IMC/IPC/IFGC Committee Hearing Agenda
May 27, 2019 2pm-5pm
City and County of Denver, Room 4i5

1. Roll Call and Introductions

2. Discussion and voting on PMG Staff Block Vote packaged proposals
   (All proposals that are marked with an X on the summary spreadsheet)

3. Discussion and voting on IFGC and DBC-IFGC
   a. #384: DBC-IFGC Section 304.5.2
   b. #385: DBC-IFGC Section 404.1
   c. #387: DBC-IFGC Section 602.3.1
   d. #386: DBC-IFGC Section 602.4

4. Discussion and voting on IMC and DBC-IMC
   a. #54: IMC Section 309.2
   b. #41: IMC Section 401.2 and 403.1
   c. #55: IMC Section 402.2
   d. #23: IMC Section 403.2.1
   e. #19: DBC-IMC Section 404.1.2
   f. #29: IMC Section 506.3.11
   g. #388: DBC-IMC Section 903.5

5. Discussion and voting on IPC and DBC-IPC
   a. #319: IPC Chapter 4, several sections
   b. (P110)428: IPC Section 403.1.1 and 403.2
   c. #302: DBC-IPC Section 413.2
   d. #303: DBC-IPC Section 413.3
   e. #38: IPC Section 501.7.1
   f. #71: IPC Section 604.12
   g. (P99)414: IPC Section 1003.3
   h. #304: IPC Section 1003.3.2
   i. (P98)413: IPC Section 1105
   j. (P102)417: IPC Table 1106.2

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 # 35 (Block Vote Item)
Allows substitution for water dispensers, clarifies the requirements of the code before the substitution.
Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # 36 (Block Vote Item)
Food Waste Disposer Units This Proposal updates the current amendments to match revised section in the 2018 IPC.
Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # 37 (Block Vote Item)
Proponent – Section applies to combined domestic water systems in multifamily. No call for heating in summer or for higher level units. Code is vague how to handle this, concern is health and safety of people using the water that may have been sitting for months. Issue with water quality, coils sit stagnant and then first cold day the water doesn’t taste normal.
Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # 25 (Block Vote Item) Pulled for individual agenda.
This incorporates the exhaust requirements that Denver has been enforcing for Service Sinks.

Proposal # 26 (Block Vote Item)
Domestic Kitchen Exhaust System renumbering
Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # 27 (Block Vote Item)
Public Testimony in Support:
This is a significant change, may not be appropriate as a block vote, not clear here if you install a 300A system you still require the power shut off for the equipment. Hiding electrical in mechanical code.

In favor of this, it’s significant change.

Part of the listing is that it shuts off, just has to be installed how it’s listed, fire alarm panel nearby it should interface with that, we could add language but now it’s a policy so looking to bring into the amendments.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Are we requiring power shut down now?
   a. Yes, inspectors should be looking for it.
2. Was this under IFC or IMC?
   a. Requirement for I1 and I2 here it applies to all units. Except multi family.
3. Only concern is whether it is covered under IFC.
   a. Kitchen hood well represented in IFC just because this doesn’t’ say disconnect power, still have to disconnect power.

Committee is ok with this one.

Proposal # 28 (Block Vote Item)
Update current amendments to match revised section in the 2018 IMC for Residential Cooking
Appliances.
Committee ok with this one.

**Proposal # 30 (Block Vote Item) Pulled for individual agenda**
Relocate Commercial Kitchen Hood Ventilation System Ducts and Exhaust Equipment. Change scrubber system to pollution control unit.

**Proposal # 31 (Block Vote Item) Pulled for individual agenda**
This proposal clarifies requirements for the installation of PCU’s

**Proposal # 32 (Block Vote Item) Pulled for individual agenda**

*Public Testimony in Support:*
Relates to duct sox when placed in common section adjacent to kitchen hoods, cleaning them is problematic they are porous, they will collect grease.

Duct Sox – There’s a good chance that some materials wouldn’t be good to use in the kitchen. Plenty of materials that can be cleaned. Overreaching to say all products can’t be used.

*Public Testimony in Opposition:*

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**
1. Can you give an example of materials you’re talking about?  
   a. Poly urethane.
2. Can we discuss laundering capabilities?  
   a. It’s a possibility depending on type of kitchen, but they can be laundered.
3. Did you talk with health dept on this?  
   a. Talked about 1 instance that was submitted

*Committee Discussion:*
Need further information from the health department to determine if these are acceptable.

Used this type product in food prep, purpose of this is food processing facilities and large food processing. Can be cleaned and laundered. Some are not just round duct; some are lay in ceiling tiles where you can take off frame and easily put in a clean one and send other one out for laundering.

*Moved to individual agenda.*

**Proposal # 33**
To provide an alternative to requiring ceiling radiation dampers that are labeled for use in dynamic systems. Ceiling radiation dampers labeled for dynamic use are not readily available, and this amendment will allow the designer flexibility in their design.

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

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**
1. Intent of code is a system duct system a fan with 1 inch external, a bathroom fan. How do we interpret the bathroom fan?  
   a. Determined by floor ceiling.

*Committee Discussion:*
Base code says “Only” doesn’t address systems that do shut down during the fire. 2 type of systems, systems that shut down during a fire and those that don’t. Rare system that doesn’t shut down. Issue is it’s hard to meet the code unless you provide fire alarm support to bathroom fans.
Typical apartment design bathroom fans are side wall mounted, using brace of dryer duct design. Range hood through soffit to outside, doesn’t penetrate floor ceiling.

