

OKLAHOMA UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION

AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONSOLIDATED DWELLINGS TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM

2401 NW 23RD STREET, SUITE 82

OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73107

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 2026 – 1:30 P.M.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Amber Armstrong, Todd Booze, Chad Denson, Bradley Flatt, Roger Gose (arrived at 1:36 p.m.), Tyler Parette, Matthew Peacock, Chad Williams (left at 3:30 p.m.), Mike Willson, and Mark Zitzow

ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Adan Chapa and Sam Day

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

Anthony Faddis, Matt Hayes, Mitchell Hort, and Kyle Melson

ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Darryl Beebe

OTHERS PRESENT:

David Adcock (OUBCC Staff), Kathy Hehnly (OUBCC Staff), and Caitlin Redding Taylor (OUBCC Staff), and Chad Nash (Johnson Controls Fire Protection)

VIRTUAL ATTENDEES:

Cindy Giedraitis, Catherine Brown, and Spencer Wilson

CALL TO ORDER AND RECORDING OF MEMBERS PRESENT AND ABSENT:

Ms. Amber Armstrong called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m. and requested the roll be called.

CONFIRMATION OF ALTERNATES

Ms. Hehnly confirmed after the roll call that Mr. Chapa could not motion and vote but Mr. Day was able to motion and vote as Mr. Hayes was absent from the meeting.

ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Discussion and possible approval of the March 2, 2026, technical review committee meeting minutes

Ms. Armstrong noted she had found a few grammatical errors that did not change the intent of the minutes that she had given Ms. Hehnly to correct.

MR. BRADLEY FLATT MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. MATTHEW PEACOCK TO APPROVE THE MARCH 2, 2026, TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES AS AMENDED TO CORRECT GRAMMATICAL ERRORS

VOTING AYE:	Amber Armstrong Todd Booze Sam Day Chad Denson Bradley Flatt	Roger Gose Tyler Parette Matthew Peacock Chad Williams Mike Willson
VOTING NAY:	None	
ABSTAIN:	Mark Zitzow	
ABSENT:	Anthony Faddis Matt Hayes	Mitchell Hort Kyle Melson

Presentation by Chad Nash with Johnson Controls on differences in sprinkler systems:

Mr. Nash thanked the committee for inviting him to speak noting he was a representative of Johnson Controls in Oklahoma City and prior to that was a fire protection specialist for the City of Edmond who conducted plan reviews and inspections for them. He noted the purpose of his presentation was to discuss the key technical and life safety differences between the NFPA 13R and NFPA 13D sprinkler systems. He explained the following in his presentation:

- The primary objectives of both the 13D and 13R systems; the types of structures each system was originally designed for and the number of sprinkler heads required in each system along with where those sprinkler heads were to be located.
- The 13R system was more robust and covered more common areas where multiple people would egress through and that it was designed to be a bridge between the 13D and a full NFPA 13 sprinkler system.
- The differences in water supply duration times.

There was some discussion on the different types of water supply that could be utilized with the systems, such as municipal water; wells, storage tanks; on control valves and how those were integrated into the systems to shut off the water supply; firefighter expectations on waterflow and reliance when sprinklers are known to be present and working during a fire; tamper switches on valves; differences between water pressure and timing in rural and urban areas of the state; and that all three were designed to keep fires from spreading vertically.

- The 13D system was to provide the minimum level of safety in a single-family home or duplex at the most cost-effective manner based on conducted studies.

There was discussion that there were a few triplexes and four-plexes in Edmond with 13D systems and whether Mr. Nash was aware of any 13D system failures that caused a loss of life when they were utilized in anything other than a one- or two-family home or town home. Mr. Nash was not aware of any but stated he would check on that and get back to the committee. The committee discussed the recent changes to the IRC in the 2024 codes that removed the requirements for townhomes to have fire sprinkler systems; as long as

they had a two-hour firewall and how the code defined a townhouse. They discussed there were three types of fire prevention; passive fire protection; fire suppression and fire detention and all three worked together to make for the safest building possible.

Further discussion addressed the current code provisions related to duplexes and one- and two-hour fire-resistance-rated walls, as well as several projects currently underway in Oklahoma. It was noted that duplex units could be stacked, and that National Fire Protection Association was evaluating whether the 13R sprinkler system could be applied to multifamily developments containing up to 8 units. Concerns were expressed that sprinkler requirements would be removed entirely at the risk of both residents and firefighters; there was discussion that the codes were ever evolving and there was a lot unknown regarding the proposals before the committee; and examples of different types of construction and how the sprinkler systems could be designed in them. There was further discussion on sprinkler types such as dry barrel sprinkler heads, hard pipe and flexible pipe; and the costs associated with them. At the end of the discussion, Mr. Nash resumed his presentation.

