1. Roll Call and Introductions

2. Discussion and voting on Previously Tabled Proposals
   a. (P146)F126: DBC-IFC Section 505.1
   b. (P149)F129: DBC-IFC Section 907.1.5
   c. (F49): DBC-IFC Section 5307.3
   d. (F50): DBC-IFC Section 5307.4
   e. (F51): DBC-IFC Section 5307.5
   f. (F52): DBC-IFC Section 5307.6

3. Discussion and voting on Chapter 9 of the DBC-IFC and/or IFC
   a. (P153): DBC-IFC Section 919
   b. (F43): DBC-IFC Section 919.13
   l. (F28): DBC-IFC 919.13
   m. (F44): IFC Section 919.15
   n. (F46): IFC Section 919.21
   o. (F47): IFC Section 919.21
   p. (F27): IFC Section 916

4. Discussion and voting on Chapters 10,11 & 12 of the DBC-IFC and/or IFC
   a. (F59): DBC-IFC Section 1013.6
   b. (F55): DBC-IFC Section 1101.1
   c. (F30): IFC Section 1203

5. Discussion and voting on Chapter 27 of the DBC-IFC and/or IFC
   a. (P150): DBC-IFC Section 2703.12.1
   b. (P134): DBC-IFC Chapter 27

6. Discussion and voting on Chapter 34 & 39 of the DBC-IFC and/or IFC
   a. (F143): IFC Section 3405
   b. (F58): DBC-IFC Section 3903.8
   c. (F57): DBC-IFC Section 3903.1.1
   d. (F60): DBC-IFC Chapter 39

7. Discussion and voting on Chapter 53 of DBC-IFC and/or IFC
   a. (P92): DBC-IFC Section 5307
   b. (P93): DBC-IFC Section 5307
   c. (P23): IFC Section 5307
   d. (P3): DBC-IFC Section 5307.1

8. Discussion and voting on Chapter 60 of the DBC-IFC and/or IFC
   a. (F1): DBC-IFC Section 6004.2.2.10.2

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 # P146 (Revised Version)
Graphic enunciator language. Trying to address campuses where there are multiple buildings, to point fire department in to the building of alarm.

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

Committee Discussion:
- Committee feels this is necessary for private roads and where there are multiple structures. These signs guide fire department personnel on how to get to the building of alarm more easily.
- Point lit enunciator were moved away from due to cost and maintenance went to static site maps to address system nuances.

Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 11-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # F49
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.

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

Committee Discussion:
- Just memorializing what is in policy, same language from last cycle, bringing it in to the code.
- Went through this with proponent and there were no changes from the policy as far as thresholds and numbers.
- Base IFC has added 2.5 pages to Co2 systems and some committee members believe these are adequately covered. We should keep the deletion and the replace as follows are already covered in the base code.
  - Language developed before base code has many details and specifics we would like to maintain here.
- Concern was that this is already covered in base code since there are no specific issues related to CO2 in Denver that make this specific to Denver.

Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 9-0-2
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None
Proposal # F50
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
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Committee Discussion:
• Taking policy and putting it into code, language has not changed.
• Same discussion and concerns as included in F49
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 12-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # F51
(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.
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Committee Discussion:
• Taking policy and putting it into code. Same testimony as above.
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 12-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: Not underlined but it is all new wording for DBC-IFC.

Proposal # F52
(NEW) Section 5307.6 Inert Gas Systems Used in Commercial, Manufacturing or Industrial Applications is added to align with Denver Fire 2015 IFCA amendments.
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Committee Discussion:
• This is the last one associated with inert gases, this proposal is similar to the previous 3 proposals.
• Documented health and safety issue with carbon dioxide. Need to be concerned with toxicity with this gas. The other proposals are displacement gases and the concern is not the same.
• This is trying to clarify the gases of concerns and which can create hazardous conditions.
• 100 pounds of carbon dioxide vs a displacement gas one will not be a health hazard and this one will.
• Some committee members feel like this amendment is overkill because of the higher level of hazard.
• Committee feeling that we may need the proponent here to explain more of the application and clarify if this was intended for DIA. Why do we have policy and where would it be applied?

Committee Motion to Table until 9-10 – Motion Passes
Proposal # P153 (No Proponent listed for this proposal)
Elevator installation section proposed. No proponent listed. Unclear where this is being proposed to be placed.

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

- Concerned about the proposal appearing to allow non-qualified personnel in hoist way because of security one key.

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

Committee Discussion:
- Previously committee talked about new code requiring access hatches, so people don’t access hoist ways but have some methodology to establish frequency testing. A couple manufacturers that put machine or control equipment lower in hoist way, which can drive smoke and heat. This is trying to move equipment above the floor, so we don’t have to require those devices or sequences. Avoids trying to get access hatch through the pit.
- Trying to get devices out of the pit so they can be serviced outside of the hoist way.
- Some committee concerns about the location of the machine that propels the elevator.

Discussion from Public:
- Many manufacturers that put equipment in hoist way, controls are fully accessible from the outside. Unclear what this proposal is looking to solve.
- This belongs in a different section to harmonize with the model codes, need to look at national standards. People are not going to look down in IFC to find these types of requirements. Belongs in NFPA 72.

