and green roofs?
   a. Categorized as protective membrane roofing. Anytime you are burying the membrane.
5. Does it have to be protected from UV?
   a. Yes, it would have to have something on top of it to displace the water.
6. The way this reads you are not required a minimum slope if you provide leak detection. So if you don’t provide leak detection what is the minimum slope? Is there an alternative for flood testing?
   a. Yes. So if not zero slope than minimum slope is not defined. For warranty we require a roofer to flood test.
7. Using the term leakage testing, is electrical conductance for code compliance or permanent for life of membrane?
   a. It’s for both. Final test but can also be tested throughout the life of the membrane.
8. Has this been taken to the national level?
   a. Yes, it was advised that we take it to the state levels to get it approved.
9. Rough estimate of percentage of this type of roof system from Hydrotech in Denver area?
   a. Top 3 in the area. Probably 30% each of the major companies, smaller companies have the remaining percentage.

10. How would you repair or replace as these systems age?
    a. You would have to get to the membrane. It would depend on the actual roof and how hard it is to access the membrane. It can be patch repaired if needed.

11. Is there a re-cover option?
    a. Pretty rare. Systems last a long time.

Committee Discussion:
- Concerns that this code section proposed is not correct. May be based on 2015 code.
  - It should be added after PV.
- Concerns that this is not in line with the provisions of the fire code. With this being a combustible insulation.

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Modification: Remove requirement for permanent breach detection.

Discussion:
- Concerns about going to zero pitch roofs. They were taken out for a reason and not accepted at national level for a reason.
- If we kept the protection and added drainage layer maybe that would be an option, if you didn’t do that maybe there should be an 8-inch pitch requirement.
- Concerns about exposed insulation at a certain level. It could be a major fire risk.
- Concerns about using zero slope. Committee feels there would need to be some modifications.
  - City would like to work with proponent and send out to committee for final approval.
- DFD has concerns that the burn time for the insulation needs to be addressed.
  - No recorded fires with this system.
  - Work with fire to determine a comfortable dimension where we would require a thermal barrier.
  - Quantity of combustible and fuel sources is a concern for Fire. 6x the release rate.

Motion: To approve concept and work together to correct the wording.
Final Motion: ASM
Final Vote: ASM Passes 8-0

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
City staff will work with proponent to create language for this.

Proposal # 159
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: Disapprove (D)
Reason: Existing definition is not identical as stated in reason statement. This definition should remain as it encompasses snow. Current provision does not include snow.
Final Motion: Disapproval
Final Vote: D Passes 8-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # P11
Public Testimony in Support:
In 2018 Repairs got its own chapter. When it was in 2 different methods the definitions were similar but not identical, when combined in to 1 the definition in prescriptive was done away with and the definition in work area method became the definition. This proposal just attempts to make Denver’s code consistent with the IEBC. This will come in with the 2021 code, this just brings it in now.
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Is there a need to further coordinate revised language to ensure work area method includes snow?
   a. Chapter 4 IEBC doesn’t address snow. Denver’s provisions should require dead, live and snow loads.

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 7-0-1
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # 157
Proposing to delete unnecessary amendments.
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Committee Discussion:
• No longer necessary under the transoms portion. It is already covered elsewhere in the code.
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 8-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # 78 & 77
Justification not to adopt listed appendices.
Public Testimony in Support: None
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