1. Roll Call and Introductions

2. Discussion and voting on **Chapter 3 of DBC-IFC and/or IFC**
   a. F68: DBC-IFC Section 308.1.4

3. Discussion and voting on **Chapter 5 for DBC-IFC and/or IFC**
   a. (P141)F121: DBC-IFC Section 503.2.1
   b. (P143)F123: DBC-IFC Section 504.5
   c. (P146)F126: DBC-IFC Section 505.1
   d. (P132)F113: DBC-IFC 508.2 and 907.6.2.2

4. Discussion and voting on **Chapter 9 of the DBC-IFC and/or IFC**
   a. (F37): IFC Section 901.5
   b. (F6): IFC Section 901.6.4
   c. (F82): IFC Section 903.2.8
   d. (F9): IFC Section 903.3.2 #5
   e. (F11): DBC-IFC Section 904.3.4.1
   f. (F12): IFC Section 905.4 #2
   g. (P37)F97: IFC Section 905.4.1
   h. (P149)F129: DBC-IFC Section 907.1.5
   i. (F13): DBC-IFC Section 907.3.3
   j. (P42)F98: DBC-IFC Section 907.5.2
   k. (F15): DBC-IFC Section 908.3 and 908.4

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](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](https://global.gotomeeting.com/install/671519341)
Proposal # F68
Proposal to add exception 5 to the existing 4 exceptions in the 2016 IFCAs to match the exceptions in DFD’s policy. This allows for an LP container greater than 1 pound on a ground level balcony where there is no balcony above or within 10 feet.

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

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

Modification: “Not greater than 2.5 pounds nominal 1 ....., may be located on the ground level”
Discussion about difference in the ground floor section of this proposal and the balcony section and whether they should be separated as proposed or put in same section together. Decided it should be kept separate.
Concern about balconies above ground floor units which house these containers, do we limit on ground floors where there is no balcony above?
6104.2 in current amendments - exception 3 for multi family dwelling one 20 lb. propane cylinder allowed in detached garage or detached storage area.
Intent was to acknowledge those containers on the ground level.
When re reading the proposal, the committee decided that exception 1 potentially covers what is trying to be included in exception 5.
Questioning whether the intent of the proposal is already covered elsewhere in the code.

Motion: Table and speak with Proponent. Bring back August 6th. Vote 8-2-1

Proposal # P141 (Revised from last hearing)
Dimensions is replaced to help clarify Public Works for Street Guidelines. Table is revised for existing buildings unobstructed width for fire lanes.

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

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

Committee Discussion:
Suggest we change “if” to “where” in multifamily and high-rise section of this proposal.
Regarding Revisions table it is only applicable to existing buildings.
   In 2016 the table was put in without a lot of influence from Public Works. It does state the requirements for new streets in the first paragraph, but table would only apply to existing buildings.
   Only states that it applies to existing roads, not existing buildings.

Modification:
Change “if” to “where” in each section of the table.

Vote on Modification: Passes 11-0
Final Motion: AM (With both modifications approved from last hearing and today’s modification)
Final Vote: 11-0 AM Passes

Reason: To provide clarification within table, remove redundant information that is elsewhere, remove conflicting information.

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

#493 New Proposal 503.2.5 and Appendix D
Public Testimony in Support: Remove from policy language and clarified in the body of the code.
Appendix D deleted before, this brings it back in.

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Modification: In Row D delete “for Fire Lane Signage”
Final Motion: AS
Final Vote: Both are AS 11-0 Passes
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
Proposal # P143
Courts section is added to help firefighters conduct quick attacks and rescues to dwellings and/or spaces facing the interior courtyard. This has become critical in large modern city block developments.

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

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)

Modification: 1st sentence. Instead of “for buildings containing combustible construction” put in “for buildings of type 3,4 or 5 construction”

Reason: This makes the intent clearer. Less confusing.

Vote on Modification: 11-0 Passes

Discussion:

Question for Proponent:

1. Has there been an issue with this?
   a. Some architects are unclear with perpendicular and it leaves fire department unclear without these provisions.

Final Motion: AM
Final Vote: AM Passes 11-0

Reason: Clarification of detail for perpendicular direct view and specific construction type.

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P146 (Previously Tabled)
New requirement for address identification on new and existing buildings.

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

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)

Modification: 2nd paragraph to be duplicated in 907.6.4.1 (wording in both sections should match)
Reference here that site annunciators shall be provided in accordance with 907.6.4.3

Discussion:

Questions about why we need this

Denver Fire - Not every building has an address. Makes it difficult to get rigs to the building that needs help. With these signs being required trucks can more efficiently access buildings where they are need more quickly. These signs are already required in Denver, but they have to be thoroughly explained to builders, and they are still a source of confusion, this puts the clarification in to the code.

Concerns about these being lighted signs, the cost associated with them as well as this technology being outside in the elements.

Denver Fire- The information is not always accurate, so these signs help us figure out where the exact address is. With 70 buildings trying to decipher where to go this LED stands out and helps us to navigate.

Possibly an exception for a campus with 10 or less buildings.

