IBC/IEBC Committee Hearing #3 Minutes
March 15, 2022
2 p.m. – 5 p.m.
City and County of Denver

1. Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>In attendance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Rondinelli</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Reese</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Tweedie</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Thorpe</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette Roman</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Thomas</td>
<td>ONE VOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William (Bill) Clayton</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Parr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Brown</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Schultz</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Renn</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Moore</td>
<td>One vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pruett</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Caro</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Pasillas</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Carnicelli</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Peetz</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Committee Members present (Two count as a single vote)
13 votes (Robert not voting since Gary is present)

2. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC and IEBC/DBC-IEBC
   a. #11: IBC DBCA 403.5.3
      • **Support:**
      • The provisions for door locking arrangements 101 chapter 18 allow
        for door locking arrangements. Used for patients with dementia and
        Alzheimer’s. This is primarily for security risk patients.
      • **Opposition:**
      • N/A
      • **Committee Questions:**
        • Based on the revisions, do you want all 4 events to unlatch the door
          or just one of the 4? Answer – The intent is that just one unlocks the
          door.
      • **Rebuttal (support):**
- N/A
- **Rebuttal (Opposition):**
- N/A
- **Discussion:**
  - Would we consider changing the wording to say “any of the following”
  - Agree, believe the language as proposed creates confusion.
  - Using “or” can also create confusion because, does it mean the building owner gets to choose?
  - Two concerns: This is a repetitive proposal and the wording of the proposal.
  - Should the reference to IBC be to the DBC instead?
- **Motion:**
  - **To approve as modified.**
  - **Vote: Motion passes unanimously**

**House-Keeping (Added In):**

**Motion:** to re-hear Item 79A. Previously voted for against, residential committee passed by modified.

**Vote:** Motion passes (9 for, 3 against, 0 abstained)

b. **#24:** IBC 1010.2.7-B

- **Support:**
- N/A
- **Opposition:**
- N/A
- **Committee Questions:**
  - How is item 6 different from exception item 2? Question redacted, read incorrectly.
  - Is the intent that only section 403.5.3 is referenced or also 403.5.1. Does it trigger other requirements for a high-rise building? Answer – The intent is to keep it only to the stairway locking requirements.
  - Section 3 applies to all buildings, if we modify it for the language for 405.3 will that resolve your issue? Answer – We can combine the language from 6 to 3 and eliminate 3.
- **Rebuttal (support):**
- N/A
- **Rebuttal (Opposition):**
- N/A
- **Discussion:**
• N/A
• **Motion #1: To approve as amended.**
  • **Vote: Motion disapproved (2 for, 9 against, 1 abstained)**

• **Motion #2: To disapprove.**
  • **Vote: Motion approved (12 for, 0 against, 1 abstained)**

c. **#23: IEBC 1001.2.2.2 Change of Occupancy**
   • **Support:**
     • Although there are structures that could be considered R3, we create issues were there can be a hotel that meets residential requirements.
   • **Opposition:**
     • Allowing a residence to be built and then classified as an R3, R2, R1 is an issue.
   • **Committee Questions:**
     • If I have a townhouse with 3 or more units, would that be classified as an R-3 instead of an R-2? Answer – Yes.
     • IRC homes do not require fire sprinklers. Changing to an R3 would require it. How to we address that? Answer- Only applies to a change of occupancy. Sprinkler provisions will apply to what you’re changing to.
     • Would you be okay if we change “code” to “chapter” in “For purposes of this code...”
   • **Rebuttal (support):**
     • The exterior wall requirements are more stringent. Just because we changed the code, it doesn’t mean the walls are more hazardous.
   • **Discussion:**
   • N/A
   • **Motion: To approve as amended**
   • **Vote: Motion passes unanimously**

d. **#P46: IBC Table 1004.5**
   • **Support:**
     • This allows us to determine the occupant load when the calculations don’t account for considerations. It’s a good idea.
     • Gives us a tool instead of a whole bunch of work arounds. Makes it much more straight forward.
   • **Opposition:**
   • N/A
• Committee Questions:
  • Footnote D: Having a hard time envisioning a group area or business not associated with A. Answer – We can revise to say not associated with group B occupancies?
  • Rebuttal (support):
  • The intent for footnote D was for directed toward combined occupancies/lobbies.
  • Rebuttal (Opposition):
  • N/A
  • Discussion:
  • The lobby of an office space should be the same as the business area and be 150 gross.
  • There are cases where a lounge doesn’t have much seating or is meant to be a working area.
  • What designates a lobby/lounge is the furniture systems.
  • Motion: To disapprove
  • Vote: Motion passes (11 for, 1 opposed, 1 abstaining)

e.  #87: IBC 1006.3
• Support:
  • Similar to one before, it doesn’t change how we review the proposal. It is just a tool to help submit.
• Opposition:
  • N/A
• Committee Questions:
  • How is this being carrying forward? Is there anything else being done other than what is coming forward in 2024? Answer – Correct. This is how it will be presented in 2024 code.
• Rebuttal (support):
  • N/A
• Rebuttal (Opposition):
  • N/A
• Discussion:
  • N/A
• Motion: To approve as submitted
• Vote: Motion passes (12 for, 0 against, 0 abstained)
f. **#P6:** IBC 1007.1.1 Two exits or exit access doorways
   - **Support:**
     - The intent that one single fire event should not block the egress path of the 50 or more occupants trying to get out of the building.
     - Meant to make things easier for the applicant.
   - **Opposition:**
   - N/A
   - **Committee Questions:**
     - “Where exits from the story...” Just want to make sure if this is correct? Answer – It would be fine to change it to “Whew exits from a story”
     - Why did you put it here and not in 206? Answer – Didn’t want to have to reiterate.
     - Would this apply to the exit discharge door? Answer – No it would not apply.
   - **Rebuttal (Support):**
     - Any portion of the exit access vs exit access doorway is helpful to avoid confusion if it needs to be changed.
   - **Rebuttal (Opposition):**
   - N/A
   - **Discussion:**
     - I come across this a lot with plan reviews and am in support.
     - How do we measure required separation? Not enough guidance.
   - **Motion:** To disapprove
   - **Vote:** Motion passes (9 for, 2 against, 2 abstained)

g. **#15:** IBC 1008.3.4.1 Egress Illumination
   - **Support:**
   - N/A
   - **Opposition:**
   - N/A
   - **Committee Questions:**
     - Egress illumination is just normal power in your code, it that your intent. Answer – that is correct
     - I can’t find anywhere in 1008.3 that requires emergency power. Answer – “The means of egress illumination in elevator lobbies shall be provided power for a duration of not less than 2 hours.”
   - **Rebuttal (support):**
   - N/A
Meeting adjourned at 4:06PM

The following proposals were not addressed due to time:

h. #2: IBC 1503.2.2
i. #16: IBC 1511.2.4
j. #P4.2: IBC 1602.1 (Wind loads)
k. #P4.1: IBC 1609.1.1 (Wind loads)
l. #P4.3: IBC 1609.3.1 (Wind loads)
m. #P17.2: IBC 1607.14.4.2 Photovoltaic panels
n. #88: IBC 2902.2