IFC Committee Hearing Agenda
May 21, 2019 2pm-5pm
City and County of Denver, Room 4i5

1. Roll Call and Introductions

2. Discussion and voting on Staff Block Vote packaged proposals
   (All proposals that are marked with an X on the summary spreadsheet)
   
   F38, F66, F67 AS
   
   F68 Pulled from Block Vote
   Moved Remainder of Block Vote to next IFC Hearing.

3. Discussion and voting on Chapter 1 Administrative Provisions of IFC and/or DBC-IFC
   a. P136: DBC-IFC Section 105.7.2 AS 11-2 (1 recuse)
   b. F33: DBC-IFC Section 105.7.8.1 AM 13-0
   c. P107/P151: DBC-IFC Section 105.7.8.1 AS 13-0
   d. P137: DBC-IFC Section 105.7.10 AM 13-0
   e. P138: DBC-IFC Section 105.7.11 AS 10-0
   f. P135: DBC-IFC Section 105.7.26 AM 10-0
   g. P139: DBC-IFC Section 105.7.27 Tabled until June 11th

4. Discussion and voting on Chapter 2 Definitions for DBC-IFC and/or IFC
   a. Chapter 2 summary spreadsheet (not published)
      Pull out Haz Mat and Powered Industrial Truck
      Haz Mat D 10-0
      Powered Industrial Truck AM 10-0
      AS for the rest of Chapter 2 changes. 10-0

      Next Hearing will start with Block Vote and then go in to P139 then on to Chapter 3.

5. Discussion and voting on Chapter 3 of DBC-IFC and/or IFC
   a. F70: IFC Section 319.8.1
   b. F71: IFC Section 319.8.2
   c. F72: IFC Section 319.8.4
   d. F73: IFC Section 319.9
   e. F74: IFC Section 319.10.1
   f. F75: IFC Section 319.10.2
   g. F76: IFC Section 319.10.3
   h. #346: DBC-IFC Section 311.1.1

6. Discussion and voting on Chapter 4 for DBC-IFC and/or IFC
   a. F34: DBC-IFC Section 401.3.2
   b. F35: DBC-IFC Section 401.3.3
   c. F36: DBC-IFC Section 401.3.4

7. Discussion and voting on Chapter 5 for DBC-IFC and/or IFC
   a. F121: DBC-IFC Section 503.2.1
   b. F122: IFC Section 503.3
   c. F126: DBC-IFC Section 505.1
   d. F3: IFC Section 507.5.4
   e. F4: IFC Section 507.5.5
   f. F88: DBC-IFC Section 510.2.1
   g. F132: DBC-IFC Section 510.2.1.2
Please note that any items that we do not get to in this hearing will be automatically transferred to the next scheduled hearing date and will be the first items on the agenda for that hearing.

Proposal # F38 (Block Vote Item)
Add reference to existing language directing reader to main conveyance section of the amendments.
Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # F67 (Block Vote Item)
Editorial Change to section number. The 2015/2016 amended 304.3 list should have included 304.3.7. This update corrects that error.
Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # F68 (Block Vote Item) Pulled for individual agenda.
Committee felt this needed to be pulled to put limits on it.
Adding Exception 5 for Open Flame Cooking Devices.

Proposal # F69 (Block Vote Item)
Committee ok with this one.
The 2018 IFC added Section 319 Mobile Food Preparation Vehicles. DFD Mobile Food Vendor policy has specific portable fire extinguisher requirements that I am proposing be inserted into the amendments.

Motion to Table Block Vote to next IFC hearing. Passes 13-0

Proposal # P136
Public Testimony in Support: This is a series of proposals, code doesn’t well define maintenance, contractors. It is difficult to determine when they need maintenance. Proposals help to further clarify

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. It says less than 3 what duration are we talking about?
   a. When I wrote it, I was thinking instantaneous? Typically, we have 1 sprinkler out and contractors call for assistance. If we have more than 2, we would need to take a deeper look. When you do your annual, do they observe it?
      i. Yes

2. Should it be less than 1 per calendar year?
   a. Change gages every 5 years. Need some sort of more specific duration.

