2) Proposals should be drafted in Word with the only formatting that is needed being **BOLDING**, **STRIKEOUT** AND **UNDERLINING**. Please do not provide additional formatting such as tabs, columns, etc.

Please use a separate form for each proposal submitted.

Is separate graphic file provided?  ☐ Yes ☒ No

**Acronym** | **Code Name**                                                                                     | **Acronym** | **Code Name**                     |
-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|
DBC- xxx   | Denver Building Code– xxx code base                                                              | IMC        | International Mechanical Code    |
IBC        | International Building Code                                                                     | IEBE       | International Existing Building Code |

AMENDMENT PROPOSAL

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

**Code Sections/Tables/FIGURES Proposed for Revision:**

DBC-IBC 713.5

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

**Proposal:**

Delete without substitution

**Section 713.5 Continuity is amended by adding the following Exception:**

**Exception:**

Shaft enclosures for piping, ducts and vents in Construction Types of IIB, IIIB and VB may be supported on non-fire-rated assemblies.

**Note:** Show the proposal using **strikeout**, **underline** format. At the beginning of each section, one of the following instruction lines are also needed:

• Revise as follows
• Add new text as follows
• Delete and substitute as follows
• Delete without substitution

**Supporting Information:**

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.
The current amendment adds an exception that allows shaft enclosures for piping, ducts and vents to be supported on non fire-rated assemblies for construction types that don’t have a required fire-resistance rating for building elements. The IBC requires shafts to be constructed with fire barriers that have supporting construction with at least the same fire-resistance rating as the fire barrier, regardless of construction type. There is no justification for Denver’s amendments to be less restrictive than the IBC and to reduce the requirements of a fire safety provision.

The wording in this amendment is inconsistent with the wording in IBC 707.5.1 for supporting construction, that this amendment is intended to be an exception to (IBC 713.5 requires compliance with 707.5). IBC 707.5.1 requires a fire-resistance rating for “supporting construction” of fire barriers, which could be a floor or floor/ceiling assembly (and its supporting construction), or just beams and columns that directly support the fire barrier. The exception in this amendment is for support by “non fire-rated assemblies”, which implies support only by a floor or floor/ceiling assembly (and its supporting construction), so direct support on beams and columns would not be allowed since these are not “assemblies”.

IBC 713.11 includes an option for enclosing the bottom of shafts with construction having a fire-resistance rating not less than required for the shaft enclosure. This rated bottom enclosure is typically also the supporting construction of the shaft which is not required to be rated per Denver’s amendment, which is inconsistent.

IBC 704.1 requires structural members to have a fire-resistance rating not less than the assemblies supported by the structural members and has an exception that references specific sections where this is not required or may be different for a specific condition; however, Section 713.5 (as amended) is not referenced, which is inconsistent and creates a conflict in the code.

For the reasons above, it is proposed that Denver’s current amendment to IBC 713.5 be deleted.

Note: The following items are required to be included:

Purpose: The proponent shall clearly state the purpose of the proposed amendment to physical, environmental and customary characteristics that are specific to the City and County of Denver (e.g., clarify the Code; revise outdated material; substitute new or revised material for physical, environmental and customary characteristics; add new requirements to the Code; delete current requirements, etc.)

Reasons: The proponent shall justify changing the current Code provisions, stating why the proposal is necessary to reflect physical, environmental and customary characteristics that are specific to the City and County of Denver. Proposals that add or delete requirements shall be supported by a logical explanation which clearly shows why the current does not reflect physical, environmental and customary characteristics that are specific to the City and County of Denver and explains how such proposals will improve the Code.

Substantiation: The proponent shall substantiate the proposed amendment based on technical information and substantiation. Substantiation provided which is reviewed and determined as not germane to the technical issues addressed in the proposed amendment shall be identified as such.

Bibliography (as needed): The proponent shall submit a bibliography when substantiating material is associated with the amendment proposal. The proponent shall make the substantiating materials available for review.

Referenced Standards:

None.

List any new referenced standards that are proposed to be referenced in the code.

Impact:

This proposal will increase the cost of construction relative to Denver’s 2016 IBC amendments to the 2015 IBC but would have no effect relative to the 2018 IBC. This may increase the cost of design due to additional fire-resistant assemblies that are needed for supporting construction. This proposal deletes a less-restrictive amendment to bring Denver in line with the IBC.

Note: The proponent shall discuss the impact of the proposed amendment and indicate one of the following for each point below regarding the amendment proposal:

- The effect of the amendment proposal on the cost of construction: Increase, Reduce, No Effect
- The effect of the amendment proposal on the cost of design: Increase, Reduce, No Effect
- Is the amendment proposal more- or less-restrictive than the I-Codes: More, Less, Same

Departmental Impact:

This proposal should have little or no effect on review and inspection.

Note: The proponent shall discuss the impact of the proposed amendment and indicate one of the following for each point below regarding the amendment proposal:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of the amendment proposal on the cost of review;</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Reduce</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effect of the amendment proposal on the cost of enforcement/inspection;</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Reduce</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>