

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

TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 2026 – 1:30 P.M.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Amber Armstrong, Todd Booze, Anthony Faddis, Roger Gose, Matt Hayes, Mitchell Hort, Kyle Melson, Tyler Parette, and Chad Williams

ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Darryl Beebe (arrived at 1:38 p.m.) and Sam Day

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

Bradley Flatt, Chad Denson, Matthew Peacock, Mike Willson, and Mark Zitzow

ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Adan Chapa

OTHERS PRESENT:

David Adcock (OUBCC Staff), Kathy Hehnly (OUBCC Staff), Caitlin Redding Taylor (OUBCC Staff), Kilee Thomas (KOCO 5), Ben Anderson (KOCO 5), John Moore (City of Piedmont), and Anthony Reed (State Fire Marshall's Office)

VIRTUAL ATTENDEES:

Deanna Fields, Cindy Giedraitis, and Randy Plumlee

CALL TO ORDER AND RECORDING OF MEMBERS PRESENT AND ABSENT:

Ms. Amber Armstrong called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

CONFIRMATION OF ALTERNATES:

Ms. Hehnly confirmed after the roll call that Mr. Day was able to motion and vote as Mr. Peacock was absent.

ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Discussion and possible approval of the May 12, 2026, technical review committee meeting minutes

MR. TYLER PARETTE MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. MATT HAYES TO APPROVE THE MAY 12, 2026, TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

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

Legislative and Current Rules Update:

Mr. Adcock noted the agency's rules were passed on the last day of session and would go into effect on September 14, 2026, taking the agency from the 2018 to the 2024 I-codes. The committee briefly discussed the rulemaking process, that the commission was finishing up the review of the International Swimming Pool and Spa Code and which codes the commission would be reviewing next.

Discussion and possible action on Chapter 10 of the 2024 International Building Code® (IBC®) and International Fire Code® (IFC®)

Discussion and possible action on Proposed Code Change Form AHCDTC-7 on Section 1027.5 Location

Mr. Day explained his proposal dealt with adding two exceptions to the 10-foot exterior minimum fire separation distance for exit stairways. He noted the first exception addressed exit stairways that extended no higher than 15 feet above the level of exit discharge and allowed the separation to go from 10-feet to 2-feet. The second exception allowed buildings that were sprinkled according to Sections 903.3.1.1. or 903.3.1.2 to have exterior stairs with a minimum fire separation of 5-feet. He explained that exterior stairs offered both economic and social advantages and touched on the fact that they were often safer when trying to escape in a fire situation as there was not a concern with smoke accumulation which reduced fire-related deaths.

The committee discussed safety concerns related to the proposal as it would allow exterior stairways on the sides of buildings that did not open to a public way. Concern was expressed that occupants of a building with exterior stairways could become trapped in a narrow corridor due to the adjacent building being on fire; as heat, flames or the space being occupied by firefighters could prevent evacuation. It was also suggested that the buildings that met this proposal could also meet the requirements for a single staircase which could further inhibit the occupants from exiting the structure.

They discussed concerns that an adjacent building fire would impact the exterior stairway and sprinkler requirements for the stairway would not help with that impact; that structures built in the last 60 years if built to the property line would not have openings without a 2-hour fire rated

wall and there were not a lot of buildings grandfathered in that didn't meet that safety requirement; that a building with the exterior staircase would still be required to have emergency egress windows; and how to handle a situation where the exterior of the adjacent building catches fire – with the example of the Grenfell fire in England cited.

They discussed amending the proposal to clarify it could not be the only stair for the building; that it would be an infill lot so there would only be one stair; that exception 3 was not needed if the structure only had a single staircase; that the fire separation in the section was not the same fire separation for exterior walls – ideally the adjacent buildings would be 20 feet apart even on the same lot but was not the same – and the information was in the commentary. They discussed the definition of the fire separation and that the section did not reference the distance to the public way and was specific to the exit stairs that had to be protected from its own building. They discussed scenarios involving an R-2 building with a stoop with four steps that ended 2 feet off the property line and if by definition that would be an exit stairway; that the issue was about the exit access distance from the farthest point in the building to the exit discharge not the exit stairs; the definition of an exterior exit stairway; if the stoop would be part of the exit discharge; and that there would always be scenarios where there would be exceptions to the code. The committee discussed the exit staircase would need to be non-combustible as it was part of the exit system; that if it was in an apartment building and was an exit access staircase it may not need to be non-combustible; different occupant groups and how the change would affect them and if specific occupancies should be excluded from the exceptions; and the limitations for exterior exit stairways in the code.

