

IBC/IEBC Committee Hearing Minutes #4

April 12, 2022

2 p.m. – 5 p.m.

City and County of Denver ([via Zoom](#))

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	
Robert Pruetz		X
Tony Caro		X
Juan Pasillas		X
David Carnicelli		Tony Thornton filling in
Keith Peetz		X

Committee Members present: 13

2. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC and IEBC/DBC-IEBC

- a. [#79a](#) IBC 804.5 Expanded Indoor Environmental Quality Low VOC materials
 - Support:
 - N/A
 - Opposition:
 - N/A
 - Committee Questions:
 - How does the inspector know a material meets VOC requirements?
Answer - A top sheet is usually included with thresholds.
 - Did the IRC accept this proposal with no changes? Answer - The IRC's concerns were about the reference additions and to make sure you couldn't use any version of the standard. They did also have a concern about the word "finish" materials. Plywood and particle board are not finish materials technically. They did approve as

modified.

- At the end of exception 1, is everything after the “and” supposed to be one item? Answer – Yes.
- Why did you include furniture? Answer - It follows along the LEED categories where furniture is listed as an exception.
- When you state furniture, are you referring to furniture that is installed after the certificate of occupancy. Answer – Yes.
- Since the building code does not regulate furniture, would there be a problem if we delete furniture from the exception #1? Answer – There is no issue.
- I don’t see millwork addressed here. I would like to see a clear definition as to what is in/out. Can you verify that it does not include millwork? Answer – Further defining it would be beneficial. The intent is to include millwork.
- Is this intended to apply to all occupancies? Answer – That is the intent.
- Rebuttal (support):
- N/A
- Rebuttal (Opposition):
- N/A
- Discussion:
- N/A
- **Motion:** For disapproval
- **Vote:** **Vote Passed (12 for, 0 against, 1 abstained)**

b. [#P8.2](#) IBC 1903.4 Embodied CO2e of concrete materials

- Support:
- Helps the state meet their goal to reduce emissions.
- Works hand in hand with bike lane legislation.
- A 2021 cost analysis showed that concrete with a 30% less embodied carbon composition costs less than a 1% premium.
- Opposition:
- A similar amendment was presented nationally last month and was vetoed by all 13 members.
- Believe the amendment should be in the Denver green building code.
- The timing will create additional supply change issues already plaguing the concrete industry.
- This proposal focuses on the embodied carbon of only concrete and not other materials and create an unfair advantage.

- The biking Colorado act was phased in over several years and this proposal does not have that.
- The cost of concrete is not just for the builders but also for the companies that create the concrete. Smaller and medium sized enterprises will be the most affected and disadvantaged.
- The code is putting out the minimum standards, I don't think this is the right place for this proposal.
- It is unclear what the scope of this proposal. When does it apply? After a certain square footage, a pothole repair, etc.?
- Committee Questions:
- Why is precast concrete excluded? It seems like it makes it an unfair advantage. Answer – Precast concrete is excluded because it is addressed elsewhere.
- Where did the 100-mile come from. It is recommended no more than an hour from plant to pouring. Answer – From the AECC.
- Rebuttal (support):
- What would allow you to move forward with this. If it is too stringent, what can we do to address this.
- Rebuttal (Opposition):
- The figures that were thrown out were not accurate to what it costs to get an EPD.
- The proposal indicates that it does not change the cost of construction but that is not accurate.
- A reminder that EPD's must be updated every 5 years.
- The ready-mix industry wants to be part of the solution.
- Discussion:
- What is the runway this committee has to be able to modify this proposal since this our last meeting? Answer – We cannot bring anything back and proposals not addressed today will be handled by a smaller group from the city.
- I think this proposal does belong here, but it seems too universal. There should be some limiting factor to state it applies to project of certain scale, for example.
- **Motion:** To disapprove.
- **Vote: Vote passed (10 in favor, 2 against, 1 abstaining)**

c. [#P8.1](#) IBC 2205.3 EPD disclosure for structural steel (Embodied Energy)

- Support:
- We do need to take steps to address embodied carbon. Requirements and codes do allow the market to progress.

- EPD's is something the building industry is not going to stop asking for. Colorado state and GSA of the federal government require them and they will not be going away.
- Opposition:
- I wouldn't feel comfortable because we are regulating the facility and when they are manufacturing.
- We all understand there is a global issue, but this is not the avenue.
- Committee Questions:
- N/A
- Rebuttal (support):
- It would be great to have this in the Denver Green Code, but it is not a mandatory code.
- Rebuttal (Opposition):
- N/A
- Discussion:
- The first clause "minimum of 75% of steel products...", it is unrealistic to estimate the cost up front and lumping all steel materials together.
- **Motion:** To disapprove
- **Vote: Vote passes (11 in favor, 0 against, 2 abstaining)**

d. [#P42](#) IBC 1107.2.1

- Support:
- I wanted to ask the committee if I can step up to answer technical questions for the committee for the proponent. – Allen Yanong
- We are not proposing a designated space but a space that would be universal for all.
- Opposition:
- N/A
- Committee Questions:
- Is the intent also to match the deletion. Answer – The intent is to have all spaces accessible to people with disabilities and not to reserve spaces for people with disabilities.
- Somebody without a disability could use that parking space, is that correct? – Yes, the intent is equal access.
- In section 1111 of the IBC there is a requirement for signs for accessible spaces. Would that no longer be applicable?
- Do we only use the EVSE parking criteria as to how to apply the table or total EV parking spaces?

- Rebuttal (support):
- Dimensions and size are already in place for van accessible spots. You would only need to paint and place the sign; no additional changes would need to be made.
- Rebuttal (Opposition):
- N/A
- Discussion:
- If we leave the base code as is the only one space required would be for van accessible spots and that is a missed opportunity for EV.
- **Motion:** To change the verbiage from “required” to “provided”
- **Vote: Vote passed (11 in favor, 1 against, 1 abstaining)**
- **Motion:** To approve as amended
- **Vote: Vote passed (11 in favor, 1 against, 0 abstaining)**

e. [#P41](#) IBC 1107.2 Exception

- Support:
- N/A
- Opposition:
- N/A
- Committee Questions:
- N/A
- Rebuttal (support):
- N/A
- Rebuttal (Opposition):
- N/A
- Discussion:
- Our energy code does require EV stations for these occupancies. If we think this is require for those occupancies, it would be needed to take this exception out.
- **Motion:** To approve as written
- **Vote: Vote passes unanimously (13 votes)**

f. [#P30](#) IBC 1029.3

- Support:
- N/A
- Opposition:
- N/A
- Committee Questions:
- By putting this in 1029, do you think this can create confusion or do you think it can be moved to 1016? Answer – I don’t know that it

would create confusion but the way I would apply it is equally to any portion that is open to the sky.

- I would agree that this is adding confusion.
- Also confused by the use of egress court.
- Rebuttal (support):
- N/A
- Rebuttal (Opposition):
- N/A
- Discussion:
- None
- **Motion:** For disapproval
- **Vote:** Vote passes (10 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstaining)

Hearing Adjourned at: 4:56 PM.