IFC Committee Hearing Agenda  
September 17th 2019 2pm-5pm  
City and County of Denver, Room 4F3

1. Roll Call and Introductions  
2. Discussion and voting on Previously Tabled Proposals  
   a. (F47): IFC Section 919.21  
3. Discussion and voting on New Proposals (proposed to address P149)  
   e. (F144)495: DBC-IFC Section 908.8  
4. Discussion and voting on Chapter 9  
   a. (F8): DBC-IFC Section 903.2.11.1.4  
      • (Requested to be heard after 705.8 was heard in IBC, will go over results when this item comes up)  
   b. 40: DBC-IFC Section 915.7.4  
5. 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  
6. 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  
7. 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  
8. Discussion and voting on Chapter 60 of the DBC-IFC and/or IFC  
   a. (F1): DBC-IFC Section 6004.2.2.10.2  
9. Discussion and voting on Chapter 80 of the DBC-IFC and/or IFC  
   a. (P7) (F91)284: DBC-IFC Chapter 80  
   b. (F48)233: DBC-IFC Chapter 80 Revised Standards  
10. Discussion and voting on Appendix Chapters DBC-IFC  
    a. (P39)334: DBC-IFC Appendix N103.3.1  
    b. (P147) (F127)465: DBC-IFC Appendix N Section 103.14  
    c. (P148) (F128)466: DBC-IFC Appendix N Section 103.15

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 # F47 (2 revisions received)
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.

Discussion:
- Concerns from public and committee that this be moved to the next cycle 2021.
- Some public concern that this is too important of an issue to be put off until next cycle.
- Seems that the big contention is penalty part of this proposal. Which truly doesn’t fall on the committee shoulders.

Discussion on F47 Proposal from Public Revision #2

Public Testimony in Support:
NEII – This proposal was designed to focus on communication. In order to know when mechanic would arrive so elevator contractor and rescue can plan accordingly. Having a specific time/deadline would raise cost concerns and opens up contracts. Service contracts that are current would be at risk for the building owners. Penalty section is different, not proposing to waive all penalties. Concerned with the liability of enforcing penalties.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Discussion on F47 Proposal from DFD Revision #1

Public Testimony in Support:
Communication has to be in line with mechanic being on his way when running late for whatever reason. We need to have a process of getting a mechanic on the scene and communicating when there is an issue, don’t think we need to list those issues deemed out of mechanics control as is done in the other revision of this proposal. This proposal clarifies what information is necessary and makes the process easier to follow. We want to make sure that elevator contractors have a timeline to follow when they are not able to be on time.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

This proposal doesn’t make it clear when the 1-hour time frame starts. When mechanics are driving, they can’t answer, they may be working on live controls they can’t answer, so when does that clock start. It should be clear that the 1-hour starts at the time that the mechanic is able to be reached.

Rebuttal:
A lot of times when mechanic may not answer the phone. Elevator contractor has been notified of the entrapment. Incident commander on scene needs the elevator contractor to be in touch with mechanic. Don’t think we should allow leniency in the time frame.

Re Rebuttal:
When elevator entrapment occurs, the button is pushed, call goes out to dispatch center and
dispatch looks to see who is available to assist. Mechanic may not answer depending on where they are and what they are doing. Once mechanic accepts the call, they either give a time frame or go to the entrapment. Mechanic may not know he is being called for an entrapment until he is able to answer his phone.

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. From building owner standpoint, if DFD proposal is passed and contract opens up, what costs are out there?
   a. A lot of contracts have no emergency response time requirements. We would inflate contract by a percentage to accommodate the expedient response time desired. So, if we go forward with this the cost would increase for service contracts for building owners.
2. How many service mechanics in Denver?
   a. 25. M-F 1 on call after 4 pm. Sa-Su 1 on call.
   b. Collective Bargaining Agreement states the requirements for on call and service mechanics allocated.
3. 1 on weekdays and 2 on weekends is that for City of Denver?
   a. Yes, it covers Denver Metro (Boulder – Castle Rock)
4. Not clear on the cost implications, at last hearing we talked about the average being 1 hour 50% of the time?
   a. It’s the guarantee of having a mechanic on site that causes the price to increase.
5. What’s the difference in saying if you’re not on-site you have to be in communication?
   a. Because the sentence is specific mechanic shall be on-site within 1 hour, even though that is followed by an exception the legal implication is that the mechanic shall be on-site within 1 hour.
6. Would it address problem if we eliminate the semi colon and put “or if they are unable to arrive within 1- hour”?
   a. No
7. Are there other jurisdictions that use something like this?
   a. Not that I know of.
   b. Unsure.

