IFC Committee Hearing Agenda
June 11, 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 (tabled from last hearing)
   (All proposals that are marked with an X on the summary spreadsheet)

3. Discussion and voting on Chapter 1 Administrative Provisions of IFC and/or DBC-IFC
   a. P139: DBC-IFC Section 105.7.27

4. 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

5. 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

6. 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. P88: 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.

IFC Committee Hearings Go-to-meeting for those who can’t be there in person
Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.
https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/671519341

You can also dial in using your phone.
United States: +1 (571) 317-3122
Access Code: 671-519-341

New to GoToMeeting? Get the app now and be ready when your first meeting starts:
https://global.gotomeeting.com/install/671519341
Proposal # F69 (Block Vote Item – Previously Tabled)
The 2018 IFC added Section 319 Mobile Food Preparation Vehicles. DFD Mobile Food Vendor policy has specific portable fire extinguisher requirements that are proposed to be inserted into the amendments.

Committee Discussion:
Could be confusion with what to use. More complicated than base code. K and ABC extinguishers agents counteract and if you have both types it could potentially counteract and cause more problems.

In Denver over 700 of these trucks, they come in yearly for inspection and get training on which ones to use. This has been in for over 5 years in policy. This would be taking policy to code.

Does anyone know if they added food trucks in 906? No, it’s just a general requirement for fire extinguishers.

Currently Class K is covered.
Item needs to be pulled for individual agenda.

Proposal # F79 (Block Vote Item)
2018 IFC can stand as written now, so this section on High Rise Buildings in the Denver Amendments can now be deleted.
Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # F56 (Block Vote Item)
605.8 amendment provided reference to section 916 for detailed visible and audible alarm requirements.
New section 605.8.2 provided specific information on what must be included on signage.
Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # F80 (Block Vote Item)
Covered Mall Buildings- Move section to Chapter 12.
Committee Disapproval 12-0

Proposal # F37 (Block Vote Item)
Installation Acceptance Testing
Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # F7 (Block Vote Item)
This concept allows system maintenance to only impact single portions of the system without deactivating the entire buildings protection regarding Townhouses.
Committee ok with this one.
Committee Discussion:
Is this language carried over for Denver or new?

Idea is we can isolate the fire and not vacate the whole community. This cleans up the language.

Annunciated is the correct term that should be used here.
Proposal # F8 (Block Vote Item)
IBC 705.8 amendments in the DBCA (allowing 50% openings with an NFPA 13R system) has been deleted, therefore this section is no longer applicable.
Committee ok with this one.

Committee Discussion:
This deletion coordinates provisions with Fire Code.

Pull this out. Not in Fire code it’s in the building code. 705.8

Needs to be heard after IBC hears 705.8 in order to decide here.

Proposal # F10 (Block Vote Item)
Insulation Above Sprinklers. This would keep sprinklers from becoming obstructed during a fire scenario as the 2015 IFC committee intended.
Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # F9 (Block Vote Item)
New Exception 5 added regarding Tenant Finish and quick response sprinkler systems.
Committee Discussion:

Old buildings, 50 years or more they replace the sprinkler systems. Rely on standard response instead of quick response. Set parameters about when we upgrade sprinklers to quick response.

Would amend add “throughout the compartment”

That could potentially be the whole floor plate.
This would require any tenant finish to cost a lot more. Can’t have like for like. Forcing them to change all sprinklers.

This is only applicable if work area exceeds 30%.

Pretty expensive for landlords to try and manage this. Then on TI side my cost excels, and landlords feel things complicated.

Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.

Proposal # F13 (Block Vote Item)
Align Elevator Emergency Operations with current version of codes and standards.
Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.
Committee Discussion:
What plans are we asking for? Wanted to have plans so they know what devices are there. The permit plans. This is for alterations.

Building permit plans shall be permanently mounted is that feasible?

Floor plan – Graphic Map

907.6.4.1.1.1 IFCA is correct reference section.
Proposal # F15 (Block Vote Item)
Emergency Fuel Shut off for Aircraft Fueling.

*Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.*

**Committee Discussion:**
Unclear if this is for new installation.

DIA has changed regulations to reroute here. Consume 2 million gallons of jet fuel a day. Fuel line is 22-inch diameter. Have to keep current with shutdowns in case of a fuel spill. DIA has made it retroactive due to their new fueling contract. Updated every 5 years.

Ties in with Proposal F53

A lot of this is due to fires at LAX and Miami airport.

Are these in IFC or being added? This would be adding them, not currently there.

These systems are used as emergency systems, 2006 doesn’t identify them as such. This amendment would identify them as such.

This is a new requirement, manual emergency alarm.... If it’s not already there, this is going to mandate it. Yes, it is already there just being expanded to new concourse expansions.

Confusion with the Emergency Alarm Sections

Suggest pulling and work with JD on this proposal.

*Needs to be pulled for individual agenda*

Proposal # F81 (Block Vote Item)
Circuits Supplying Fire Pumps revise this section to make it clearer.

*Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.*

**Committee Discussion:**
Would agree. NEC now gives multiple options of how you comply. We would be acknowledging the other 3 options here.

Proposal # F39 (Block Vote Item)
Alterations to Existing Conveyances, Current procedures already require that the conveyance being altered or other conveyance in the facility be current with the Fire Code and State Conveyance Regulations.

Committee ok with this one.

**Committee Discussion:**
Conveyance deemed dormant, alteration permit to bring it up, how are we going to get it to current if it’s dormant? Would have to bring it up to operation and then apply for alteration permit. Suggest adding an exception for dormant status conveyances.

**Modification:** Add Operational Permits are not required for dormant conveyances. – 12-0

Modification

Proposal # F40 (Block Vote Item)
To allow construction contractors to bypass the requirement of obtaining a removal of a conveyance from service permit when an entire building is being demolished. Committee ok with this one.

**Proposal # F41 (Block Vote Item)**
Revise Annual Conveyance Operating Permit to include double operational permit fees when an elevator, escalator or AGTS is operating without a current certification.
Committee ok with this one.

**Committee Discussion:**
Is AGTS defined? Defined in DBC-IFC Automated Guideway Transportation Systems and in ASME 20.1

Discussion about changing language, ultimately committee decided to stay with what we have.

**Proposal # F42 (Block Vote Item)**
Conveyance Maintenance Notification. We have many conveyance owners that do not notify us of contact changes. The State Conveyance Regulations already require this, adding this to our amendments helps to clarify this requirement.
Committee ok with this one.

**Committee Discussion:**
What’s the definition of notifying? Email, form, call in?

Should we say within 30 days notify in writing?

Form available on state database maybe Denver should adopt that.

Notifying Administrator in writing of any change in ownership.

City staff clarified it is currently a form.

**Proposal # F45 (Block Vote Item)**
Automated Guideway Transportation Systems. To clarify that the AGTS is required to be inspected annually and is required to have an operational permit.

Committee ok with this one.

**Proposal # F47 (Block Vote Item)**
The purpose of this new amendment is to provide an established timeline for elevator personnel to respond to instances where parties have been trapped in an elevator to ensure public safety

*Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.*

**Committee Discussion:**
Love this one, but not sure it’s enforceable.

No different than what we do on Fire Alarms.

45 minutes might be a bit arbitrary. Depends on building, could be days to get someone out there. Denver Housing Authority could be down for several days. Like the way it’s written but 45 minutes is not realistic for afterhours calls.
45 min might be aggressive, but 2 hours is not.

Issues I have seen are people who can’t get up and down the stairs and they are stranded for the weekend.

Maybe we break it down 6 bank elevators need to get mechanic there in shorter period.

It’s the building that only has one elevator that is the true concern here.

Denver has seen a steep incline in number of entrapments. Is that because Denver’s elevators are getting old? It is largely due to lack of maintenance. If you maintain them, you can address issues before they cause an entrapment. Issue with enforcing the maintenance requirement.

**Proposal # F55 (Block Vote Item)**
The base Code intent section appears to be a clarification section and not effective enforceable Code language, needs revision to be more enforceable.

*Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.*

**Committee Discussion:**
As written creates some confusion. We say whole chapter complies then exception doesn’t match.

**Proposal # F53 (Block Vote Item)**
Added operational permits for aviation fuel dispensing facilities – maintenance and inspection to allow the fueling operator at the airport to maintain and inspect certain portions of the fueling system and for fire watch if the EFSO system is impaired.

Committee ok with this one.

**Committee Discussion:**
This goes back to disconnect where system is intended to be used as an emergency system. This requires airport to get yearly operational and fire watch permits.

Suggest we already address in F15 the blue strobe, if not, that needs to be added to that section. Language activation of blue strobe should be in F53.

“Activation of the emergency alarm system shall activate a blue strobe or beacon”. Should be added to F15.

**Proposal # F77 (Block Vote Item)**
The base Code intent section appears to be a clarification section and not effective enforceable Code language, needs revision to be more enforceable.

Committee ok with this one.

**Committee Discussion:**
Concern a lot of changes in fire code, need to look at these side by side to determine if we are creating conflict.

Title of 2311 is Fire Extinguisher.

MCG will coordinate the numbers.

It shouldn’t be 2311
2311. 8&9 Gas Detection Systems
Just need to coordinate section numbers.

Proposal # F57 (Block Vote Item)
Wording has been changed to liquefied flammable gasses (LGP) because the 2018 IBC includes “flammable gasses and flammable cryogenic liquids”; LPG does not fall into these hazardous material classifications and the 2018 IFC is written incorrectly.

Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.
Committee Discussion:
Don’t think this is necessary IFC as amended already addresses these locations.

Proposal 60 to scrap Chapter 39.

Proposal # F60 (Block Vote Item)
Remove Chapter 39, use DBCA Chapter 39.

Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.
Committee Discussion:
In orientation, it was emphasized looking at amendments not the code. I think we should add to the IFC. Not 100% sure that we can do that. Don’t know if there are proposals to just remove all Chapter 39 in Denver Fire Code Amendments. You would have to have proposals to remove everything in 39 because it’s already in IFC.

Author was very involved in I codes and NFPA standard. He felt things were being dropped out, keep what we have learned and evolved on.

What is worthy of keeping in the IFC. If you take this proposal you lose all that is included in Chapter 39 IFC.

Proposal # F58 (Block Vote Item)
Backup power is needed for extraction processes due to off-gassing extracted (spent) plant material; mainly in LPG extractions but this hazard can exist in flammable liquid extractions as well. Add Section and Exception for Stand by Power Systems.

Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.

Proposal # F78 (Block Vote Item)
Emergency Alarm section revised to include specific information on what must be included on signage to include signage inside the hazardous room
Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # F49 (Block Vote Item)
Section 5307.3 CO₂ (CO₂) Systems Used in Beverage Dispensing Applications is replaced by carrying over Denver Fire 2015 IFCA amendments as adopted by policy in October 2017. This provides specific language.

Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.
Committee Discussion:
This was written in policy before, just carrying it over into the code language.
Brand new section in IFC and a lot of new language to address this. National Issue but a lot of experts nationwide on this one. Don’t know that we would want to pull just Denver’s policy in place of National Fire Code.

Think our policy is much more detailed.

This changes what people have to comply with.

Any way to compare the new IFC and add Denver’s policy in. Take some work to combine the two but might be the best option.

In 2015 long conversation and research to change this and create policy.

Talk with JD. Spent a lot of time on this, maybe he can give more info for us to present to committee.

Clarify this is in policy not code. Language right now is in policy; does it make sense to just keep it in policy.

Committee Member will work on this one. — Goal is to take policies and put them in to code.

**Proposal # F50 (Block Vote Item)**
Section 5307.4 Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) gas enrichment systems using on-site supply tanks and/or cylinders in plant growing (husbandry) applications is replaced with Denver Fire 2015 IFCA amendments

*Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.*
Committee Member will work on this one.

**Proposal # F51 (Block Vote Item)**
(NEW) Section 5307.5 Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) Gas Enrichment Systems Using a Natural Gas Burner in Plant Growing (Husbandry) Applications is added to align with Denver Fire 2015 IFCA amendments.

*Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.*
Committee Member will work on this one.

**Proposal # F52 (Block Vote Item)**
(NEW) Section 5307.6 Inert Gas Systems Used in Commercial, Manufacturing or Industrial Applications is added to align with Denver Fire 2015 IFCA amendments.

*Needs to be pulled for individual agenda.*
Committee Member will work on this one.

**Final Motion for Block Vote: As Modified (AM)**
**Final Vote:** AM 12-0 Passes
**Modified F39, take out Pulled items.**

**Proposal # P139 (Previously tabled item)**
The base code is vague on maintenance topics and this language helps steer contractors in the proper direction. This addresses smoke control systems.

*Additional staff or committee comments for the record:*
Should be pulled and sent to smoke control committee. Motion to move to Smoke Control.
Motion Passes 11-0

**Proposal # F70**
The 2018 IFC added Section 319 Mobile Food Preparation Vehicles. DFD Mobile Food Vendor policy limits the aggregate capacity of LP-gas containers to 80 lbs.

*Public Testimony in Support: None*

*Public Testimony in Opposition: None*

*Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS) -2nd*

*Support:*

*Opposition:* This is a national issue; national experts feel that 200 is fine. Important to recognize IFC here.

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

1. Have there been issues with excessive storage within these vehicles?
   a. Explosions nationally we now have 700 trucks on the road, biggest problem is backyard propane plumbing. None of the other I codes regulate the Food Trucks. When lots of trucks in one spot 80 pounds is the safe capacity for trucks constantly on the road and lots of vibration. Faulty propane plumbing found to be cause of explosions I mentioned.

*Committee Discussion:*

If 80-pound vs a 200-pound is one less terrifying than the other?

Once you get over certain size then CDOT requires a DOT rather than conventional, those tanks are more expensive.

Big difference between the amount of area affected by explosion based on tank size (80 vs 200)

*Final Motion: As Submitted (AS)*

*Final Vote: AS 11-1 Passes*

*Additional staff or committee comments for the record:*

**Proposal # F71**
The 2018 IFC added Section 319 Mobile Food Preparation Vehicles. Adapted DFD Mobile Food Vendor policy on LP-gas container mounting requirements into new subsections of 319.8.2.

*Public Testimony in Support: None*

*Public Testimony in Opposition: None*

*Original Motion: Disapprove (D)- 2nd*

These requirements for LP container placement are getting too specific, many trucks may be disqualified for use.

*Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None*

*Committee Discussion:*

Conflicting language within proposal.

A lot of this is from policy we are currently enforcing and some from NFPA.

If this is disapproved the same thing will still be enforced via policy. Internal policy has conflict in this section.

Delete “or ahead of the front axle”
Confusion about what is conflicting in language. One spot says, “A frame structure” and then “or ahead of front axle”.

On most trailers these containers are mounted on the tongue of the food trucks front axle.

This is something that has never been regulated, similar to marijuana. Detailed language designed to help this industry get through and understand the requirements. Help industry catch up with safety standards.

This just feels like it takes so many trucks out of commission.

If we are enforcing policy it should be public facing, other part of policy is that if we keep it policy, we can adjust as needed without going back to council. Or we can add as approved by the fire code official.

A lot of surrounding jurisdictions are currently using our policy.

Does it have more flexibility as a policy? Two-fold, if we take it out of policy we are going against the goal of this process. In order to train this industry on requirements and even using permits and policies we need to make it easier transition for them. Environmental Health inspects Food Trucks and gives an operational permit.

\textit{Final Motion: Disapproved (D)}
\textit{Final Vote: Disapproval 1-11 Motion Fails}
\textit{New Motion: A/M}
\textit{Modification: 319.8.2.5 End sentence at roofs add section 319.8.2.6 LP Gas containers shall not be mounted ahead of the front axle on a self-powered vehicle.}
\textit{Vote for Modification: 12-0 Modification Passes}
\textit{Final Vote: A/M Main Motion 12-0}

\textit{Additional staff or committee comments for the record:}

\textbf{Proposal \# F72}
The 2018 IFC added Section 319 Mobile Food Preparation Vehicles. Adapted DFD Mobile Food Vendor policy on LP-gas piping requirements into new subsections of 319.8.4.