The committee discussed the intent of the change seemed to be for R occupancy buildings but the unintended consequence of the change was that it could be utilized for any building other than an I-2 as presented, which went beyond the scope of the committee; if mixed use buildings fell within the scope of the committee; the need to rework the proposal, and what occupancy groups should be included in the proposal. At the end of the discussion the proposed change was temporarily tabled so that wording could be amended during a meeting break and addressed later in the meeting.

Discussion and possible action on Chapter 3 of the 2024 International Build Code® (IBC®), and Chapter 2 of the International Fire Code® (IFC®)

Discussion and possible action on Proposed Code Change Form AHCDTC-5 on adding a new Section R3901.1. entitled "Small Buildings and tenant spaces" in the IBC and adding a new Section [BG] 203.8.1 entitled "Small buildings and spaces" in the IFC and moving Sections [BG] 203.8.1 and [BG] 2083.8.2 TO [BG]203.8.2 and [BG] 203.8.3, respectively

Mr. Day explained his proposal followed the existing allowances for an A-2 occupancy use, if less than 50 occupants, to be moved down to a Group B occupancy and he wanted to mirror that for mercantile uses. He added that mercantile was one of the most restrictive uses in the code as it was thought of in an era of one with the most flammable merchandise stacked in warehouses and showrooms. He noted things have moved more to micro-retail, with small shops where large quantity items were bought on line and retail was more of "experience" shopping. He noted the

change would be applicable in smaller buildings with tiny 1000 sq foot retail shops that were currently in a restrictive use. He added if he wanted to build a structure with three stories, it had to be at least a type 5-A building and be sprinkled. He noted his change stated if it had less than 20 persons in the mercantile use it could be classified as a Group B using the same language that the code uses for A-2 uses to be classified with 50 occupants. He added it would allow small retail space to be accommodated in a two-story type 5-B building without fire suppression, assuming they didn't have any residential use. He noted it was not economically feasible to build a 2000 square foot building that had a small shop with a little office above it in the current code. He added that exterior walls under Group M with a fire separation distance less than 10 feet currently had to have a 2-hour fire rated wall, so pushing it down to Group B would allow a one-hour fire rated assembly.

The committee discussed the change was not related to residential structures which was outside of their specific scope; that while it was outside of the scope, it would be located within the same kind of walkable context of a lot of the affordable multifamily changes the committee was talking about; that the committee could make a recommendation and if the commission felt it was outside of their scope, they would let them know. They discussed if the context was putting homes above a small shop then it would be applicable, but modifying mercantile by itself, it would need to be submitted to the next committee looking at the IBC; that when everyone wanted to be in the same spot it was not affordable to build a one-story structure and people didn't want to live on the first floor in some areas; that the reason mercantile was a more restrictive category was due to the potential hazards stored within the structure and there was no technical justification for the change. They discussed there was no submitted studies on the change or any kind of analysis that proved the change would be safe, rather just a change to address a situation that had occurred in the past; that it was hard to build mixed use structures with a mercantile as it was so restrictive; the number of floors and what could be built with sprinklers and without; separation requirements; and that the national codes would probably address the scenario within the next 10 years or so.

There was further discussion on the advantages of moving the requirements to Group B such as building heights, less separation requirements, exterior firewall requirements; and that it would not be required to be sprinkled. They discussed the differences between the Type B and Type M requirements for building heights and sprinkler and fire separation distance requirements; and how the code picked business occupancies and that making one permissive over the other didn't make sense from a residential perspective. They discussed how the change would allow a residential structure over a motor fuel dispensing facility, and that it made more sense for the change to be proposed to the committee that reviewed the next IBC; accessory occupancies; and using the most restrictive requirement path in the code when there was more than one occupancy in a building related to the fire separation requirements. They discussed specific sites as examples of where the code change would be applicable; that it was for things like a grocery store or laundromat; storage of other types of materials for mercantile stores such as mattresses; protection of occupants; and the types of structures that exist where the change would be applicable.

MR. SAM DAY MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. MATT HAYES TO APPROVE AHCDTC-5

VOTING AYE:	Matt Hayes	Sam Day
VOTING NAY:	Amber Armstrong	Mitchell Hort
	Darryl Beebe	Kyle Melson
	Anthony Faddis	Chad Williams
	Roger Gose	
ABSTAIN:	Todd Booze	Tyler Parette
ABSENT:	Chad Denson	Mike Willson
	Bradley Flatt	Mark Zitzow
	Matthew Peacock	

Discussion and possible action on Chapter 10 of the 2024 International Building Code® (IBC®) and International Fire Code® (IFC®)

Discussion and possible action on Proposed Code Change Form AHCDTC-7 on Section 1027.5 Location