For the proposal, just trying to think of other devices. Intent of IMC is not fan cool units

Support:
In agreement with this proposal but would like to address bathroom fan issue. Radiation dampers that they work with the flow. This is addressing fan coil units, there are other things we can’t shut down.

Code has gone specific to addressing fan radiation dampers, in HVAC almost always in static damper systems. Very few radiation dampers that have been tested

Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # 39 (Block Vote Item)
Update current amendments to match revised section in the 2018 IPC for Relief Port Piping. Committee ok with this one.

Proposal # 34 (Block Vote Item)
Update current amendments to match revised section in the 2018 IMC for Wood Burning Appliances. Committee ok with this one.

Vote for Block Vote Items: A/M by removing 25,30,31,32 -2nd Passes 5-0

25 requested to be heard first today on individual agenda.
30 requested to be heard on July 10th
31 requested to be heard today immediately following #25
32 requested to be tabled until July 10th

Proposal # 25
Public Testimony in Support: Proponent To make it clear the requirements for mop sink ventilation, currently 25 cfm, A lot of people not familiar with Denver miss the mop sinks. 1cfm a sq. ft typical janitor closet. A lot are not contained within closets, people stick them in an open corner, if enforcing cfm per sq. ft what perimeter would I use to define my CFM, Energy Usage 60 cfm exhaust fan 24/7 $120 per year, Looking at ASHRAE, 45 cfm and Denver’s maybe $60 a year for that extra increase in cfm, less contaminant versus more containment.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Is intent service sink in food service area, are we asking to require an additional fan?
   a. Yes, Within 12ft of type 1 and type 2 that’s close enough for contaminants
2. Why based on fixture?
   a. The assumption is that for any given service sink, there would be a mop, dirty water, chemicals contaminants that’s why it would be associated with specific fixture.
3. Proposal says when service sinks are installed in a cabinet.
   a. Some restaurants buy stainless steel container to contain these service sinks.
4. 1st part requires exhaust. 12 ft rule from design perspective might be difficult to determine
where to place another fan. How would designer know when an additional fan is required and where does it have to go?

a. I think that goes beyond what national codes require, nothing unique about mop sinks in Denver vs national standards.

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

**Committee Discussion:**
Recommend that we go with national standard.

ASHRAE 6.5 minimum exhaust rate, janitor closet exhaust rate cfm per sq. ft 1 air class 3. Move language from ASHRAE 62.1 into a different section than proposed.

Should this proposal be located here or in a different Chapter? Handful of things in chapter 5 that are odd balls. Everything else is in the proposed table. Many of these are independent systems. Table 403 is the correct place to capture it.

ASHRAE 62.1 refers if someone decides to put the sink within a cabinet. Don’t think this amendment is requiring a dedicated fan. Just 75 cfm.

ASHRAE is properly written to address contaminants.

**Public Discussion:**
62.1 only addresses janitor sinks, leaves out 40% that would now not get exhausted.

**Modification#1:** Bring in 62.1 instead of current language.
**Vote on Modification:** Passes 4-1

**Modification#3:** Propose to put in to 403.3.1.1 in to Work Rooms, identical row for Service Sinks - 1.0 in Exhaust Air flow rate cfm/ft.

**Vote on Modification #3:** 5-0 Passes

**Support:** If we can get to where everyone agrees I’m on board it solves the confusion. Some precedence there, it was in back in 88. This table overtime has been made to look more like 62.1.

**Opposition:**

**Final Motion: As Modified (AM)**
**Final Vote:** AM 5-0 Passes

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

**Proposal #31**
This proposal clarifies requirements for the installation of PCU’s by adding new section 506.5.2 Pollution Control Units.

**Public Testimony in Support:** Proponent This brings together several requirements from other code section, Denver policies and NFPA policies. On the justification it lists where each thing came from. Nothing new just trying to collect code info and put it in one easily accessible place. Let’s designers have 1 single page to go look at.

**Public Testimony in Opposition:** None

**Questions from the Committee to Proponent:**

1. What is the difference between item 16 and item 4? Where enclosed duct system attached to pollution control units.
   a. Item 16 clarifies and amplifies item 4. DIA turning in to a giant food court, so I want
to get all requirements out on the table.
2. Item 19 Fire protection is required, what reference?
   a. NFPA 96 adopted by reference through Denver fire code amendments.
3. Why does duct downstream of CFU's?
   a. Don’t know. I can speculate, when hood system goes off soon as agent hits PCU it gets filtered out so ductwork downstream can’t receive the suppression.

Committee Discussion:
Reference 506.3.11

#16 Discussion about upcoming proposals that may change this section.

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Modification#1: Amend 319 to insert NFPA 96
Vote on Modification: Passes 3-2-1

Modification #2:
To add another line item an increment Item 18 A gypsum wall board enclosure shall be ventilated to the exterior in accordance with IMC 506.3.11 Amended Modification: Add new number 19 “Shaft enclosures in accordance with 506.3.11.1“ and then renumber remaining items included in proposal.
Support: If using gypsum enclosure should be vented to the outside so buildup of heat, in the commentary in base code shows picture of enclosure coming to a wide spot vented to the exterior
Opposition: Like concept but just say shaft enclosure. Other constructions that gypsum board that could be used
Move to Table, work with Proponent to bring back to July Meeting 5-0 Passes

Proposal # 384
Public Testimony in Support: Renumbering a Copper and Brass Tubing section, to update to 2018 numbering.
Final Motion: As Submitted (AS)
Final Vote: AS 5-0 Passes
Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # 385
Public Testimony in Support: Proponent Simple re location of a Gas Meters section that has previously been successful in city and county of Denver. New location is more appropriate section.
Final Vote: AS 6-0 Passes