



## IFC Committee Hearing Meeting Minutes # 1

February 2, 2022

2 p.m. – 5 p.m.

City and County of Denver ([via Zoom](#))

### 1. Roll Call and Introductions (Present/Absent/Subbing (Name))

- Brian Kannady- Absent
- Craig Johnson- Present
- Greg Forge- Present
- Michael Passas- Present
- Robert Merlino- Present
- Stephen Rondinelli- Present
- Wayne Griswold- Present
- Aaron Foy- Present
- George McNeill- Present
- Russell Mack Holt- Present
- Jaclyn Gorman- Present
- Brian Parr- Absent
- Cory Debaere- Present
- Tony Caro- Present
- Brad Emerick- Present
- David Kahn- Present

**Voting Members Present: 14**

### 2. Discussion and voting on **IFC Chapter 1**

- [#51](#) IFC B104.2.1 Townhouses
  - John Woycheese presented proposal.
  - Support
  - NA
  - Opposition
  - N/A
  - Committee Questions/Comments
  - Michael: Under the IRC, each unit is supposed to have it's own utilities

(water, waste, gas) but sometimes townhomes under IBC are using one fire service for a group of 10. So is this amendment for a group of 10 th separated by a fire rated wall?

- John: Yes, a collection of more than 3 units. Intended for collection of units constructed under IRC definition (not IBC def which is more stringent). Does not apply to duplex because IRC definition is 3 or more units. This proposal is related to fire hydrants outside the bldg., not inside.
- Robert: This amendment would be less strict than base building code, correct?
- John: Yes, this is how it's being applied now.
- Robert: Is there anywhere in Denver that doesn't have sufficient water supply where this would be an issue?
- John: Defer to Tony. Tony says very few areas that fall outside the pressure requirement. So doesn't suspect it would be a big issue.
- Tony: this proposal aligns us with the intent of Section 102.5 of the fire code.
- Aaron: How would the calculation work?
- John: If there is a 5 unit bldg., vertically separated by fire barrier. 3,000 sf, (3) 2k sf & 1k sf. Base the calcs on the area of the largest unit.
- Wayne: Is there any anecdotal or fire operation data that would impact this or drive this one way or another?
- John: There are non-Denver sources that have seen fires expand out of one unit depending on response time & construction, but John's understanding is this has been applied for a substantial amount of time. This is supported by CO Springs position (included in proposal). John defer to Tony about whether there have been any incidents of insufficient water? Tony: not in the past decade. Two incidents in townhomes being constructed but that's a different situation.

- Support (Rebuttal)
  - N/A
  - Opposition (Rebuttal)
  - N/A
  - Motion: Stephen: motion to approve this amendment based on substantiation provided in document.
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion: Tony: seconds approval as submitted.
  - **Vote: Pass** (14 for, 0 against- unanimous)
- [#71](#) IFC 105.5.52 Fencing OP permit
    - Tony Caro presented proposal.
    - Support
    - N/A
    - Opposition
    - Mark Jelinske: Consider not specifying voltage to avoid people with a volt meter getting picky & not showing it's 12 volts.
    - Tony: Important to maintain because in section 316 it only allows 12 voltage fencing to prevent electrocution. Section 105 is not the driving portion, it's the operational portion.
    - Shaunna: Does there need to be clarification in the proposal?
    - Committee Questions/Comments
    - Wayne: Proposes a slight revision to physical & health hazards. P&HH is pretty specific to hazardous materials. Is this referencing P&HH in addition to section 316? Seems like we're trying to align with hazards outlined in 316.
 

Tony: Health intended to address booby trap doors.
  - Robert: Base fire code already has a 105.5.52 so this should be 105.5.53?
  - Shaunna: there will be a bunch of things that get renumbered, so the numbering will be taken care of with revisions & Denver can review.
  - Brad: Is there any wisdom in referencing 316.7.1?
  - Tony: Great idea because this would help with end users trying to pull permits. Some folks like fencing companies aren't as familiar with file codes.
  - George: "When approved by fire code official, permit is required."
 

What's the intent of this wording? Is it to have latitude to request a

permit?

- Tony: Statement just coordinates with the section 316.
- Glenn: Clarifies intention is: when fire code official has approved the fence in accordance with 316, a permit will be issued.
- Michael: Same question as George. Any fence? Fence during construction?
- Glenn: This is an operational permit, not a construction permit. So the fire official is reviewing the construction that's proposed & once the fire official has approved that, this kicks in the need for an operational permit.
- Stephen: What barbed wire/ razor wire/ electric fences would be approved by a fire official? They all seem to pose a hazard to fire fighters?
- Tony: If the owner wants to mitigate access to the site by a secure fence, they need to provide easy access for fire fighters the fire official is ok. This allows notes in the dispatch regarding access.
- Glenn: Suggested rewording based on discussion. Where hazardous...in accordance with 316.7...a permit is required. Trying to get reference back to 316.7
- Greg: do we want to clarify the type of permit (ie operational permit?)
- Tony: Section 105 is operational permits.
- Glenn: It wouldn't be unusual, there are other requirements in section 105 that specify operational permit.
- Brad: How about: "When approved by the fire code official in accordance with 316.7, a permit is required...."
- George: Wherever we can clarify by extra words I think it's helpful. Whole point is we don't want to have barbed wire or electrified fences being hazards to firefighters. So both places makes sense.
- Wayne: We need to point back to section 316, may not need to be so

specific to 316.7.1 because that's only electrified fences.