3. There’s language in the charging paragraph that is struck out, but it is not replaced. Exception 3, is that replaced elsewhere?
   a. Refers to a policy never published. 2 applicable sections 105.1.5 talks about repairs, but it excludes sprinkler systems repair. 108 talks about maintenance but is very vague.

Committee Discussion:
The number of 3 only applies to the leaky sprinklers.
Issue seems to be replacement, just replace the wording replacement with like for like. Cheap insurance to have like for like to require permits.

*Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)*
*Final Motion: As Submitted (AS)*
*Final Vote: AS Passes 11-2*

*Additional staff or committee comments for the record:*

Proposal # F33

**Public Testimony in Support:** The purpose of this new amendment is to provide more accurate permit tracking. There is currently no process requiring contractors to provide notification that the permitted scope of work has been completed.

*Original Motion: Disapprove (D)* Not necessary, it’s an operational issue.

*Public Testimony in Opposition: None*

*Questions from the Committee to Proponent:*

1. Do all inspections get sent in?
   a. Yes, Installation, Operation, Modification or Removal of. Make the best but we have to halt due to the need to resubmit for permit.

2. Why is this different than any other permit?
   a. On an elevator permit they would not have to call for final inspection for CO with other permits they do.

*Committee Discussion:*

When we accept an alteration or modification; we do send in permits to Denver Fire. Once permit is picked up another contractor can pick up and finish the work. Been an issue with another contractor taking over after permitting.

It should all relate back to conveyance number.

Creates confusion as to who is really closing out the permit. Permit could stay open indefinitely.

There is another proposal to address the closing out of the permit.

Language is not clean.

DFD issues all the elevators, third party does the inspection.

Problem is they are not closing the loop by calling a 3rd party in to complete the work. Permit is never closed out. And then when there’s a problem they need to track down the contractor to try to weed through it. This closes the loop hole.

*Motion to Table:* Table until after next proposal, same title and same subsection. Speaks to the current conversation. Approved 13-0

Proposal # P107

The purpose for the addition of this amendment is to provide language placing the responsibility on a conveyance contractor to verify they have completed the scope of work encompassed by the
issued permit to the specifications and code requirements of the permit. There is currently no such requirement.

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:

1. Who is deemed the responsible party? When Russ pulls permit, is he the responsible party or is the building owner the responsible party? Who would this fall on?
   a. Contractor that pulls the permit should be the responsible party. That permit is closed out properly so you can move forward.
   b. Could be contractors admin.

2. Would this be reconciled at the end of the year annual inspection?
   a. No, it’s possible work may or may not have been completed by then. Depending on type of alteration, CO may be held back, or they may need a new one depending on changes made. Doesn’t nullify their current scope.

3. Responsible party is the licensed contractor correct?
   a. Yes

4. Someone starts but doesn’t call for final inspection, how is that section put in to code language that you have obligation to call?
   a. Obligation is to show us the status of the permit so we can close out and not let them fall through the cracks.

5. Why will tracking change with this proposal? Obligation?
   a. Right now, we are not tracking at all, pull permit from authority expectation is it be inspected by a 3rd party, could be elevator didn’t request inspection, trying to get education out there so these are inspected, and reports submitted. Trying to close the loophole so these are inspected and properly closed out. Put the responsibility on someone.

6. Wouldn’t it be better coming from the inspector?
   a. We may not know and building owner may not even know who is doing the inspection. Putting it on their shoulder.

7. Tie permit to elevator conveyance number? When annual renewal comes due, you have to come back with the report to close out permit. When we have annuals done and we talk to inspector, who is sending info to fire department? Building owner says they are, but there is no way to track. Manipulate the language to include all parties.
   a. Yes, there could be a way for us to double check. Building owners have to work with contractor that pulled the permit, Inspector required to submit his inspection report to us. The way the State gears toward building owner. Like idea of putting it on inspector, State hasn’t done that so not sure if we have authority.

8. When scope of work has begun prior to permit…. Seems wording is contradictory, Work that fails to begin prior to expiration. if they begin prior it doesn’t cover that?
   a. If work has begun but hasn’t been finished prior to expiration date someone has to notify DF once work is complete. If it hasn’t started prior to permit issued has to apply for extension. Loop hole in the language.

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

Committee Discussion:
In the event that a building owner calls in saying that they have replaced jack asking if they can get permit so it can be closed out. No one was called out to do inspection, got turned over now a mess. Not always 3rd party inspector that gets called in. Burden should be on elevator owner.

