



## IBC/IEBC Committee Hearing Meeting Minutes #1

January 25, 2022

2 p.m. – 5 p.m.  
City and County of Denver

### 1. Roll Call and Introductions

- a. Stephen Rondinelli - Present
- b. Austin Reese - Present
- c. Aaron Tweedie - Present
- d. David Thorpe - Present
- e. Yvette Roman - Present
- f. Steve Thomas – Absent (Bill Clayton subbing)
- g. William (Bill) Clayton - Present
- h. Brian Parr - Absent
- i. Julie Brown - Present
- j. Paul Schultz - Present
- k. David Renn - Present
- l. Gary Moore - Absent
- m. Tony Caro - Present
- n. Juan Pasillas - Present
- o. David Carnicelli - Present
- p. Keith Peetz – Present

**Voting Members Present: 13**

### 2. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 2

- a. [#10](#): DBC-IBC 202
  - Support
  - N/A
  - Opposition
  - N/A
  - Committee Questions/Comments
  - First sentence end with parenthetical phrase. Would there be harm in deleting parenthesis?
    - No issue with eliminating parenthesis
  - Electric lock definition seems to have a couple requirements in the definition. Is there a better place for them instead of the definition?
  - Would it be better to have the definitions in the fire code 108.5.6?
    - Not opposed to having them in the fire code.
  - Support (Rebuttal)
  - N/A

- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Motion: To approve with the modification of removing the parenthetical phrase in “electric locks – master switch”.
- **Vote: Does not pass** (6 for, 7 against)
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion: To table. Item 11 uses one of the definitions. Propose to review all the propositions offered all at once.
- **Vote: Passed** (11 for, 0 against, 2 abstentions)

b. [#6](#): DBC-IBC Sleeping Room Definition

- Support
- N/A
- Opposition
- The definition is used by residential teams. Needing to have a space with a closet would leave open language and make it more difficult to implement.
- Committee Questions/Comments
- Don’t understand how having a closet adds to defining a space as a sleeping room.
- Definition of a sleeping room is not defined in any of the I-codes?
  - Only defined in the Denver amendment.
- Defining a sleeping room might have some unintended consequences if the term isn’t used as intended in each occurrence.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Motion: Motion to disapprove
- **Vote: Passed** (11 for, 0 against, 2 abstentions)

3. Discussion and voting on **IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 4**

a. [#11](#): DBC-IBC 403.5.3

- Motion: To table and hear together with 10,11,12,13,14
- Vote: Passed (10 for, 1 against, 2 abstentions)

b. [#21](#): DBC-IBC 420.12

- Support
- N/A
- Opposition
- N/A
- Committee Questions/Comments

- What do you presume the added cost to construction would be?
  - None. The requirements are already in the code. It is just a clarification.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Motion: To approve as written
- **Vote: Passed** – approved unanimously

#### 4. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 6

##### a. [#P18](#): DBC-IBC 602.4.2.2

- Support
- N/A
- Opposition
- N/A
- Committee Questions/Comments
- Comfortable that the code language they are putting in addresses the concerns. Comfortable with the amendment.
- Would it be better grammar to say “unlimited” instead of “limited...to 100%”
- Will lower the cost of construction for type 4B and will hopefully encourage this type of construction aligning with Denver’s climate goals.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Motion: To approve as written
- **Vote: Passed** unanimously

#### 5. Discussion and voting on IBC/DBC-IBC Chapter 7

##### a. [#83](#): DBC-IBC 703.2.3

- Support
- N/A
- Opposition
- N/A
- Committee Questions/Comments
- How does it differ from 104.11?
  - It’s the alternative materials section. The IBC one was

deleted.

- Is the change that we are making, deleting 104.11 and replacing with our own section?
  - Correct
- Support (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Motion: To approve as written
- **Vote: Passes** unanimously

b. [#84](#): DBC-IBC Table 705.8

- Support
- N/A
- Opposition
- N/A
- Committee Questions/Comments
- It's a simple change that does exactly what is intended.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Motion: To approve as submitted
- **Vote: Passed** unanimously

c. [#17](#): DBC-IBC 705.8.1

- Support
- The section is not designed for exposure protection.
- The amendment lessens the code below that of national safety.
- The Denver code should not be less restrictive than the IBC.
- Opposition
- N/A
- Committee Questions/Comments
- This provision went back into the 80's and allowed the development of downtown Denver. In the 90's it became a component of the code. Helped to stop fires from spreading through window openings. Not opposition, just explaining how it got there.
- What types of projects would not have happened without this?
  - Currently, outside of Denver, new buildings located near property lines.

- Support (Rebuttal)
- You can have existing buildings that can install water curtains and maintain the number of openings they have.
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Motion: To pass as written
- **Vote: Passed** unanimously

d. [#18](#): DBC-IBC 707.6

- Support
- This is something that we need right now. Fire dampers in shafts are illegal right now.
- Opposition
- N/A
- Committee Questions/Comments
- N/A
- Support (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Motion: To approve as written
- **Vote: Passed** unanimously

e. [#19](#): DBC-IBC 713.4

- Support
- N/A
- Opposition
- N/A
- Committee Questions/Comments
- N/A
- Support (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Motion: To approve as submitted
- **Vote: Passed** unanimously

f. [#20](#): DBC-IBC 713.5

- Support

- N/A
- Opposition
- N/A
- Committee Questions/Comments
- The more we have the Denver code aligned with international code, the easier it is as a consultant.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Motion: To adopt as stated
- **Vote: Passed** unanimously

**Meeting adjourned at 4:59 MT**