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

1. Roll Call and Introductions

2. Discussion and voting on **Chapter 3 of DBC-IFC and/or IFC**
   a. F66: IFC Section 301.2
   b. F67: DBC-IFC Section 304.3
   c. F68: DBC-IFC Section 308.1.4
   d. #346: DBC-IFC Section 311.1.1
   e. F76: IFC Section 319.10.3
   f. #346: DBC-IFC Section 311.1.1

3. 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

4. Discussion and voting on **Chapter 5 for DBC-IFC and/or IFC**
   a. (P141) F121: DBC-IFC Section 503.2.1
   b. (P142) F122: IFC Section 503.3
   c. (P146) F126: DBC-IFC Section 505.1
   d. F3: IFC Section 507.5.4
   e. F4: IFC Section 507.5.5
   f. (P88) F87: DBC-IFC Section 510.2.1
   g. (P152) 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 # F66

Added a reference to new 2018 IFC Section 319 to list of activities or uses that require permitting in accordance with Section 105.6.

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

**Original Motion:** As-Submitted (AS) Because of addition of mobile food prep vehicles, necessary to add this from permitting perspective

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

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

---

Proposal # F67

The 2015/2016 amended 304.3 list should have included 304.3.7. This update corrects that error to the Containers Section.

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

**Original Motion:** As-Submitted (AS) Editorial change. Updates this code section.

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

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

---

Proposal # F68

Added exception 5 to the 4 exceptions for Open Flame Cooking Devices. in the 2016 IFCAs to match the exceptions in DFD’s policy.

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

**Original Motion:** Disapprove (D) Disapproval fails for lack of 2nd

**New Motion:** AS – 2nd Seems reasonable that small tank could be located on the ground.

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

1. How many on ground level now? Are there a lot of 20-pound canisters?
   a. They are not allowed on ground level currently.

**Committee Discussion:**

Need to disapprove because this creates confusion without clarifying the quantity.

We wouldn’t want people storing multiples.

Would like to limit it. Capacity no greater than 20. 2 ½ to 20. Shouldn’t limit to 1 pound on lower.

2 ½ may be a better number to start with.

Hard from a regulatory stand point.

We still have complexes where we have had success educating public, if we add this it’s less headaches in our inspections process. Not sure 20 pounds is the way to go. Current policy is 1-pound cylinder.

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

Tabled for proponent to bring back on 7/22/19 with new language.
Proposal # 346
Public Testimony in Support: Proponent – Removing reference to IPMC in code as Denver does not adopt the IPMC.
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS) Necessary amendment so we don’t refer to a non-adopted code.
Final Motion: As Submitted (AS)
Final Vote: AS Passes 12-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # F76
The 2018 IFC added Section 319 Mobile Food Preparation Vehicles. DFD’s Mobile Food Vendor policy does not allow CNG and the CNG maintenance requirements in 319.10.3 should be deleted for Fuel Gas Systems section.
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS) Appears to be a necessary amendment because CNG is not allowed.
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Committee Discussion:
Discussion in last meeting about the fact that CNG should be allowed, it was brought up by Fire that there was no reason not to allow it, just hadn’t been addressed prior to this. CNG is a safer fuel source than LPG.

By taking this out it doesn’t tell you CNG is not allowed it just won’t be inspected every 3 years.
Committee looked back to decision on F73 decided to withdraw motion for AS - 2nd.
This proposal specifically states that cylinders must be inspected. Question is, s 3 years ok? 3 years is the national standard.

Motion: Disapproval Fails for lack of 2nd.
Motion: ASM
Modification: Keep strike through.
Motion was withdrawn.
Final Motion: Disapproval
Final Vote: D Passes 12-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # F34
Public Testimony in Support: 3 proposals, in all 3 the language is the same in the beginning. 1st one is trapped in an elevator and they call what procedures have to be followed. Not dependent on age of elevator. New altered or existing conveyances. Reason being issue involved elevator phone called out and notified building but not the fire department. This is needed to cover all new altered or existing.

Code is designed by disaster, this issue in the past resulted in a fatality.
Public Testimony in Opposition:
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Question on #4 would the rest be re numbered.
a. **Order is not so important, leave as 3 and move the others for 4 & 5.**

2. Is this going in a different section?
   
a. 403.11 was put in there during 2016 amendment process.

3. Do we need to re number?
   
a. Yes, we will add and re number. Shaunna will correlate with correct code section.

4. Currently 919 is all things related to elevators, is it more valuable to have this in 403 because it’s emergency requirements?
   
a. Its in 401- General in current amendments.