Committee Discussion:
- There are some units that have oil reservoir in the pit, big question is when there is sprinkler activation and water comes in direct contact then there becomes an electrical issue. This proposal is trying to address access issue and avoid the electrical issues.
- Hard to harmonize when the code adoptions are out of sequence.
- Just trying to get devices out of the bottom of the hoist ways.

Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Fails 4-6-2
New Motion: Disapproval
Vote: D Passes 8-3-1
Reason: Plenty of discussion and the concerns mentioned.

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
- Need to minimize and go back to base codes and figure out what needs to be done nationally. There is a lot of confusion and it should be dealt with in the base code.
- Denver is somewhat different from, others most cities use sprinklered 3 feet from the bottom, Denver requires recall smoke down there.

Proposal # F43
To clarify the requirements of the existing amendment. Also, to ensure the Code keeps pace with changes in technology for different types of communication methods.

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

Original Motion: Disapprove (D)
Reason: Certain elements we are already dealing with for two-way and voice communication and area of rescue, for fire alarms, all alternatives should be addressed for all communication methods in one place. We should not be addressing WIFI and internet protocols without addressing globally for the other communication methods. Elevators shouldn’t be held as a separate code.

Committee Discussion:
Important to segregate the 2. For two-way Refuge areas have very prescriptive language for end cap there isn’t a lot of language, however this repeats ASME which already allows VOIP, and clarifies confusion in filed between two types of systems.

Taking an off site for monitoring basically sets it at same communication as off site with no justification.

Final Motion: Disapproval
Final Vote: D 6-3-3

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # F28 (47.36 Recording)
Requiring hoist way door interlocks greatly reduces the chance that a construction worker can open the hoist way landing door which would create a fall hazard. The electrical circuits for these interlocks are already incorporated in the hoist controllers.

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
Committee Discussion:
Discussion:
• Should is not code language. It should be “shall”.
• Can’t enforce should.
• Personnel hoists, talking about electrical mechanical hoist way door interlock. If someone forgets to lock hoist way side, that elevator can leave elevator with landing un guarded. If it “shall” have it, they have no choice, they have to put hoist way interlocks. It’s a safety concern to not have these locks in place and create a fall hazard.
• Committee concern that this proposal is looking to amend ANSI 810.4. We cannot amend ANSI standard as it appears to be proposed here.
• Correct section is 919.19
• State is not currently enforcing 810.4
• This would only apply during construction.

Support:
Modification: Place in 919.19.1 Delete ANSI C330 reference and begin with Door Locking Devices
Vote on Modification: 12-0 Passes
Final Motion: As Modified
Final Vote: AM 12-0

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # F44
Current Fire Code does not clarify that inspections are to meet required to meet State Conveyance Regulation annually, this change also clarifies state requirements in the Fire Code and requires that inspector send us the inspection report in a timely manner. Many inspection reports are not sent to use for weeks or months after the inspection was completed.

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Committee Discussion:
• To the public in the room: In 919.15.3 the requirements for reports are those reasonable.
  o Yes, it is reasonable.
• Are they already required to do annual inspections?
Yes, but currently they are not turned in promptly. Trying to get system more streamlined.

- Committee concerned about the 5 day number proposed. Committee feels we could put in 5-7 business days to give a little more flexibility.
- This gives enforcement more room by codifying the reports being submitted in a timelier manner.
- Committee concern that this doesn’t clarify if inspection reports should be submitted per car or all at once. So is the 5 days from Car 1 or 5 days from 2 weeks it took to complete the entire bank of elevator inspections.
  - Some committee feels this is overthinking and this is just a trigger to get people to get their paperwork in.

**Modification:** Change to 5 business days

**Vote on Modification:** Passes

**Final Motion:** As Modified

**Final Vote:** AM 12-0

*Proposal # F46*

Fire Fighters can enter elevator lobbies from different directions or from other elevators. It is critical that they can ascertain what elevators they are on or directed to without looking at both sides elevator entrance frames.

**Public Testimony in Support:** None

**Public Testimony in Opposition:**
- This gets lost when it’s this far down in the code, should be in the building code for floor numberings. Needs to be visible to architects.
- Every main access floor both jambs are required now, right now we are trying to put it on other floors, proposal is unclear. This won’t be found by architects listed where it is being proposed.
- Concern that this could be confusing for ADA individuals. They are not trained to look for the identifying marks on other floors.

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

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

**Committee Discussion:**
- Intent is to be able to look at any door to see identifying marks. This wants the numbers on both sides so it can be easily seen no matter what direction the fire crews enter from.
- This would be a secondary requirement.
- National code is now just the main egress, if there is smoke on that level the fire crews would have to access from an alternate floor which may not be clearly marked making it difficult to determine the number of the car.
- Suggestions that we have a companion change to be placed in the IBC.
  - Committee feels this should probably go in IBC.
- This would be on new builds.
- In IBC it already states 30.1 that they must comply with Denver Fire Code.
- Committee concerns about those buildings that may only have 1 elevator, this is unclear for those situations.
- Concerns that there is nothing specific to Denver that requires this.
  - Denver has 40% of the elevators in the state.
  - Currently running 8 elevator rescues a day in Denver, trying to reduce that and get these buildings back in service.