The committee reopened discussion on AHCDTC-7 and reviewed proposed modified language. They discussed modifying the first exception to add Group R-3 as well as Group R-2; if doing so would create a conflict as the first exception said the fire separation "shall have a minimum fire separation distance of 5 feet" and the second exception says it "may go to 2 feet" and that it created a conflict with Exception 1 for Group R-3 occupancies. There was further discussion on removing Group R-3 from exception 2 and changing the fire separation distance in the first exception to 2 feet; the differences between the terms "shall" and "may" and changing the wording to "shall" in both Exceptions 2 and 3; and that changing to "shall" would make the 2 feet the minimum requirement but the fire separation distance could be greater than that. Concern was expressed that 2 feet was not enough space and a recommendation was made to take it to 3 feet. There was discussion on the spacing requirements and the difference between how many steps made a stair or a stoop; and exit discharge requirements; the spacing needed between sides of buildings for exit discharge of occupants and accessibility for firefighters; and scenarios for exit discharge. The committee reviewed the code commentary for the section; the need for technical justification such as a study that would show the life safety impacts of the change; and exiting to the public way. At the end of the discussion the committee felt further modification was still needed and the proposal was tabled.

Call for any further discussion on Chapter 10 of the IBC and IFC

There was no further discussion on Chapter 10.

Approval of Chapter 10 of the IBC® and IFC®

Approval of the Chapter was tabled until proposal AHCDTC-7 was addressed.

Discussion and possible action on Proposed Code Change Form AHCDTC-2 R1 on Section 310.4 Residential Group R-3 in the IBC and Section [BG] 203.9.3 Residential Group R-3 in the IFC

Mr. Day explained the change allowed NFPA 13D sprinkler systems and changed the number of dwelling units from 12 to 8 units at Mike Wilson's request.

MR. TODD BOOZE MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. MATT HAYS TO APPROVE AHCDTC-2 R1 (REVISION 1)

VOTING AYE:	Todd Booze Sam Day Anthony Faddis Roger Gose	Matt Hayes Mitchell Hort Tyler Parette
VOTING NAY:	Amber Armstrong	Darryl Beebe
ABSTAIN:	Kyle Melson	Chad Williams
ABSENT:	Chad Denson Bradley Flatt Matthew Peacock	Mike Willson Mark Zitzow

Call for any further discussion on Chapter 3 of the IBC® and Chapter 2 of the IFC®

There was no further discussion on either of the chapters.

Discussion and possible action on Chapter 3 of the IBC® and Chapter 2 of the IFC®

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

Discussion on modifications made by other states or other articles and information related to affordable housing and consolidated dwellings.

Ms. Armstrong noted the articles had been on the agenda for some time and asked if there was anything anyone wanted to discuss regarding them. Mr. Day encouraged everyone to read the Pew Charitable Trust article entitled "Modern Multifamily Buildings Provide the Most Fire Protection."

Discussion and possible assignments of tasks for the next committee meeting

1. Mr. Faddis noted he had some costs regarding 2-hour fire rated walls – area separation walls and would have them at the next meeting. Ms. Armstrong asked if he could include the type of assembly he used in his report.
2. Ms. Armstrong asked if anyone had any information on what other jurisdictions are allowing. Mr. Parette noted he touched on that in his Housing Forward briefing.
3. If there was any information on any failures due to fires. No one had any information on this item.

4. Insurance information. No one had any information on this item.
5. Fire Marshal Presentations. Ms. Armstrong noted there had been two presentations.
6. Status of ICC ad-hoc committee – study on the issue. Ms. Armstrong noted she had reached out to ask where they were on their study and she did not have any response other than to check the ICC website. She added she had not checked the website before the meeting. She noted the last she heard, they had commissioned some research studies and were waiting for those to be completed.

The committee discussed with Ms. Hehnlly their future meeting schedule and the timeline for presenting the presentation to the commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There were no public comments.

ADJOURNMENT: (3:52 P.M.)

MR. DARRYL BEBBE MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. MATT HAYS TO ADJOURN

VOTING AYE:	Amber Armstrong	Matt Hayes
	Todd Booze	Mitchell Hort
	Sam Day	Kyle Melson
	Anthony Faddis	Tyler Parette
	Roger Gose	Chad Williams

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT:	Chad Denson	Mike Willson
	Bradley Flatt	Mark Zitzow
	Matthew Peacock	

Minutes approved in the regular meeting on the 13th day of July 2026.

AMBER ARMSTRONG

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

PREPARED BY: KATHY HEHNLly

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

Official Copy: Original with signatures in office file.