5. Do we have emergency responders somewhere else in the code?
   
a. Evidence of Emergency section, alarm activation.

6. Is it intent to keep existing items 3 & 4 within this subsection?
   
a. Yes

7. 3 other proposals to add new altered or existing conveyances. Would it make more sense to add new altered or existing conveyances to other sections without all those proposals?
   
a. Yes

8. Question to Moderator: Is it acceptable to do that?
   
a. Yes, we have to deal with this proposal and then we can deal with the others. We can approve and then committee can discuss about next 2 proposals. We know the intent. Could change this one and then not need the other 2.

9. Would it be simpler to say “for all” instead of this language?
   
a. Code looks at differences between hand set an automatic setting. Some systems don’t have the phone, this covers anything that has a phone now

10. When you say existing conveyances if I have 70-year-old elevator I need to put in a communication system?
    
a. It’s not saying that they are required to install.

**Committee Discussion:**

These call takers are not necessarily familiar with the procedures and are not typically local.

All this proposal is doing is amending the current amendment to incorporate new, altered or existing conveyances.

Committee discussion about which section is truly appropriate to place this section based on differences between base code and amendments.

**Original Motion:** As-Submitted (AS) Number sequence leave up to MCG. It is appropriate and a conservative approach.

**Support:**

If the company would have followed through with that being existing, there would not have been that fatality. Want to make sure we don’t have that situation again.

**Opposition:**

The other events that are not elevators could create some confusion. Put in higher language it would be clear that it goes to all below it. It creates confusion for other systems whether this applies to all other areas.

Could be confusion whether this applies to existing buildings or new buildings.
This is an operational thing that should apply to all.

Ultimately the fatality situation mentioned had no repercussions due to the confusion with new or existing. This would avoid that in the future.

No harm having this in all 3 sections.

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

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

Proposal # F35

To clarify that this requirement was for existing conveyances as well as altered and new installations.

**Public Testimony in Support:**

If this section is looking at it for only new, it conflicts with state regulations. We cannot be less than the state.

**Original Motion:** As-Submitted (AS) Like the idea of being very specific, more freedom for enforcement.

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

1. Why conflict with state of Colorado?
   a. It would be a conflict if we only look at for new.
2. 401.3.2 says elevator entrapment communication procedures and next section Procedures. We have 2 sections called procedures.
   a. Believe they called it just procedures.

*Moderator deemed this as an editorial fix.

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

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

Proposal # P141

Helps clarify the previous intent and matches on-going efforts at Public Works for Street Guidelines in regard to Apparatus Road Dimensions.

**Public Testimony in Support:** None

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

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

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

**Committee Discussion:**

Questions about table included. Some lines appear to contradict others.

It is intended that cul-de-sac and hammerhead turn around supersede the other.

Denver code is less stringent but then hammerhead is more stringent in IFC.

If you look at the 2 in Appendix D, they are more conservative. I think he’s saying you can use these. It appears proponent was trying to give 2 alternatives.

**Modification #1 Proposed:** “Strike the proposed edition of last row dead end turn around. Add
footnote 4 would apply to rows Cul-De-Sac and Hammerhead turn around. Alternative compliance options” 2nd

Modification #2 Proposed: In multi-family row Option 1 20 ft with additional 40 feet.
Option 2 25 ft or greater without obstruction, fire lane parking not required.
20 ft requires 40-foot fire line and 25 is not going to require fire lane it is confusing relative to
the first sentence.

Committee Discussion:
No objection to this change from proponent, it clarifies.
Think this helps it read better. In older neighborhoods the narrow streets we have to get that
width in front of buildings. To break it out would be fine.
Change “if” to “where” and add Option 1 and Option 2

High Rise Buildings
Option 1
Confusion on what is intended in high rise to clarify corner buildings.
Think corner stands on its own. Could have 20 one side and 25 other side.
List Option 1 and Option 2 and then say for corner building/structure 20 and 40 or 25 one side.
Based on the conversation, it was felt that this was confusing and should be tabled until next
meeting and brought back by proponent with changes.
Why would it need 2 sides for corner lot vs a standard building in middle of the block?
It’s about space to get our fire apparatuses in there.
Change to beginning charging statement, want to make sure we understand what he’s writing.
Wording was based on what Public Works allows. Remove existing so it now applies to all.
Tabled AM until July 22nd. JD will work with Tony to bring this back.

Proposal # P142
Helps clarify the previous intent and matches on-going efforts at Public Works
for Street Guidelines in regard to Marking (signage)

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Committee Discussion:
May cause some confusion where it says access road 20 ft and Denver amendments say 14 feet.
The 14 is not the total width, it is the unobstructed space, parking still additional space on each
side.
Not going to have less than 20 feet unobstructed.