If they start but can’t finished prior to expiration date they have to notify and apply for extension.
If they start the day before they can still utilize their permit. Rather they pull for what they are working on. Some contractors say they pull all permits and never started work.

2 purposes 1. trying to give ownness to elevator operators to get and close permits 2. Follow permit procedures. Those are already defined. X number of rules for permits. 2nd half is a duplication of what is already in the code.

Outlined in state conveyance code not sure we need duplication.

**Modification #1:** Delete “by a responsible party” remove duplication and confusion.

Based on previous one someone can start, and another can finish. Responsible party states whoever pulls permit isn’t necessarily who finishes it.

Permits transferrable for elevator conveyances. No that is not permitted. Permits are not transferrable. Should not be happening.

Is this last section already included in our amendments? Don’t know if city ordinance can trump state law. Technically it’s just repeating what the state says.

Is language necessary is what the committee is discussing.

**Motion A/S Rob – Motion to Amend- 2nd Masoud,**

**Modification #2:** Deletion of first sentence – Deletion of last part.

**Support:** The reason behind it is that those permits pulled by Elevator Contractors then the city doesn’t get notified that these inspections are completed and closed out. On alterations those fall through the cracks. Issued permit but building owner changes their mind. Don’t get close out inspection report. Trying to keep responsible party

**Opposition:**

**Final Motion: Modification Vote 12-0 Passes as Modified (AM)**

**Final Vote: 12-0 Passes AM**

**Additional staff or committee comments for the record:**

**Proposal # F33 (Previously tabled item)**

**Motion: Disapproved (D)**

**Final Vote:** Disapproval Passes 9-3

Motion to bring back to the floor and modify.

**Committee Discussion:**

The modification proposed strikes the first 2 sentences of proposal, already captured in proposal we just approved. We need to retain the last portion “if for any reason” Pertinent that change of contractor be included. Unless committee feels it covered elsewhere in fire code.

Person who holds permit, it’s to that contractor. Owner would have to have a new sub-contractor take over permit.

It works the same way as what the city has. I already struggle to get them to read the fire code and
Denver code. Agree with committee about not being redundant, but this would funnel them to one area for better understanding. Gives one place to point them to, one reference point.

First 2 sentences confuse the whole proposal. Suggest removing original permit applicant. Should be original applicant.

Building owner perspective if I have to go in an apply for new permit as well as wait for permit approval. Contractor went south and I’m trying to determine how to get it done quickly, this process will kill us.

When they change contractor the scope of work could then change and require a new permit. Dealing with this industry it can change and this keeps everyone on same task.

With conveyance so many different permits. It breaks the code infrastructure when we change it up for one aspect of the code. Not sure this is necessary.

**Final Motion: As further Modified 11-0 Passes**

**Additional staff or committee comments for the record:**

**Proposal # P137**

**Public Testimony in Support:**
Back to maintenance topic, Fire alarm and detection systems. Exception for Minor work.

**Public Testimony in Opposition: None**

**Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)**
Brings clarity to the section, direction to the contractors, removes policy which is always hidden.
Item #4 saying like for like don’t need to do anything.

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None**

**Committee Discussion:**
Confused with the language. Requires a construction permit with exception now says it requires a permit and has exception. These are not exceptions. Move to amend to remove exceptions.

Add wording included but not limited to.

Suggest take 5 bullet points and list them in the sentence in charging language. Then you’re left with 2-4 exceptions.

Agreed that intent is to require repairs and maintenance permits. Has to get written approval.

**Final Motion: As Modified (AM)**
**Final Vote: Modification Passes 10-0 AM Passes 10-0**

**Additional staff or committee comments for the record:**

**Proposal # P138**

**Public Testimony in Support:**
Same language as previous proposal but looks at Fire Pumps

**Public Testimony in Opposition: None**
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)

Modification: Change the requirement to have permits. We just want to delete reference to policy do not remove “does not”.

Committee Discussion:
To keep consistent with the others language should remain.
Motion: Motion to withdraw Modification.
Final Motion: As Submitted (AS)
Final Vote: AS 10-0 Passes
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P135
Public Testimony in Support:
Taking out policy and making it require a permit. Adding #3 exception. The base code is vague on maintenance topics and this language helps steer contractors in the proper direction regarding Standpipe systems.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Do you think this is inclusive enough?
   a. Yes, other option would be a long laundry list.

