1. Roll Call and Introductions
   a. Stephen Rondinelli - Present
   b. Austin Reese - Present
   c. Aaron Tweedie - Present
   d. David Thorpe - Present
   e. Yvette Roman - Present
   f. Steve Thomas – Absent (Bill Clayton subbing)
   g. William (Bill) Clayton - Present
   h. Brian Parr - Absent
   i. Julie Brown - Present
   j. Paul Schultz - Present
   k. David Renn - Present
   l. Gary Moore - Absent
   m. Tony Caro - Present
   n. Juan Pasillas - Present
   o. David Carnicelli - Present
   p. Keith Peetz – Present

   Voting Members Present: 13

2. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 2
   a. #10: DBC-IBC 202
      • Support
      • N/A
      • Opposition
      • N/A
      • Committee Questions/Comments
      • First sentence end with parenthetical phrase. Would there be harm in deleting parenthesis?
        • No issue with eliminating parenthesis
      • Electric lock definition seems to have a couple requirements in the definition. Is there a better place for them instead of the definition?
      • Would it be better to have the definitions in the fire code 108.5.6?
        • Not opposed to having them in the fire code.
      • Support (Rebuttal)
      • N/A
• **Opposition (Rebuttal)**
  
• N/A
  
• **Motion:** To approve with the modification of removing the parenthetical phrase in “electric locks – master switch”.
  
• **Vote:** Does not pass (6 for, 7 against)
  
• **2nd Motion:** To table. Item 11 uses one of the definitions. Propose to review all the propositions offered all at once.
  
• **Vote:** Passed (11 for, 0 against, 2 abstentions)

b. **#6: DBC-IBC Sleeping Room Definition**

• **Support**
  
• N/A
  
• **Opposition**
  
• The definition is used by residential teams. Needing to have a space with a closet would leave open language and make it more difficult to implement.
  
• **Committee Questions/Comments**
  
• Don’t understand how having a closet adds to defining a space as a sleeping room.
  
• Definition of a sleeping room is not defined in any of the I-codes?
  
• Only defined in the Denver amendment.
  
• Defining a sleeping room might have some unintended consequences if the term isn’t used as intended in each occurrence.
  
• **Support (Rebuttal)**
  
• N/A
  
• **Opposition (Rebuttal)**
  
• N/A
  
• **Motion:** Motion to disapprove
  
• **Vote:** Passed (11 for, 0 against, 2 abstentions)

3. **Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 4**

a. **#11: DBC-IBC 403.5.3**

• **Motion:** To table and hear together with 10,11,12,13,14
  
• **Vote:** Passed (10 for, 1 against, 2 abstentions)

b. **#21: DBC-IBC 420.12**

• **Support**
  
• N/A
  
• **Opposition**
  
• N/A
  
• **Committee Questions/Comments**
• What do you presume the added cost to construction would be?
  • None. The requirements are already in the code. It is just a clarification.

• Support (Rebuttal)
• N/A
• Opposition (Rebuttal)
• N/A
• Motion: To approve as written
• Vote: Passed – approved unanimously

4. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 6
a. #P18: DBC-IBC 602.4.2.2
  • Support
  • N/A
  • Opposition
  • N/A
  • Committee Questions/Comments
  • Comfortable that the code language they are putting in addresses the concerns. Comfortable with the amendment.
  • Would it be better grammar to say “unlimited” instead of “limited...to 100%”
  • Will lower the cost of construction for type 4B and will hopefully encourage this type of construction aligning with Denver’s climate goals.
  • Support (Rebuttal)
  • N/A
  • Opposition (Rebuttal)
  • N/A
  • Motion: To approve as written
  • Vote: Passed unanimously

5. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 7
a. #83: DBC-IBC 703.2.3
  • Support
  • N/A
  • Opposition
  • N/A
  • Committee Questions/Comments
  • How does it differ from 104.11?
    • It’s the alternative materials section. The IBC one was
• Is the change that we are making, deleting 104.11 and replacing with our own section?
  • Correct
  • Support (Rebuttal)
  • N/A
  • Opposition (Rebuttal)
  • N/A
  • Motion: To approve as written
  • **Vote: Passes** unanimously

b. **#84**: DBC-IBC Table 705.8
  • Support
  • N/A
  • Opposition
  • N/A
  • Committee Questions/Comments
    • It’s a simple change that does exactly what is intended.
    • Support (Rebuttal)
    • N/A
    • Opposition (Rebuttal)
    • N/A
    • Motion: To approve as submitted
    • **Vote: Passed** unanimously

c. **#17**: DBC-IBC 705.8.1
  • Support
    • The section is not designed for exposure protection.
    • The amendment lessens the code below that of national safety.
    • The Denver code should not be less restrictive than the IBC.
  • Opposition
    • N/A
  • Committee Questions/Comments
    • This provision went back into the 80’s and allowed the development of downtown Denver. In the 90’s it became a component of the code. Helped to stop fires from spreading through window openings. Not opposition, just explaining how it got there.
    • What types of projects would not have happened without this?
      • Currently, outside of Denver, new buildings located near property lines.
• **Support (Rebuttal)**
  You can have existing buildings that can install water curtains and maintain the number of openings they have.

• **Opposition (Rebuttal)**
  N/A

  • **Motion:** To pass as written
  • **Vote:** Passed unanimously


d. **#18:** DBC-IBC 707.6

  • **Support**
    This is something that we need right now. Fire dampers in shafts are illegal right now.

  • **Opposition**
    N/A

  • **Committee Questions/Comments**
    N/A

  • **Support (Rebuttal)**
    N/A

  • **Opposition (Rebuttal)**
    N/A

  • **Motion:** To approve as written
  • **Vote:** Passed unanimously


e. **#19:** DBC-IBC 713.4

  • **Support**
  
  • **Opposition**
  
  • **Committee Questions/Comments**
  
  • **Support (Rebuttal)**
  
  • **Opposition (Rebuttal)**
  
  • **Motion:** To approve as submitted
  • **Vote:** Passed unanimously

f. **#20:** DBC-IBC 713.5

  • **Support**
- N/A
- **Opposition**
- N/A
- **Committee Questions/Comments**
  - The more we have the Denver code aligned with international code, the easier it is as a consultant.
- **Support (Rebuttal)**
- N/A
- **Opposition (Rebuttal)**
- N/A
- **Motion**: To adopt as stated
- **Vote**: Passed unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 4:59 MT