IFC Committee Hearing Agenda  
August 6th 2019 2pm-5pm  
City and County of Denver, Room 4i5

1. Roll Call and Introductions

2. Discussion and voting on Previously Tabled Proposals
   a. F68: DBC-IFC Section 308.1.4
   b. (F82): IFC Section 903.2.8
   c. (F9): IFC Section 903.3.2 #5

3. Discussion and voting on Chapter 9 of the DBC-IFC and/or IFC
   a. (F11): DBC-IFC Section 904.3.4.1
   b. (F12): IFC Section 905.4 #2
   c. (P37)F97: IFC Section 905.4.1
   d. (P149)F129: DBC-IFC Section 907.1.5
   e. (F13): DBC-IFC Section 907.3.3
   f. (P42)F98: DBC-IFC Section 907.5.2
   g. (P146)F126: DBC-IFC Section 505.1
   h. (F15): DBC-IFC Section 908.3 and 908.4
   i. (P144): IFC Section 912.1.2
   j. (P100): DBC-IFC Section 913.9
   k. (P101) (F90)416 DBC-IFC Section 913.10
   l. (P145): IFC Section 914.3.8
   m. (P5): DBC-IFC Section 915.1.3
   n. (F25): DBC-IFC Section 915.7

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 # P5
Delete 2016 amended section 915.1.3 and delete 2016 amended section 915.1.3 exception to the existing 2016 Denver Amendment as it pertains to the 2015 IFC. 2018 IFC section 915.1.3 is for Carbon Monoxide (CO) detection for Fuel-burning forced-air furnaces within dwelling units, sleeping units and classrooms where the fuel burning appliance is not within the dwelling units, sleeping units and classrooms.

Public Testimony in Support: Proponent- Want to bring this back to base code, remove the amendment.
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: Existing code adequately addresses fuel burning appliances within dwelling units. For schools this prevents a conflict. Makes sense to match the states rules.
Final Motion: AS
Final Vote: AS Passes 12-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # F68 Withdrawn

Proposal # F82 (Previously Tabled)
Group R-X Occupancies, approved in other committees, this exception is for IFC. To clarify fire sprinklers will not be required on these occupancies.
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Committee Discussion:
This was tabled until building department heard it, IBC committee approved it. Committee requested to see #21 to see definition passed in IBC for RX Occupancy. Denver currently has 2 campuses of these tiny homes for transitional housing.
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Final Motion: AS
Final Vote: AS 11-1 Passes
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # F11
Several firefighter crews have experienced breathing issues after being exposed to clean agents during investigative functions in rooms where the agent has been discharged. This proposed sign will ensure they are alerted to use their SCBA’s and avoid health issues caused by exposure.

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: Low cost way to protect fire fighter safety.
Committee Discussion:
How is thoroughly ventilated defined?
Fire side - we have ways to monitor the air, either mechanical systems from buildings or we can set up fans. Go in test and ventilate as needed.
Concern that the term thoroughly ventilated is subjective.
This just notifies the fire fighters to put on the SCBA’s.
Modification: Delete “of a fire and” So it would read “In the event of a system discharge”

Vote on Modification: 13-0 Passes
Final Motion: AM
Final Vote: AM 13-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # F12
NFPA 14 has been revised to include a 200’ distance at horizontal exits. This distance aligns with Department fireground tactics and will allow the omission of unneeded host valves at this location

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: This proposal is necessary for coordination with national standard NFPA 14, provides practical application within fire code.
Committee Discussion:
Do we know when this was added to NFPA 14? Could create a conflict with health care facilities. Believe it appeared in the 2016 addition. CMS could be a conflict.
This makes the code less restrictive for those areas where you don’t have a stair well.
Final Motion: AS
Final Vote: AS Passes 12-1
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P37
Public Testimony in Support: Buildings are getting large and because of that we end up with stand pipes that have to be within 200 feet, NFPA allows riser not to be protected. When you go to the building, they have 14x14 5 story shaft, nothing holding it. This coordinates NFPA 14 with the code and sets high rises separate.
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Committee Discussion:
We’ve already increased the distance allowable. This doesn’t increase the distance just addresses the stand pipes.
Has been an issue in Denver because designers don’t know we need this additional protection for stand pipes.
Modification: Change is to in and building to buildings. Should read “In buildings equipped with fire sprinkler systems”
Vote on Modification: Passes 13-0
Final Motion: AM
Final Vote: AM Passes 13-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P146 (Listed as P146 Revisions)
Graphic enunciator language. Trying to address campuses where there are multiple buildings, to point fire department in to the building of alarm.
Tabled until 8/27

Proposal # P149 (Listed as P149 Revisions)
Site directory without LEDs. Hard cover map.
Tabled until 8/27
Proposal # **F13**
To require building plans to be permanently mounted adjacent to the panel.

*Public Testimony in Support: None*

*Public Testimony in Opposition: None*

*Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None*

*Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)*

*Committee Discussion:*
To clarify on building plans, is intent to have map or sketch or the full plans
  Just graphic map next to the panel.
Replace building plans with graphic map.
  In 907 and Appendix N we refer to it is building plans for graphic maps. So, it should read this way.

*Final Motion: AS*
*Final Vote: AS 13-0*
*Additional staff or committee comments for the record:*

Proposal # **P42**
Requires that visible notification devices remain activated after audible notification devices are de-activated, which results in conflicting signals for people who are deaf or hard of hearing and people who are blind or have limited vision. The proposed change to require that both audible and visible notification appliances be deactivated simultaneously when the silencing switch is used will allow the City and County of Denver to comply with National Codes and Standards and with the intent of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards.

*Public Testimony in Support: None*

*Public Testimony in Opposition: None*

*Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None*

*Original Motion: Disapprove (D)*

*Reason:* Trying to align with national code, driven by ADA. This can come across as treating hearing impaired unfairly.

*Committee Discussion:*
Denver Fire trained to silence alarms when they are investigating, we keep strobes going so crews can see if they are in alarm zones and if we are still investigating. At that point we are considering it a fire alarm tool not a fire alarm function during occupant evacuation.

*Final Motion: D*
*Final Vote: Disapproval 13-0*
*Additional staff or committee comments for the record:*

Proposal # **F9** *(Tabled until after the break)*
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: None*

*Original Motion: Disapprove (D)*

*Reason:* Cost is the primary reason for requesting disapproval, expecting a landlord to replace sprinklers when working on 30% of a floor plate is a huge financial undertaking when no work is done on 70% of the floor plate. Not sure what’s driving this.
The NFPA 13 already requires you put in quick response in light hazard if you’re doing tenant finish work.
Committee Discussion:
No fire barrier in these buildings, if you’re doing 30% you have to do the whole floor. People will start having 20% one month then do 15% to avoid this being applicable to their project. Concerns that new NFPA 13 is going to catch landlords off guard.
Question if you have a tenant space that is 20,000 square feet and you are remodeling 6,000 square feet, are we saying you have to go in to all of the other tenant spaces and fit for quick response sprinklers? That is costly for developers.
NFPA 13 2019 version Chapter 29 says new sprinkler requirement applies for modifications made for existing systems.
Final Motion: Disapproval
Final Vote: D 13-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # F15
Section 908.3 is added to identify an EFSO for aviation fueling spill as an emergency alarm as defined in chapter 2 to ensure it is designed and installed appropriately for life safety.
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: There is a big need for this, there has been a discrepancy in fire code in regard to the definition of emergency alarm system, it directly entails what the system is supposed to do, but the fire committee never coordinated the two. Only applies to fuel systems at DIA. 12 inch distribution of jet fuel to all gates, flowing about 2.1 million gallons a day through that system. 5 emergency evacuations a month currently.
Committee Discussion:
Will this be applicable to existing conditions?
No, air craft chapter puts you back to 908.
This is currently a policy, just looking to move in to the code.
Final Motion: AS
Final Vote: AS 13-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P144
Theft and tampering have become a city wide issue resulting in many orders to comply and DFD effort to maintain FDC’s in a useable/functional condition. This provides further clarification for locking which is already permitted in the code.
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: Base code allows locking; this provides further clarification what Denver wants. We want swivel guard because people remove the casings. Make them vandalism proof.
Final Motion: AS
Final Vote: AS 13-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P100
Requires trained personnel to be present for all testing and maintenance on fire protection systems.
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Original Motion: Disapprove (D)
Reason; 1st statement is already covered; Denver licenses people who work on fire pumps. 2nd statement prohibiting automated inspection devices, these devices have been around for a long time and we allow them. Justification provided is not good enough to prohibit these devices.