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM) Don’t want to reference an appendix we don’t
adopt.
Support:
Modification: Bring in D103.6 through 6.2
Vote on Modification: 12-0 Passes
Final Motion: As Modified (AM)
Final Vote: AM 11-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P146
Public Testimony in Support: Proponent- Entrances are required to have graphic site map. Beneficial for firefighters to find out where buildings are.
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
   1. Are you trying to amend public works regulation on the fire code?
      a. No
   2. Can they get a revocable permit?
      a. Could add unless approved by public works. We have run in to this being an obstruction to public works right of way. Could add in order to clarify.
   3. Is this asking for each entrance to have a site map? So, 6 entrances 6 different signs?
      a. 2 elements, Public Works with monuments, as well as signage at each entrance.

Committee Discussion:
Think this is 2 amendments. Address Public Works issue, graphic maps and graph annunciator needs to be pulled in, all entrances. Needs to be split as they can be addressed as individual merits.

Think we have better ways of conveying information to firefighters.

If you look at the 505.1 it says address identification, really has nothing to do with address of building.

Campus Style where you are not sending out a signal for specific building. To have it lit on a graphic map wouldn’t be any more relevant. If you annunciate each building this is a moot point. This tries to address us going to a club house instead of directly to a building. Need to do research on why this was proposed.

If you can get the 2nd section in to 907 so we can vote on it. Doesn’t belong here, needs Public works.

Motion to Table until July 22nd meeting.

Proposal # F3
To bring the fire code into alignment with Denver Revised Municipal Code regarding vehicle parking.
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: Disapprove (D)-2nd Reason – More of a traffic control issue, as far as parking it doesn’t make sense to put in the IFC. Wouldn’t be enforced in fire code.

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
   1. Does Fire have authority to write parking citations
      a. We have the latitude but it’s not the practice.
   2. Do inspectors in the field look for unobstructed access in the field.
      a. No.
   3. Does it need to be in if it’s already in the municipal code.
a. Not adding or taking anything out.

Committee Discussion:
This is already in model code; amendments propose to add a subsection under obstructions. Don’t object to adding, don’t think it will be enforced from revised municipal code perspective. From design perspective doesn’t hurt to have it here. Given the goal of the process if it’s helpful but redundant do we really need it.

Final Motion: Disapproved (D)
Final Vote: Disapproval Passes 10-2
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # F4
To bring the fire code into alignment with Denver Revised Municipal Code in regard to clear space around hydrants.

Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: Disapprove (D) Based on previous action.

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. So, you’re saying this, from an operation standpoint, is more valuable vs the previous amendment?
   a. Yes. Parking was not as much of a concern, if they park there, they are getting a ticket. Less than 3 feet of space makes operations more difficult.
2. Do you look at this on plan review?
   a. Yes
3. Do we have a clear view of why this was taken out?
   a. Goal was to remove anything that was redundant, or justification couldn’t be shared.

Committee Discussion:
We have run in to issues with shrubbery and fences being installed and obstructing.

3-foot line is very small for fire department to work in based on national standards and industry experience.

In a 50 feet residential lot if we tell homeowner 5 feet that’s going to create problems. Think 3 feet is more reasonable for homeowners.

Considering the gear and tanks 3 feet makes it really difficult to maneuver.

Homeowners curve around 5 feet take more of the yard, but agree fire needs the clearance.

Water has 5 feet pocket, so crews can work around hydrant, if they put a fence, we could rip it out. 25 feet within the right of way. This goes in line with what Denver water is currently enforcing.

This is enforceable vs the previous one regarding parking.

Withdrawn Motion for Disapproval.

New Motion: AS
Support: If water department has 5 feet fire code should meet up.

Opposition: Vote against it. This is a national standard, and this does create an appearance that we are just changing the code randomly.

Final Motion: As Submitted (AS)
Final Vote: AS Passes 11-1
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P88
This proposal is intended to ensure Emergency Responder Radio Enhancement Coverage System (RES) provide safe reliable and effective performance by requiring them to be listed to the UL product standard.
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: Disapprove (D) Inappropriate to bring in outline, not ready for prime time and not used in Denver.
Final Motion: Disapproved (D)
Final Vote: Disapproval Passes 10-0-2
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P152
To ensure meaningful and accurate annual tests are performed.
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Original Motion: Disapprove (D) Code already addresses this in different sections. No basis.
Final Motion: Disapproved (D)
Final Vote: D Passes 12-0
Additional staff or committee comments for the record: