IMC/IPC/IFGC Committee Hearing Agenda
June 19, 2019 2pm-5pm
City and County of Denver, Room 4i5

1. Roll Call and Introductions

2. Discussion and voting on IFGC and DBC-IFGC
   a. #387: DBC-IFGC Section 602.3.1
   b. #386: DBC-IFGC Section 602.4

3. Discussion and voting on IPC and DBC-IPC
   a. #319: IPC Chapter 4, several sections (May be heard by IBC Committee, TBD)
   b. (P110)428: IPC Section 403.1.1 and 403.2
   c. #320: IPC Section 403
   d. #302: DBC-IPC Section 413.2
   e. #303: DBC-IPC Section 413.3
   f. #38: IPC Section 501.7.1
   g. #71: IPC Section 604.12
   h. (P99)414: IPC Section 1003.3
   i. #304: IPC Section 1003.3.2
   j. (P98)413: IPC Section 1105
   k. (P102)417: IPC Table 1106.2

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

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.

IMC/IPC/IFGC Committee Hearings go-to-meeting for those who can’t make it in person

Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.
https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/731466413

You can also dial in using your phone.
United States: +1 (571) 317-3122

Access Code: 731-466-413

New to GoToMeeting? Get the app now and be ready when your first meeting starts:
https://global.gotomeeting.com/install/731466413
Proposal # 387
Minor clarification revisions to existing amendment. Many gas fired range manufacturers do not publish exhaust requirements so the designer must use an alternate method of sizing the airflow.

Public Testimony in Support: Proponent- Installation of gas ranges, exhaust rates above range going to exterior. Allows designers to provide some method of calculation.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. How will you calculate what you need?
   a. HVI online, ASHRAE fundamentals.
2. Can we set a minimum of 600 CFM?
   a. Problem is then we trigger make up air.
3. Approved published method is vague. How do you define what that is?
   a. HVI online has exhaust rates over appliances, ASHRAE fundamentals.
4. Currently, the code reads “they shall be installed according to manufacturer’s instructions” Is that correct?
   a. Yes, most don’t come with manufacturers instructions.
5. What have you done in the past if they submit without calculations?
   a. We accept them but this requires us to be able to see the actual calculations.

Committee Discussion:
Gives designers another option and let them know what Denver is looking for as far as calculations.

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

Motion for Modification: Where not specified by manufacturer other approved published methods shall be used. Vote 5-0 Passes

Support:
This makes it clear that in the absence of calculations from the manufacturer, you would have alternative methods that will be accepted.

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

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
Need to italicize Approved because it’s a defined term.

Proposal # 388
Public Testimony in Support:
(Proponent) Wood Burning Appliances with EPA certification, refers to IFGC as that code addresses propane and natural gas. Move it where it’s appropriate

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

Committee Discussion:
Just cleaning it up.

Final Motion: As Submitted (AS)
Final Vote: AS 5-0 Passes

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # 386
Public Testimony in Support: None
Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Final Vote: AS 5-0 Passes
Proposal # 302

Public Testimony in Support:
Proponent Asked to review and eliminate what we can from Denver Amendments. Currently an inch and a half in base code, Denver took it up to 2 inches. If this has been a problem, it would have been changed to 2 inches

Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

Committee Discussion:
Wet vent system that introduces solids into the system can create a blockage, Denver doesn’t want those solids introduced in to a 1 ½ inch it was increased to 2 inches to reduce risk of blockage.

Talked to chief plumbing inspector, in residential houses with 1 ½ inch drain they are much more problematic.

In general, the bigger the pipe the better it is.

Final Motion: As Submitted (AS)
Final Vote: AS Fails 0-5
New Motion: Disapproval-withdrawn
Proposed Modification
Modification: Remove reference to (CPB) and keep this in the code.

Suggest to table this and bring back to next meeting so we can rework to keep 2 inch and correlate with all food waste disposal.

Expert in Room: – Should modify to remove reference that is no longer valid. Committee should be aware 416.3 is still unmodified and left at the inch and a half.

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
Tabled until July 10th Hearing.

Proposal # 303

Public Testimony in Support: Proponent- Goal is to correlate and monitor current Denver Amendments, currently 413.3.1 food waste disposer. New Section in the code specifically prohibits what this amendment is requiring. This proposals corrects that conflict.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None

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

Modification: Discussed with Wastewater Management and they would like to keep this amendment but do not like the exception. So, propose we leave the strike out for the exception and add “as allowed by Wastewater Management”

Committee Discussion:
We are getting these grease interceptors larger and larger. If we add to be approved by wastewater management, it is difficult to get in touch to get approval for these.

Would it be better to give Public Works the authority? The authority is currently with them.
Another proposal that addresses this issue as well.

Moderator - Any way to have someone from Public Works here so that we can get their side of why and get what they are looking for into the code.

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
Tabled until July 10th in hopes that Public Works can be involved and provide further clarification.

Proposal # 38
To eliminate the omission of a UL labeled tank when required by the Colorado Boiler Regulations and the IPC.