This should also be addressed in 907 not just Chapter 5 so it is more direct to the people who are doing this type of work, installing these.

There are a lot of technical issues with these signs. The LED is not bright enough during the day. Cost – 8 building structure cost is minimum $10,000. Electronics, weatherized, and circuitry.

Motion to Table: Will be brought back when committee hears Section 907. Tony will write up for 907 and will bring this plus a new proposal to add this in to 907 back.

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Editorial “Each character shall be not less than 6-inch letters.”
Proposal # P132
Brings back emergency alarm provisions that were previously removed from the code.

Public Testimony in Support: Proponent – In 2016 amendments Fire Command Room deleted. There was nothing to give direction to anyone about providing anything other than Fire Command Center which is under high rise buildings. In proposals we took what was in 2011 amendments and considered requests in the field. 100 square feet with 3 feet of clearance. Allows the Command Room to be in the lobby.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Is intent for the fire panel to be in this room as well?
   a. Yes.
2. On a low rise building we would have a fire pump or smoke control panel, we don’t want it in the lobby with switches exposed, and accessible to the public. In that situation we typically put it in a room.
   a. If it’s a low rise it’s an atrium smoke control. Smoke control dictates a fire command center.
3. How is this different from a fire command center? Not defined.
   a. Fire Command Center and Fire Command Room are different, not defined in base code. Think definition was dropped out as a mistake.
4. Why was this pulled in 2016?
   a. Denver University complained that in order to improve safety they installed voice in every building, and they found this provision was penalizing them for going above and beyond code requirements.

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Modification:
Minimum 6x8. 6 feet in front of equipment, minimum length of 8 feet. 1-hour fire barrier construction (Copy section Fire Command Center 508.1.2, copy language from this section) Copy line location from command center over her to make clear where the command room should be located.
Remove exception regarding fire command room and fire command center. It is redundant. First sentence: Mass communication should be “a building with any emergency voice/alarm communication system”
Exception added “Unless approved by the building official.”

Vote on Modification: 11-0 Passes
Final Motion: AM
Final Vote: AM 11-0

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
Editorial: “If the owner requests...”

Proposal # F37
Replace installation acceptance testing section.
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: Disapprove (D) – This should be published policy, otherwise it locks fire department in to 72 hours, puts a lot of pressure on fire department with that 72-hour window.
Final Motion: D
Final Vote: D Passes 8-0-3

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
Proposal # F6
Adding a requirement for work to remain visible and accessible for inspection purposes.

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)

Modification:
Change permit applicant to contractor (person who is doing the work is more responsible for leaving this exposed)

Discussion:
Permit applicant is not a defined term.
The responsibility of leaving this work exposed is on the contractor and not necessarily the permit applicant who may be just working with an expediting service or in an admin position.
People who are doing the covering or closing are not fire personnel. This does not belong here. Doesn’t make sense in 901. Should be addressed in administrative chapters.

ASM withdrawn
New Motion: Disapproval
Final Motion: D
Final Vote: D 10-0-1 Passes

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # F82
Change DBC-IFC provisions regarding the automatic fire sprinkler requirements to agree with the proposed modification of IBC Section 903.2.8.

Public Testimony in Support: Allows RX occupancy, small sleeping unit only 903 fire sprinklers except for tiny homes.

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS); A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM); Disapprove (D)

Public Testimony in Opposition:
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Is tiny home under IRC?
   a. Under IBC allows them to be designed per IRC. But RX occupancy is 10x12 with a bed, no cooking, plumbing. Sleeping unit.

Motion to Table: Until the Building Code has heard Proposal #21 Community Villages. August 6th
Vote to Table: 11-0

Proposal # F9 (Pulled from Block Vote)
Tenant finish projects are continuously on-going in many Denver Buildings (especially office high-rises) and without such provision, these new renovated spaces are protected with outdated standard response type sprinklers which have delayed activation characteristics versus modern quick response (QR) type sprinklers.

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

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. What’s driving this?
   a. High rises during tenant finish, work is being done and they are not upgrading to new technology.
2. Cost and Expense. If you touch 30% same as touching 100%. Doesn’t this create a huge expense.
   a. Agreed, but the code already requires quick response sprinkler systems.
3. Do we have a problem with standard head sprinklers in older buildings?
   a. We have had damaged heads put back in which is why we mandated quick response heads.
Committee Discussion:
Suggest eliminating compartment or fire barriers.
Concerns about changing out sprinklers like for like.
If we aren’t going to force people to change out heads beyond the tenant space, then this amendment is not needed.
If there are no instances that standard heads are causing a problem in Denver, not sure this makes sense for us to put in.
Discussion about removing 1st sentence.
   We need to leave this because otherwise there is a conflict between IFC and NFPA 13. If we leave just the first sentence, we may be putting people out of compliance with NFPA 13 for light hazard occupancies.

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Modification: Strike 2nd sentence and add “quick response or residential sprinklers”
Motion to Table: Tabled until Tony can look at NFPA 13 and confirm light hazard occupancies
August 6th. 11-0 Passes