**Modification:** Take out “Where an inspection...”
Reason: Confusing as is, this takes out the confusion regarding tests and keeps it to the main egress and alternate floor.

Modification Vote: Passes 12-0

Modification #2: Add language “where more than 1 elevator exists”

Modification Vote: Passes 12-0

Final Motion: As Modified

Final Vote: AM 8-1-3

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
Need to send this to IBC and recommend for Chapter 30. Find IBC section to put reference to new 919.21. Tony will send to Shaunna

Proposal # F47
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.

Public Testimony in Support: None

Public Testimony in Opposition:

• On average response time for entrapment is 30 minutes. In Denver if not within 20 minutes fire fighters are called. Denver is 10 minutes less than avg response time. Under collective bargaining agreement at national level applies to all states and all jurisdictions, same scope of work throughout the country. Can only have 1 elevator mechanic per office on call m-f and only 2 mechanics over the weekend. Any change her is a huge implication in the collective bargaining agreement and can affect labor contracts. With the avg of 30 minutes stuck in traffic jam going 20 miles per hour, there are extenuating circumstances in a city this big that can prevent mechanics getting to an entrapment. Concern about the cost to the building owners for these service contracts. Those have been negotiated without these changes, we would be looking at re negotiating potential multiple year contracts. Penalty structure requires significant judgement on behalf of the Chief. These penalties could be enforced on someone who has no real control of the mechanic ability to get to the entrapment. Legal liability on building owner, elevator mechanic. Also concerns about when the button is being pushed is it going directly to 911 or the elevator company.

• Elevator mechanics being turned in to first responders with putting these restrictions in place. Not trained to rescue people, trained to repair elevators.

Questions to the Public:

• Idea on number of entrapments nationwide? Is Denver running higher than others?
  o Don’t have those numbers.

• How many jurisdictions are responding with elevator company’s vs fire department?
  o Don’t have those numbers.

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Reason:
From fire department stand point there are people in an entrapment that are claustrophobic this can be traumatic. Is this at same risk level, should it match similar response times.

Committee Discussion:

• There are specific situations in Denver where we have had no response from elevator companies and left people with no escape for multiple hours.

• Committee concerns about the 45-minute limit with as large as the Denver Metro area. The communication requirement to provide communicate and ETA would be helpful and alleviate some of the stress and uncertainty.

• Committee feels that addressing the communication could be a fix to still utilize this requirement.

• Concern that this could affect labor laws. Committee member suggests we should discuss
with City Attorney. Moderator says this will automatically be taken to city attorney because of the concerns mentioned.

- Upon notification from fire crews or building licensed contractor shall be on site with 45 minutes, if delayed shall be in constant contact with dispatch center or officer on duty.
- Committee feels this may need to be tabled and revised, work with the public that is here today in order to provide additional information and address the response time as well as communication concerns before 9-11

**Discussion from Public:**

- Fire crew or designated personnel would notify through dispatch and that would start the clock. Mechanic in communication with fire chief, the mechanic would not know who that is. In order for this communication to be established. Feel that the public proposal submitted regarding this would address the concerns that committee is having with this proposal. Have to consider that although we are not currently handing out summons for non-compliance, that may not always be the case and the loss of license is a huge liability to the company.
- Mechanics on call are typically doing call backs. They may be working with live electricity, get the notification to notify you have additional calls coming in. In order to stay focused on current job and keep safety in mind, they may remove the notification device to finish the current job, they see the entrapment call or have 2 entrapments now he is in company vehicle and cannot be on the phone. He would have to pull over to make that call to communicate, adding additional time to the response time. Safety of mechanic working on live equipment needs to be a consideration.

**Support:**

**Modification:** If they can’t arrive in 45 minutes there should be regular communication.

**Final Motion:** Tabled until 9-10 after working group discusses and comes up with changes

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

Feeling from Public that the following need to be addressed piece by piece

1. Notification
2. Time Frame
3. Extenuating Circumstances
4. Penalties

**Proposal # F27**

Section 916 is a new gas detection system section in the 2018 IFC. Portions of section 908.8 in the 2015 IFCA have been brought into this section as a carry-over of 2015 amendment requirements. The 2018 IFC has made a distinction between manual emergency alarm and gas detection systems.

**Public Testimony in Support:** None

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

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

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

**Committee Discussion:**

- Going in to 916.10
- This should go in to Chapter 5 where these systems are addressed. Existing 916 in DBCA-IFC should be section 5.10.

**Discussion:**

**Support:**

**Modification:** 916.3 – Chapter 5.10
916.10 Remove supervising station
N103.11 need to change title Emergency Alarm Systems and Gas Detection Systems

**Opposition:**

**Final Motion:** As Modified
Final Vote: AM Passes 11-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: