1. Roll Call – Quorum achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>In Attendance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hanlon</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lawrence Berton</td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Wisniewski</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Jacobs</td>
<td></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. #P24.6 IRC R702.7 - Vapor retarders
   - Support
     - Nathan Skrdla: Sets it up for our climate zone and makes the most sense for Denver
   - Opposition
     - N/A
   - Committee Questions
     - N/A
   - Committee Comments
     - Kate H: Motion to approve as modified. Austin seconds.
   - Motion: Motion to approve as modified
   - Vote: Passes (5 for, 0 against, 1 abstentions)

b. #18 IRC R302.1 FSD for gutters
   - Support
     - N/A
   - Opposition
c. **#79b** IRC R331 - Low-volatile organic compound (VOC) materials

- **Support**
  - N/A
- **Opposition**
  - N/A
- **Committee Questions/Comments**
  - Paul W: Why did this get shot down in IBC?
    - Kristen: Language was confusing so we cleaned it up for clarity. And the CDPH is a common reference standard used in LEED.
    - Austin K: For the CA standard, and we link to an outside standard and it changes, how does it impact if that changes?
      - Shaunna: Normally if you reference the standard as an addition you can add a date so that it is specific and it can be updated. The dates would be in Ch 44, not in the code language.
      - Kristen: We will want the most recent standard of Green Seal or Greenguard.
- **Support (Rebuttal)**
  - N/A
- **Opposition (Rebuttal)**
  - N/A
- **Motion**: Include modification to reference standard years. Motion to approve as modified.
- **Vote**: **PASSES** (4 for, 2 against, 0 abstentions)
d. **#13** IRC R403.1.4.1 Frost protection

- **Support**
  - N/A
- **Opposition**
  - N/A
- **Committee Questions/Comments**
  - Austin K: Is the frost line always 36 inches in Denver? If yes can we just call that out?
    - Glenn: Yes, it is a typical of a model code but we could include it.
- **Support (Rebuttal)**
  - N/A
- **Opposition (Rebuttal)**
  - N/A
- **Motion**: Add “frost line of 36” instead of table reference. Motion to approve as modified
- **Vote: Passed** (6 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

e. **#19** IRC R403.1.4.1 Frost protection

- **Support**
- **Opposition**
  - N/A
- **Committee Questions/Comments**
  - Austin: Why does it matter if it is a one pour rather than two?
    - Glenn: Risk of failure
- **Support (Rebuttal)**
  - N/A
- **Opposition (Rebuttal)**
  - N/A
- **Motion**: Motion to as submitted
- **Vote: PASSES** (5 for, 1 against, 0 abstentions)
f. **IRC R311.7 Stairway exception**

- **Support**
  - N/A
- **Opposition**
  - N/A
- **Committee Questions**
  - Kate: This is only stairways have something to do with egress?
    - Glenn: This would now apply to any stairway on the property.
  - Kate: Yes Denver is a more urban environment, but not everywhere. If any existing resident decides to add an addition, would they have to bring their other stairs on the property?
    - Glenn: No this is only newly construction stairways on the property.
  - Paul: This appears to point to non-habitable areas, do the pull down stairs from an attic need to be full stairs in that case
    - Glenn: It would not need to be full stairs from non-habitable stairways.
  - Austin: Would this change anything in historic homes? (Butler stairs, etc. or modifications to the historic character
    - Glenn: Not addressed in model code, and it is not affected by this proposal.

- **Support (Rebuttal)**
  - N/A
- **Opposition (Rebuttal)**
  - N/A
- **Motion**: Motion to disapprove due to this taking away discretion from landscape designer and architect seen as a use for a nicer environment with landings.
  - Casey: This will cause confusion and too strict on mandating on the
requirements for places it can be extended to the backyards.

- **Vote:** PASSED FOR DISAPPROVAL (5 for, 0 against, 1 abstentions)

---

g. **#P35** IRC R327 pool barrier
   - **Support**
     - N/A
   - **Opposition**
     - N/A
   - **Committee Questions/Comments**
     - N/A
   - **Motion:** Motion to approve as submitted
   - **Vote:** PASSED (5 for, 1 against, 0 abstentions)

---

h. **#13** IRC R401.4 Soil report policy into code
   - **Support**
     - N/A
   - **Opposition**
     - N/A
   - **Committee Questions/Comments**
     - N/A
   - **Motion:** Motion to Approve as Submitted
   - **Vote:** PASSED (5 for, 1 against, 0 abstentions)