- That the requirements for inspections; research showed lack of maintenance accounted for only about 3 percent of failures; that it was usually because the system was turned off; and reasons for why systems were turned off.

There was discussion on designs of 6 and 8 cluster layouts; costs per square foot for the 13D and 13R systems; tap fees; impact fees; overall costs for sprinkler systems; shut off valves; what happened when water was turned off; backflow preventer requirements; and the possibility of requiring monitoring for 13D systems when used in multifamily designs. There was further discussion on the cost of monitoring for both smoke alarms and sprinkler systems. There was some discussion that it would cost \$45,000 for the lifecycle of one four-plex and the methodology utilized to reach that figure. There was further discussion that requiring monitoring would increase the cost of rent and the committee need to focus on affordable housing. Concern was expressed that while the committee was talking about affordability there were things that could be discussed other than placing the safety of the general public at risk; that all the things proposed so far lowered safety standards and were not about things that could really affect affordability, that there were corners cut in new construction that drove prices higher down the road. At the end of the discussion Mr. Nash continued his presentation.

- That the 13D system was homeowner driven just like other appliances such as HVAC drain or hot water tank; that the 13R system required periodic inspections; issues often found with 13R systems sprinklers that were painted over; fire response times; and the 13D system lacked operational controls and depended on homeowners' awareness and is not accepted by dozens of people sharing a building. He concluded by stating supervision, inspection and system durability were the three big things on a sprinkler system for the lifespan to make sure it does what is needed if there was a fire.

There was a question and discussion period that touched on how the 13D system could be turned off; the backflow valves and how they were often held with a zip tie to keep them on; if there should be signage requirements for them; that backflow preventors were to protect the city water systems; different system types that could be utilized; and that it was easier to turn off a 13D system as they were not monitored. They discussed circulating systems and what was required by most jurisdictions related to them; looking beyond just Oklahoma for data regarding the statistics related to the differences in the two sprinkler types and failures; and more detailed costs differences between the two systems including the costs over a certain volume of units. They talked about the cost differences of 13R systems for two units verses 60 units; and that in a 4-unit scenario with a 13D system each unit would need a backflow preventor as if it was only in one unit and the water was turned off in that one, then there would be no water in all of them. At the end of the discussion, the committee thanked Mr. Nash for his presentation.

Discussion and possible action on Chapters 1 and 3 of the 2024 International Residential Code® (IRC®)

Discussion and possible action on Proposed Code Change Form AHCDTC-4 on Sections R101.2, R302.3 and R309

Mr. Parette stated he submitted the proposed change to address consolidated buildings, noting he pulled the language from changes made primarily in North Carolina and Dallas. He reviewed the proposed changes in Chapters 1 and 3.

Sprinkler System

- **Single Stair Exits and Fire Separation**
The committee discussed requiring two-hour fire separation between the units and when they were required between dwelling units.
- **Life Safety**
They discussed that smoke alarms saved people, and the code required smoke detectors to be hard-wired.
- **Current Building Practices**
The committee discussed how the cities permitted for one- and two-family dwellings; the 2024 codes and where in the state adoption process they were and when they could go into effect; that the proposed change was limited to four units but it would allow the units to be built in a vertical configuration rather than just horizontal; and that other states had made the same change. The committee discussed the language in the 2024 IRC related to mixed use structures that pointed to the IBC; and that most residential builders were not used to spending time reviewing the IBC.
- **Action**
The committee discussed requiring some kind of monitoring even if it was something included in with a burglar system; if a smoke alarm could be monitored and if that would be acceptable rather than a sprinkler system; if putting the change in the IRC was the right approach because the IRC didn't address language from Section 1027 of the IBC; Type A, B or C units; and when the requirements for the different unit types kicked in based on

the number of units in the structure. Concern was also expressed that the IRC did not address common areas; and that the IRC allowed for a change in riser heights at the top and bottom risers of a stair.

There was some discussion about modifying the proposal to point to the accessibility requirements in the IBC; when the changes from the committee would make it into the code; and approving the change with an amendment as part of the motion.

- **Jurisdiction Enforcement**

They discussed that cellular communication requirements added to the code would be tricky to enforce as they related to the proposals for different options of monitoring; other enforcement difficulties with monitoring of smoke detectors; and what would happen when the home was sold to a new owner who didn't want to pay for monitoring. There was further discussion on what entity would be notified in a reporting situation such as the homeowner, an emergency contact, or emergency services; if there was a way to clarify the proposed change could only be utilized in an urbanized area serviced by a municipal water supply; and ways to write an exception to the section for areas that did not have municipal water services that required approval for use of the section by the code official.

Mr. Parette began to make a motion, however there was some concern with the word proposed as some felt it was subjective. The committee discussed that the proposed change did not limit the size of individual units and considered additional options for rewriting the amendment language. At the end of the discussion, the committee determined it would be better to amend the proposal rather than making a motion amending the proposal and the form was tabled.

Call for any further discussion on Chapters 1 and 3 of the 2024 IRC

No further action was taken.

Approval of Chapters 1 and 3 of the IRC®

No further action was taken.

Discussion and possible action on Chapter 7 of the 2024 International Building Code® (IBC)

Discussion and possible action on Proposed Code Change Form AHCDTC-6 on Table 705.9 Maximum Area of Exterior Wall Openings Based on Fire Separation Distance and Degree of Opening Protection

Mr. Day explained the IBC had strict requirements on fire separation related to unprotected openings. If he had a building within 5 feet of another lot, he could not have any unprotected openings with windows on that side of the building, adding if the space was between 5 and 10 feet, he could have approximately 10 percent of the wall be windows. He noted when talking about infill units it can be hard to build a multi-use structure with adjacent lots and stay 10 feet away from other buildings on all sides of the lots to provide windows. The building code provided exemptions if the building was sprinkled but only to a full commercial NFPA 13 system. He was proposing that there be an exemption if the structure was sprinkled with an NFPA 13R system.

He noted there were very few cases of fire death in sprinkled buildings; and that in his proposal it changed the unprotected windows from 10 percent to 25 percent when the space between buildings was between 5 and 10 feet. Mr. Day noted the extra windows helped with building design and quality of life with bringing light to the units. He provided some statistical data related to residential structural fires. He noted the International Residential Code allowed windows within 3 feet of the property line in R-3 homes with no sprinklers.

- Cost

The committee discussed that adding windows would increase construction costs but could still support affordability by improving livability in smaller multi-unit housing, thereby encouraging a shift away from one- and two-family homes and contributing to lower overall rental costs in the area.

- Sprinkler System

The committee discussed the intended occupancy classification for the buildings that the change would apply to would be R-1 and R-2 utilizing NFPA 13R.

- Life Safety

They discussed concerns with areas in the structure that would not be required to be sprinkled with a 13R system and that the change could increase the amount of fire spread.

- Current Building Practices

The committee noted that when discussing openings, they were really talking about windows; and fire caulking.

- Action

There was discussion that the change was editing a footnote to a table; and on possible ways to amend the change.

- Structure Design

The committee discussed that adding more windows allowed for better design options for where bedrooms could be located with the required emergency egress windows, which could otherwise only be in the front or back of the property due to the smaller infill lot lines. There was further discussion on ventilation requirements and when the change was made in the IRC to require mechanical ventilation and not allow natural ventilation; concern with allowing the change for Group I occupancies; and the projection requirements in the IRC.

- Amending Proposal

While Mr. Day worked on an amendment to his proposal the committee discussed ICC was looking at the single-stair issue and would be taking a vote on it later in the month. Once that vote was taken information would be sent out to the committee with an update on what changes ICC approved for the next code update related to it. They discussed how to look at the code change proposals on ICC's website.

Mr. Day proposed language to modify the change as follows: "up, s = unprotected openings in buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or buildings equipped with an automatic sprinkler

system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.2 where all unprotected openings over 144 square inches are in sprinkled rooms."

Concern was expressed regarding exhaust vents between the interstitial space between floors falling within the language; the need to clarify the language; as the way it read there was the possibility that someone could interpret the language to allow 75 percent of the wall to have little openings as people tried to game the system; and that the intent was to make it so any opening over one square foot had to be protected. At the end of the discussion the committee determined it would be better to amend the proposal rather than creating a motion amending the proposal and the form was tabled.

Call for any further discussion on Chapter 7 of the IBC

No further action was taken.

Approval of Chapter 7 of the IBC®

No further action was taken.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There were no public comments.

ADJOURNMENT: (4:12 P.M.)

MR. MARK ZITZOW MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. MATTHEW PEACOCK TO ADJOURN

VOTING AYE:	Amber Armstrong	Tyler Parette
	Todd Booze	Matthew Peacock
	Sam Day	Chad Williams
	Chad Denson	Mike Willson
	Bradley Flatt	Mark Zitzow
	Roger Gose	

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT:	Anthony Faddis	Mitchell Hort
	Matt Hayes	Kyle Melson

Minutes approved in the regular meeting on the 12 day of May, 2026.

AMBER ARMSTRONG
Amber Armstrong, Chair
Affordable Housing Consolidated Dwellings Technical
Code Review Committee

PREPARED BY: KATHY HEHNLY

Kathy Hehnly, Affordable Housing Consolidated Dwellings Technical Code Review Committee
Secretary

Official Copy: Original with signatures in agency file.