

**IRC Committee Hearing # 3 Minutes**

April 19, 2022

2 p.m. – 5 p.m.

City and County of Denver

**1. Roll Call -**

<b>Committee Members</b>	<b>In Attendance?</b>
Mark Hanlon	X
David Lawrence Berton	X
Austin Krcmarik	X
Kate Hilberg	X
Mikaela Firnhaber	X
Paul Wisniewski	X
Brian Jacobs	X
Casey Vesque	X
Robert Pruett	X

**2. Discussion and voting on IRC**

a. [#12](#) IRC AF101 - Radon appendix

- Public Support/Opposition – N/A
- Committee Questions:
  - Mikaela: Why use a percent rather than a square footage in AF101.1 #4? Need to consider an equitable solution.
    - James: Faced this issue quite a bit currently and discussed with 3 national experts. Not sufficient data/research/language to justify a given number. It does address statistically the effort to control a percentage of radon that may be getting into the dwelling unit that is much closer to the EPA’s recommended value. A square footage is not always equal to that value.
- Committee Discussion:
  - Mikaela: Do any other committee members have a similar concern of the percentage?
    - Kate: It would be better if there was just a single number that would apply across all projects.

- Casey: Same, a number of sqft would be better for equity. Should we maybe add 200 sqft instead.
- Mikaela: I suggest 300 sqft. It was in discussion with James Sobey and what the national experts recommended and stated that 200 sqft is too restrictive.
- Motion to Approve as modified
  - Shaunna: Need to update comma structure to include the correct intent
  - Robert: Do we need to include all storage, living or utility spaces? Or just reference the addition? Fewer words the better.
    - Yes but definition would be helpful for clarity.
  - Motion approved (8 yes, 1 no, 0 abstaining)
    - Glenn and Shaunna to fix comma structure.

b. [#20](#) IRC R101.2 Scope

- Public Support or Opposition – N/A
- Committee Questions:
  - Mark – Would like to clarify if R313 is deleted.
    - Yes- deleted and replaced in it's entirety
- Motion to approve as submitted
  - Approved (6 yes, 1 no, 0)

c. [#21](#) Appendix AJ

- Public support:
  - Jennifer Cappeto- Worked on this code amendment to allow greater flexibility for historic buildings and increase the sustainability of historic buildings by reducing what goes into a landfill.
  - James Sobey- Would like to address the acute need for this in residential permit submittals. Denver has unique situations that this would help clarify.
- Committee Questions:

- Paul: Can we take a 10-minute break to review the language?
  - Yes
- Robert: Section 108811- It has three or more risers, but when you build something new it is four risers?
  - Mikaela – Language is that way in the IBC, but it makes sense that it should be 4 for IRC
- Motion to modify to four or more risers throughout document.
  - Robert: On 104.8.4 and 104.8.3.1- what about when we do a change of occupancy.
    - It would have to comply with the base code
  - Motion to approve as modified (8 yes, 1 no, 0 abstentions)

d. [#22](#) Ch 2- Definition

- Shaunna: Is this intended to be and/or?
  - Yes
- Glenn: Hallway would be more fitting based on IRC language.
  - Agreed
- Committee Questions:
  - Paul: Does it have to be 48 inches?
    - Yes, to specify that it is a door, not just something that is propped up
  - David: Why are we going to 48 inches instead of 36?
    - To clarify what is needed to clarify 1 verses 2 dwelling units
    - Glenn: When you're looking at natural light and ventilation, there is a requirement that there need to create a space for 25sqft, that is a purpose of this proposal.
  - Shaunna: Why is non-separated in there?
    - Mikaela: Adds language to convey what we are trying to get across
- Motion to approve as modified
  - Approved (8 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain)

**Meeting Adjourned at 3:32pm**