Committee Discussion:
Proposal states the NFPA already requires authorized personnel to complete work on fire pumps. So this is unnecessary.

Final Motion: Disapproval

Final Vote: D 13-0

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P101
To require trained personnel to be present for all testing and maintenance on fire pumps.

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Original Motion: Disapprove (D)
Reason: Based on previous action.

Committee Discussion:
Current pumps are all manual shut off.
We are monitoring for fire pump running sometimes, don’t want interruptions with that.

Final Motion: Disapproval

Final Vote: D 12-0

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P145
Such large complexes place many occupants at risk when a single afforded fire pump or generator gets placed out of service for basic items like frequency testing and/or maintenance (simple oil change), etc. In addition, during an outage, DFD has struggled to staff such complex fire watches which become very expensive based on number of personnel needed. Other building design features (structural reinforcement) already incorporate higher levels of safety when Risk Category IV is involved, therefore this concept is similar.

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: We have had about 9 years of booming economy, built around 200 high rises, building groups of buildings larger than ever before. Fire Dept has an issue with union contract any time buildings have system outages, we have to protect buildings and staff fire watches. 524 high rises make it difficult to staff fire watches. Wildland Fire Fighting is more appealing to off duty fire fighters than fire watches. This allows the building to be protected with redundant systems.

Committee Discussion:
What is considered large buildings- 5,000 or more occupants
This doesn’t just apply to high rises, can be low rise, depending on the occupant load.
5,000 occupants may not be the best number to use.
Chapter 16 IBC – Risk Category 3 maybe we should look at wording there.

Why just fire pump and generator?
Those are the ones that are down most often and need continuous maintenance, they are also the typical systems we have to staff fire watch for.

A lot of cities that make you do a fire pump and generator for a new building. Denver has been different and less restrictive with this topic.

Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote:  AS Fails 7-6  
New Motion:  Disapproval  
Reason:  Feel this is superfluous, to require such an expensive piece of equipment. Should be able to be addressed another way. Feel it’s too specific.  
Final Vote:  D Passes 7-6  
Committee Discussion:  
See a way to bring this back in with a trigger and consequence be a rational analysis.  
Tony will check municipal code to confirm if another Chief is allowed to vote in a tie breaker.  
Increase safety for fire pump.  
5,000 occupant number is a concern.  
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:  
Tony will bring back a new proposal.  

Proposal # F25  
Requires carbon monoxide detection and alarms be provided in buildings regulated by the IRC.  
Public Testimony in Support: None  
Public Testimony in Opposition: None  
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None  
Original Motion:  As-Submitted (AS)  
Reason:  Very important to accurately strike language that unintentionally excluded occupancies 1-2 family dwellings and townhomes from requirement to provide alarms. Mandatory in IRC, this cleans it up to remove the conflict between IRC and IFC.  
Committee Discussion:  
Concerns about mixing the two codes when IRC is a stand-alone code.  
Does this apply to hotels as well or just dwelling units?  
No, just dwelling units.  
Final Motion:  As Submitted  
Final Vote:  AS Passes 7-4  
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:  

Proposal # 493  
Coordinates fire regulations with the City’s air quality goals and requirements. Includes special provisions for chimineas.  
Public Testimony in Support: None  
Public Testimony in Opposition: None  
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None  
Committee Discussion:  
Denver just fell out of compliance with EPA for air quality. Environment health allows 15-20 permits a year for excepted situations such as religious events. Anything that runs on natural gas or UL listed device does not apply. 15-20 calls a night currently with chimineas. We already prohibit portable outdoor fireplaces, this also prohibits chimineas.  
Concerns that this is the Fire Code and it’s truly a health issue.  
Already in the code, just coordinating things here to make less confusing and address and areas of problem.  
These are stipulations for open burning permits.  
Original Motion:  As-Submitted (AS)  
Final Motion:  AS  
Final Vote:  11-0-1 Passes AS  
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:  
DDPHE editorial change.