\textit{*Format will need to be edited*}

\textit{Public Testimony in Support:}
Helps food vendors who are building their own trucks.

\textbf{Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)}
Based on previous actions, important to bring into code instead of leaving as policy. Vote 12-0 Passes

\textit{Final Motion: As Submitted (AS)}
\textit{Final Vote: AS 12-0}
\textit{Additional staff or committee comments for the record:}

\textbf{Proposal \# F69 (Block Vote Item- Pulled for individual Agenda)}
The 2018 IFC added Section 319 Mobile Food Preparation Vehicles. DFD Mobile Food Vendor policy has specific portable fire extinguisher requirements this proposal brings it into the amendments.

\textit{Public Testimony in Support: None}
Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS) – 2nd
This proposal is only including information that is in other places, doesn’t hurt to have it here, they don’t have to go hunt it down.

Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None

Committee Discussion:
Item 2 should we specify where the extinguisher should be mounted? Would be hard to define where it should be mounted. If you specify it locks, you in. When you come and train you could have inspectors suggest placement.

I think its ok, the assumption is mounted in the vehicle.

Final Motion: As Submitted (AS)
Final Vote: AS 12-0

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # F73
The 2018 IFC added Section 319 Mobile Food Preparation Vehicles. Adapted DFD Mobile Food Vendor policy does not appear to allow CNG systems to be used on mobile food preparation vehicles. CNG Systems is removed.

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

Original Motion: Disapprove (D)
CNG is safer to use in LPG and so I think we failed to realize CNG exists in base code

Final Motion: Disapproved (D)
Final Vote: D 12-0

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # F74
The 2018 IFC added Section 319 Mobile Food Preparation Vehicles. DFD’s Mobile Food Vendor policy requires cleaning and inspection of hood systems every three months. 2018 IFC Table 607.3.3.1 Commercial Cooking System Inspection Frequency requires cleaning and inspections every 3 months for high-volume cooking operations.

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

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS) – 2nd

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Do these mobile vehicles get dirtier than a stationary hood system? Is there justification to require higher?
   a. Good question, on typical basis they are less use. Not sure without pulling our inspectors to get their input.

Committee Discussion:
Would like to withdraw proposal for AS based on discussion of no increased hazard with this over stationary system. Tony said they are typically not used as often as a traditional restaurant.

Currently they are inspected every 3 months by hood inspection companies.
This is not a restaurant you can have control, if you don’t have good cleaning maintenance you could have a major problem.

Think the table is fine.

*Final Motion: As Submitted (AS)*
*Final Vote: AS Failed 5-7*
*New Motion: Disapproval Passes 8-3*

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

**Proposal # F75**
The 2018 IFC added Section 319 Mobile Food Preparation Vehicles. DFD’s Mobile Food Vendor policy requires inspections of hood extinguishment systems every 6 months by DFD licensed inspectors.

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

**Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)**

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

1. Not sure we have launched a hood inspection program just yet. Will we have one in place before this is adopted?
   
   a. Probably not. We just don’t have a license for such right now. Authorized inspectors or providers is what we use right now.

2. So, this would create a higher standard for food trucks then restaurants.
   
   a. Yes

**Committee Discussion:**
Amendment is ahead of its time. If we just take it out it will just defer to IFC.

Committee discussion on how the inspector is referenced. An inspector licensed by DFD.

Current policy says current licensed fire extinguisher inspectors.

**Modification #1:** “by a properly trained qualified and certified person acceptable to the HJ”

**Vote on Modification #1:** 0-11

*Final Motion: As Submitted (AS)*
*Final Vote: AS Fails 0-12*

**Modification#2:** Take language from the standard and remove Denver Fire License Inspector.

**Vote on Modification #2:** 0-12 Fails

**New Motion:** Disapproval 2-9 Fails

**New Motion: Motion to modify**

**Modification #3:** Modification is “shall be maintained and inspected in accordance with 904.12.5”

**Vote on Modification #3:** AM 11-1 Passes

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