Committee Discussion:
Can any suppression folks add any language?

I think it’s clear that this is limited to standpipes. Code language uses “such as”

Maybe strike “including” and change to “such as”

Modification: Change “Including” to “Such as” and remove etc. (change other related proposals as well)
Final Motion: As Modified (AM)
Final Vote: AM 10-0 Passes
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P139
The base code is vague on maintenance topics and this language helps steer contractors in the proper direction.
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Support: Smoke control difficult topic, so many different facets and disciplines. Underlined portion clarifies.

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. What was intent with annual testing already being needed. Is it your intent that any deficiency be permitted to repair that?
   a. These systems are so in depth, we need to capture all the parts.
2. No exception 3 on purpose?
a. Correct. Exception 2 gives room for discussion. Some kind of record or archive that it happened.

**Committee Discussion:**
Add exception for repairs after annual exam.

Suggest putting in an exception that references section 909.10.6 as Exception 3

Referencing other code that is already implemented. I would like to follow format saying other work such as physical items that would end up being in that list. Minor work not impacting mechanics of the system. Make it consistent with the last 4 proposals.

Issues identified will be identified in the annual, don’t know that we need to follow format for this one.

Don’t think we need exception 3. There are no minor parts to this system. Condition is covered under condition #2 to get approval from fire official.

No smoke control that passes, always an adjustment needed. If you have to get approval for every adjustment, I don’t know how that’s going to work.

**Committee decided to table and bring back with changes.**

**Additional staff or committee comments for the record:**
Change “including” to “such as”

**Proposal # Chapter 2 Definitions**
Chapter 2 Definitions
Alcohol Beverage to Alcoholic Beverage – Seems to be a typo mistake from last cycle.
Delete Chemical Fume Hood
Delete CO Alarm
Delete CO Detector

Edit Haz Mat to Hazardous Materials
Definition is added to IFC and should be combined with Denver definitions.

Proponent probably wants to revise to say as regulated by Denver Fire Code.

Permit process makes material hazardous.

Existing says permitted by Denver Fire.

Typically, you don’t put a code requirement in a definition. IFC definition does cover it, trying to eliminate amendments stick with IFC.

Delete Lowe Flammable Limit LFL
Delete Lowe Explosive Limit LEL
Delete Multiple Station Alarm
Delete Owner
Delete Pressure Vessel
Delete Self Service Motor Fuel Dispensing Facility
Delete Tank
**Block Vote Chapter 2 definitions Vote:** Motion to Approve as Submitted 2nd -

Add Powered Industrial Truck – Pull from vote, vote on individually - Want to include for battery.

Pull out Haz Mat and Powered Industrial Truck

**Committee Discussion:**
IFC references Alcohol not Alcoholic.

Alcoholic Beverage is not defined in IBC. No definition in IFC. Alcoholic beverage occurs many times.

It's editorial. Editorial change needed to Alcohol Beverage to say Alcohol Beverage or Alcoholic Beverage.

IFC shouldn’t discuss radiological materials. This committee shouldn’t get in to this. DOE standards. Not on a public site typically restricted by government.

Denver Fire Code has always regulated them.

If permitting under hazardous materials, then we have to keep the Denver amendments

Add those that Tony mentioned to the Radiologic and Biohazard to the definition.

Reactive is permitted correct? Is it under hazardous? Yes

Radioactive in Chapter 50. 105.6.69

Keep definition as is. Don’t need IFC definition added whether it is permitted or not.

Tony – Move to disapprove Haz Mat – 2nd – 10-0

Powered Industrial Trucks –
Isn’t battery power already covered in the code? Fire hazard

You would think it would be implied, section in Fire is titled Powered Industrial Trucks.

I think it’s already covered in other sections.

It’s becoming the most common battery storage.

Creating a list here.

It does say such as.

309.1 may already cover. Put it here instead of in the definitions.

309 implies but the definition doesn’t pick anything else up.

**Motion to Approve as Submitted with intent to modify:** Modification change from add to edit –
2nd – 10-0 Approve