Public Testimony in Support:
Duplicate the words of Colorado state boiler. Denver can approve based on plumbing code but then state inspector can disapprove. Would be nice if this passed and they were in sync.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Original Motion: As-Submitted (AS)

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Question about the 120-gallon limits.
   a. Explained it is 120 and above, you would have to exceed 120 gallons.
2. So, 120 is acceptable without a label?
   a. Yes

Final Motion: As Submitted (AS)
Final Vote: AS 5-0 Passes

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:

Proposal # P98
To provide an enforceable method of building storm system sizing.

Public Testimony in Support: None

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Original Motion: Disapprove (D)

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:

Committee Discussion:
Basically saying 2018 IPC is ahead of manufacturer data

This is a dramatic change back to the old code.

Method in 2009 is more conservative than the current method of sizing. Method I accept as part of review. Not sure we need to codify using this alternate approach.

A lot of discussion at national level about referencing old code instead of bringing the language into the code now. Suggest working with the proponent to bring in the language instead of leaving the reference to 2009 causing people to carry around or retain old codes.

Disapproved (D) Fails 0-5

New Motion: AM

Modification: Bring in the wording from 2009 instead of the reference to 2009 code.

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

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
Proposal # P102
This proposal introduces a new table for PVC and Cast Iron in regards to their values for building a storm drain system.

Public Testimony in Support:
Did not hear back from proponent, this is to modify Table not just the section. Not sure if this was supposed to be footnote or to go in the table.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent: None
Committee Discussion:
Table until we can speak with proponent to confirm where this was intended to be placed.

Additional staff or committee comments for the record:
Proposal tabled until 7-10 hearing.
If approved, you might need 2 tables for plastic PVC or Cast Iron.
A footnote could address this.
To make it easier to follow it would be better to recreate a separate table, because all rows would be affected as a modifier.

Proposal # 54

Public Testimony in Support:
(Proponent) To address untampered air in to satisfy ventilation requirements when they are terminating air close to people. Require that air would be properly mixed before a customer would feel it.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None
Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
   1. Why 75. Typically, we say 78?
      a. Proponent ok with changing it to 78, was thinking 75 would be the typical set point.

Committee Discussion:
Big issue is Delta T. You could short your make up air. Don’t want that large Delta T getting into the space, making the space uncomfortable.

Typical make up air is 55, HVAC can make up those additional 3 degrees. Designed to keep kitchen occupants comfortable.

Conditioned space, non-conditioned space you want a minimum because you don’t want to freeze sprinklers.

Could modify 75 to 78 where mechanical cooling is provided.

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Modification: Modification #1: Change to 78 when mechanical cooling is provided.
   Modification #2: This section shall not apply to outdoor air provided by evaporative cooling.
   Modification #3: Shall not exceed 78 degrees when cooling is provided by a means other than evaporative cooling

Committee Discussion:
Don’t want to limit someone when they read this. This would mean 68 degree in winter even if I want to use outside air for cooling.
Agree with intent, but not sure we don’t need more time to think about the quirks.
Table until 7/10
Proposal # 41
This proposal revises the ventilation requirements to make them easier to understand and follow.

Public Testimony in Support:
(Proponent) Work of the city and architects for multifamily buildings, when over 4 stories you still have to meet each requirement for blower doors. Code says only mandatory if less than 5 ACH method. In Denver this applies to commercial as well. Did some research ½ people having trouble with how to enforce this. Asked ICC what actual intent was behind this section, intent was not to have this apply to 4 stories or more. Buildings getting tighter and tighter mechanical ventilation should be applied to everything across the board. If you comply with energy code, you have to have tight construction and need mechanical ventilation. This is actual wording in 2021 code.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Every dwelling unit needs mechanical ventilation?
   a. Yes, if you ‘re complying with energy code you need mechanical ventilation for dwelling units.
2. So, cannot use natural ventilation?
   a. Not on an apartment building.
3. What does exhaust air mean?
   a. That is already in the code, that’s not something I changed. 2021 is taking out exhaust only as an option.
4. This allows exhaust only?
   a. No, the code currently allows that.
5. City has interpreted the code to allow balanced ventilation, we’ve been consistent on that. In 2021 there was a proposal accepted by IECC to allow energy recovery in non-transitional dwelling units. Allowing exhaust only. In 2021 requiring a balanced ventilation?
   a. It depends what you want to allow... exhaust only strategies for 3 stories or less
6. The way it reads by exhaust supply or combination thereof?
   a. This is all already in the code.

Original Motion: Disapprove (D)
Final Vote: (D) 4-0-1 Passes

Proposal # 55
Public Testimony in Support:
(Proponent) Relates to natural ventilation and window openings where building code requires fall guards. When these windows are used for natural ventilation it is impossible to maintain the fall protection.

Public Testimony in Opposition: None

Questions from the Committee to Proponent:
1. Normal is considered what?
   a. 4 inches is the normal opening area. There is a standard that specifies how the override works.
2. You want them to only utilize their restricted opening area correct?
   a. I think you can take credit for the triangular sides.

Original Motion: A/S with Intent to Modify (ASM)
Modification: Say restricted opening instead of normal opening.
Vote on Modification: 5-0 Passes
Committee Discussion:
Understand intent, but people are going to come back and make same argument.

Depending on the type of window, sliders vs encasement windows

*Final Motion: As Modified (AM)*

*Final Vote: AM 4-1*

*Additional staff or committee comments for the record:*