Motion: Approve As Submitted for Revision #1
Committee Discussion:
• Both proposals appear to be the same besides conditions beyond mechanic control, penalties and 1-hour response time.
• Committee discussion about changing the language for elevator mechanic, support that it be changed to elevator contractor, to make clear that the elevator contractor be in communication with central dispatch, until such time as mechanic is able to give their location and estimated time of arrival.
• Concern that the modification doesn’t follow code language, admin committee will review and correct as needed to put this in to code language since we have the desired intent.
• Proposal does not say that the mechanic has to be on-site, it says if they are not on-site,
they have to communicate their location and estimated time of arrival.

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

**Modification:**
Take out semi colon and put an or “The elevator mechanic shall be onsite within one hour or if the mechanic cannot be onsite the elevator contractor is required to communicate…..”

**Final Motion:** As Modified F47 Revision #1

**Final Vote:** AM Passes 10-1-1

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

**Motion for Disapproval of Revision #2**
**Reason:** Committee does not approve of the Penalties section.

**Final Motion:** Disapproval

**Final Vote:** D Passes 10-1-1

**Original F47**
**Final Motion:** Disapproval

**Final Vote:** D Passes 10-1-1

**Proposal # F144**
Allows responding units to identify the hazard and potentially mask up prior to entering the premises. This type alarm would trigger a specific response matrix with necessary hazardous material equipment including gas meters for sophisticated analysis of the site.

**Public Testimony in Support:** None

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

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

**Reason:** Already doing this, just putting it in to code.

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

1. Does this only apply to new installations?
   a. Yes, only applies to new.

**Committee Discussion:**
We are already doing this; it’s just being codified here.

**Final Motion:** As Submitted

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

**Additional staff or committee comments for the record:** None

**Proposal # F8**

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.

**Public Testimony in Support:** None

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

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

**Original Motion:** Disapprove (D)

**Reason:** In order to coordinate with IBC. Fire code amendment is still applicable because the building code amendment still exists.
Final Motion: Disapproval
Final Vote: D Passes 9-0-3
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # 40
This proposal is to add provisions to the DBC to enable uniform regulation of in-home child day care facilities. The proposal's scoping provisions are intended to be in harmony with the State of Colorado Department of Human Services Social Services Rules (the Rules) for child care facilities.

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Committee Discussion:
- Discussion needed under section 3. Exception #1, last part of sentence talks about exception applying to townhouse with street frontage. What does the term street frontage mean? Without street frontage definition it will be difficult for Fire to enforce this.
- Decision made here may supersede residential and building code which have already approved this proposal As Submitted.
- Intent was to make child care more affordable in Denver while still keeping the children safe.
- Some committee concern that both exceptions should be removed due to the level of risk and future problems.

Modification #1:
Exception 1: Add to end of sentence.” or within a townhouse unit with frontage within 125 feet of a street or fire access road”
Vote on Modification: Passes 12-0

Modification #2:
Remove both Exceptions to #3
Reason: In PA 8 occupants 5 children died as a result, 3 were children of a firefighter.
Vote on Modification: Fails 3-6-3
Final Motion: As Modified
Final Vote: AM Passes 12-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # F59
Both the referenced amendment sections and the IFC base Code sections should be deleted. In the base Code, 1013.6 is only applicable to externally lit exit signs; these signs are not permitted by Amendment 1013.3. The amendment should be deleted because the graphic requirements are already contained within UL 924; there is no need to repeat them. The pictogram amendment language in the is section is in conflict with unamended IFC 1013.4 which manages an EXIT sign.

Public Testimony in Support:
This was submitted as a cleanup. Deleting the section, the modification retains green signs and puts it in a different section. Creating a new section for Graphics 1013.5.1
Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:

1. How is the IBC section being dealt with, that is very similar to what is being deleted here?
   a. There is another amendment to address the IBC.

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Reason: Cleans up the code, standards already address this, and it shortens the amendments.
Modification: Move green signs in to its own section 1013.5.1 Graphics.
Final Motion: As Modified
Final Vote: AM Passes 12-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # F55
The intent section as written does not give clear direction as to when the numbered subsections sections are applicable and appears to give the reader the option to choose one of the 6 options.

