IRC Committee Hearing # 3 Minutes
April 19, 2022
2 p.m. – 5 p.m.
City and County of Denver

1. Roll Call -

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

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