AMENDMENT PROPOSAL

Please provide all of the following items in your amendment proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Sections/Tables/Figures Proposed for Revision:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBC-IRC R315.1, R315.1.2, Definitions, R315.2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** If the proposal is for a new section, indicate (new).

**Proposal:**

Modify the current Denver amendment as follows:

**SECTION R315**

**CARBON MONOXIDE ALARMS**

**Section R315.1** General **Carbon-monoxide alarms** is modified to add an Exception:

**Exception:** Dwelling units described as being regulated by the IRC in IBC Sections 308.3, 308.5 or 310, shall comply with IFCA 915.

**Section R315.1.2** Definitions is added:

R315.1.2 Definitions. The following terms are defined for the purposes of this section:

- CO (CARBON MONOXIDE). A colorless odorless gas that is produced as a result of incomplete burning of carbon-containing fuels.

- CO ALARM. A single station device or multiple station group of devices listed per UL 2034 having a sensor that responds to CO. CO alarm devices may be monitored by an alarm control unit, but shall be powered independently of the alarm control unit and shall function autonomously in the event the alarm control unit is nonfunctional.

- FUEL FIRED APPLIANCE. An appliance that is fueled by carbon-containing solid, liquid, and/or gaseous fuels; this definition includes a fireplace.

- MULTIPLE PURPOSE ALARM. A single device that incorporates the capability to detect more than one hazard, such as smoke, vapors, and/or gases. Multiple purpose devices shall emit audible alarms in a manner that clearly differentiates between the detected hazards.
understand the Denver amendments on top of their professional understanding of the model I-Codes.

The proposal would result in the Denver code being more similar to the I-Codes.

Referenced Standards:

**Reason:**

1. The exception for when the IBC allows the IRC use is misplaced under the section title. This is not standard I-Code formatting. It is believed by this proponent that the exception is meant to be under R315.1, General.
2. Within sections in the body of the code is the appropriate location for definitions.
3. “Carbon monoxide definition” is not unique to code applications and thus does not need to be defined in the code. IRC 201.4 supports this concept by referencing the user to “ordinarily accepted meanings”.
4. “CO alarm” definition is not necessary. The content of the definition is covered by others sections of 315, such as listing. Per UL 2034.
5. “Fuel fired appliance” definition is not necessary because the inclusion of “Fireplace” is already addressed in the amendment to R315.2.1, exception 1, which is retained in this proposal.
6. “Multiple-purpose alarm” definition is not necessary as this term is not used anywhere in the amendments or the IRC section. Rather, R315.4 references “combination alarms”.
7. “Single station alarm” and “multiple station alarm” definitions are not necessary, as they are only used once in the Denver amendments and their use is unnecessary. R315.1.1, Listing, describes the alarms that are permitted through their listing. R315.5, Interconnectivity, describes the interconnection of alarms with one another.
8. “Plug-in” definition is not necessary as this term is not used in the Denver amendments of 315 or the IRC provisions of 315. In older homes where power may not be available in the locations required for CO alarms, a plug in option into a receptacle provides power from the building, whereas a battery only option is allowed under R315.2.2. I do not see any Denver amendments prohibiting plug in alarms and would not believe such amendment would be justified as unique to Denver.
9. Requiring CO alarms to be multiple-station in section 315.2.1 is inappropriate. This section is only related to when/where they are required for new construction. A home could be designed that only requires one, and thus a multiple-station alarm would not be necessary. R315.5 describes the interconnectivity required of alarms when there are more than one required.
10. Requiring CO alarms to be “hard-wired” in section 315.2.1 is inappropriate. The power source for CO alarms is described in R315.6, Power source. Requiring a hard-wired alarm would eliminate the use of a receptacle outlet powered alarm. If this is the intent of Denver, then justification should be provided as to why Denver is unique in this regard compared to the model code. If this can be justified, then the “hard-wired” requirement should still be moved to the “power source” section via a committee modification.
11. Amending item 2 regarding attached garages to remove the trigger that there be an opening that communicates with the dwelling is not unique to Denver. Current codes require a separation between the garage and dwelling that would not allow this communication if there were no door or other opening. If a new garage were added to an existing home, the provisions for garage/dwelling separation in R302.5 would handle CO migration. I am not unable to think of a situation where this amendment would be necessary, nor can I see how it is unique to Denver.

**Supporting Information:**

**Purpose:** To better align the Denver code with the model 2018 I-Codes

**Impact:**

There is no substantial affect on the cost of design or construction

The proposal would result in the Denver code being more similar to the I-Codes.

**Departmental Impact:**

The amendment would reduce the cost of code review, administration, and inspection due to the reduced training required of employees to understand the Denver amendments on top of their professional understanding of the model I-Codes.