Public Testimony in Support:
Another clean up, amendments are currently written under intent, so scope is not enforceable, it appears to give reader use of any of the options. Proposal moves language in to scope instead of under intent.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:

1. Is the exception intended to apply to entire section or just to Item 6? The way it’s written it applies to everything.
   a. It applies to the entire section.
2. Subsections referenced in exception apply to retrofit ordinances.
   a. Yes, those are retrofit ordinances.

Committee Discussion:
- Committee concern that exception should be moved in to the main body of the code.
  o Ultimately it was decided to create a new section for the language and not call it an exception.
- This almost serves as a checklist when you are performing a Code Analysis during review.

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Modification: 1101.1.1 new section instead of Exception. Same wording “Existing Buildings shall comply with the requirements of IFC Sections 1103.2, 1103.3, 1103.7.7, 1103.9, 1107 and 1108 as amended.”
Final Motion: As Modified
Final Vote: AM Passes 12-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None
Proposal # F30
Proposing New Emergency Stand-by Section. No supporting info or Reason Statement included.

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

**Committee Discussion:**
Used to be in 604, moved to new chapter 12, adjusted sections numbers. Underlined portion was already this way in the new amendments.

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

**Additional staff or committee comments for the record:** None

Proposal # P150
The purpose of these code changes is to tailor the code to our specific needs as well as to reduce customer confusion.

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

**Committee Discussion:**
- This is just coordinating language for signage specific to emergency alarms.
- Questions about Hazardous Production Material
  - Upon looking it up, it is a defined term and makes sense here, but should be italicized since it is a defined term.

**Original Motion:** As-Submitted (AS)
**Reason:** Efficient, helpful language and low cost.
**Final Motion:** As Submitted
**Final Vote:** AS Passes 11-0-1

**Additional staff or committee comments for the record:**
Need to follow up if spill is to be in both sections. Italicize Hazardous Production Material.

Proposal # P134 (Duplicate) Withdrawn

Proposal # F143
The outside tire storage exception was deleted late in the 2015 I-Code adoption process. The idea was to address it through DFD policy (link). Our philosophy has changed, and it would be enforceable if added back into our 2018 amendments.

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

**Original Motion:** Disapproval
**Reason:** This creates conflict within the code. 3405.1 already places limits in the base code.

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**
**Committee Discussion:**
- This brings in what DFD does now in to the code.
If this is disapproved, DFD would likely regulate the same way.
This exception is more stringent than the base code.
Base code requires 50 feet from lot lines, this is saying 20 feet.
Outside storage limited to 5,000 square feet and other sections of the code say 10,000 square feet.
Easier to say tire storage less than 20 feet from lot line.
Seattle fire department has similar language in their code.

Motion to Disapprove Withdrawn
New Motion: As Modified
Modification:
Remove the exception take language not struck out and put in to 3405.4
Strike the first sentence
“Outside storage shall be limited to 5,000 square feet of tire storage....Storage in excess of 5,000 square feet, does not meet this exception”
Start the section at Tire Storage.
Final Motion: As Modified
Final Vote: AM Passes 12-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None

Proposal # F58
This section is taken from NFPA 1-38.6.2.3.5. 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. This material is soaked with solvent when it is removed from the extractor and left in the hood or booth until it off gasses. If power is lost during this process, this off-gassing can create a hazardous condition. This section could also be applicable to open flammable liquid extractions. Some processes use hazardous exhaust systems during post oil processing where spent plant material is not off-gassed; the exception recognizes this and gives an engineer the ability to analysis the process for hazardous when power is lost.

Public Testimony in Support:
Requirement for standby power aligning with NFPA 1 for exhaust systems using LPG. Requires extraction room and gas detection to be on emergency power. This chapter is retroactive, but this section is for new or modified.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Why is this here, instead of stand by power systems where elevators are listed?
   a. Written as one stop shop for extraction facility designs. They are not going to the other section. This is very specific.

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: Matches national code, good place to have this information.
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 12-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None
Proposal # F57
This section is taken from the Base IFC and is added to align with national code. Note the 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.

Public Testimony in Support:
Aligning with base Chapter 39 to not allow extractions utilizing LPG for buildings containing certain occupancies.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Example of flammable cryogenic?
   a. Carbon monoxide.

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Reason: Per proponents’ testimony.
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 12-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # F60
This proposal replaces the new IFC chapter 39 with the Chapter 39 that was added to the Denver 2016 amendments.

Public Testimony in Support:
Intent to retain existing marijuana chapter as is in Denver Amendments and not take base language. Negative impact if we adopted on current operations.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)
Final Motion: As Submitted
Final Vote: AS Passes 12-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: None