

IBC/IEBC Committee Hearing #3 Minutes

March 15, 2022

2 p.m. – 5 p.m.

City and County of Denver

1. Roll Call

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

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 “Where 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

- Rebuttal (Opposition):
- N/A
- Discussion:
- We need somewhere to say we need emergency illumination in that lobby.
- Would recommend we add an exception
- **Motion: To approve the amendments**
- **Vote: Motion passes (12 for, 0 against, 1 abstained)**
-
- **Motion: To approve as amended**
- **Vote: Motion passes (12 for, 1 against, 0 abstained)**

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