- ? : Thinks 316 is too general because there are other hazards that aren't fences & this proposal is about fences.
- Jaclyn: Wants to stay consistent with language of "power source voltage" in the two sections.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Motion: Brad: Approval as submitted with intent to modify.  
Modification: Per Shaunna's screen.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion: George seconds.
- Discussion:
- Stephen: Do we have to get a permit for any of the other items in 316 other than fencing that are also hazards for firefighters?
- Wayne: That was Wayne's initial logic of why a general reference to 316 may have made sense, but the clarification of this being specific to fencing means it probably makes more sense for this to specify 316.7.
- Glenn: Do we want to leave "operational" in or out?
- Greg: include it just for simplicity.
- **Vote: Pass** (14 for, 0 against- unanimous)
- [#72](#) IFC 105.6.13 Gates and Barricades
  - Tony Caro presented proposal.
  - Support
  - N/A
  - Opposition
  - N/A
  - Committee Questions/Comments
  - Brad: Clarification Section 105.7 is for construction permits. Is the intention operational permit in 106 or operational permit?
  - Glenn: 105.6 is construction permit in the 2021 fire code, the section numbers were shifted.
  - Support (Rebuttal)
  - N/A
  - Opposition (Rebuttal)
  - N/A

- Motion: Stephen: Motion to approve as submitted based on substantiation & discussion.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion: Wayne seconds.
- **Vote: Pass** (14 for, 0 against)
- [#58](#) IFC 105.6.21 Phased occupancy
  - Tony Caro presented proposal.
  - Support
  - N/A or capture discussion
  - Opposition
  - N/A
  - Committee Questions/Comments
  - Michael: Very happy to see this because from a design side this comes up often. Tried to look for section 901.5.1 & couldn't find it.
  - Glenn: In base Fire Code.
  - Robert: Are there current requirements on Denver website?
  - Tony: Yes, it's under policies for phased occupancy.
  - Robert: His concern is having reference to Denver's website, which can change, and not a reference to something in the fire code.
  - Tony: this is consistent with what's in the amended codes, confirmed by Glenn. Glenn said it allows more flexibility.
  - Robert: Could we reference the title of the policy & not just reference the website?
  - Tony: That's a good point. Phased occupancy does not have a section in the code so that makes it a little more challenging.
  - Stephen: This question is asked often so this is a good amendment. Should we just put the policy language in the code? But he is ok with referencing a policy. Requires a plan to be developed by client & approved.
  - George: This is fantastic to get it up front & make it more formal. He believes it needs to stay a policy so there is some fluidity.
  - Wayne: Is there any reason we can't include existing buildings here as well? Modifications of a building that could jeopardize life safety.

- Tony: Great question. Existing buildings seldom relinquish their certificate of occupancy through renovation/ reconstruction. So this would not apply.
- Wayne: Makes sense, could we think of this as part of a future amendment & how it could apply to existing buildings.
- Glenn: “Phased occupancy approach of new buildings or a change of occupancy” (where you would be getting a new CO)
- ?: Just remove the word new from the proposed language?
- Shaunna: the phased occupancy policy would likely need to deal with existing buildings as well.
- George: Phased occupancy is as big as new building. Are there enough instances of existing buildings that it’s worth adding the complexity in wording?
- Tony: Hears what everyone is saying for existing buildings, but it’s a different approach than this policy. Two different tracks. But the tenant finish policy is in the works.
- Shaunna: Very few places in the code deal with new & existing in the same place.
- Glenn: Charging statement speaks to vertical construction, new construction.
- Brad: Steele building on 16<sup>th</sup> they took down to superstructure & then phase occupancy when they built it back out. So if we don’t specify new or existing, it leaves flexibility in the policy to make sure the occupancy plan is a good one. This is emphasizing a phased occupancy vs. the construction. Though it doesn’t happen as much with existing buildings, it does happen.
- Wayne: agrees with what Brad just said. If there is a change in use, and the IEBC drives what the changes are, it’s silent on what Brad is talking about. If we can point to this provision to give them a phased occupancy

approach that would be good.

- Michael: In the Denver amendments does it spell out what is required to get the phased occupancy?
- Glenn: In the administrative chapter Section 142.6 is TCO & that's where the details are found regarding how to get the TCO.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Motion: Brad: Approval with modification- replace the words phased occupancy with the title of the policy.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion: Stephen seconds.
- **Vote: Pass** (14 for, 0 against- unanimous)
- [#73](#) IFC 105.6.31 Tank Construction
  - Tony Caro presented proposal on behalf of David Hill.
  - Support
  - N/A
  - Opposition
  - N/A
  - Committee Questions/Comments
  - Jaclyn: Would it be easier to just remove both above ground & under ground & just have hazardous storage tanks?
  - Tony: May be important to keep because those terms are used elsewhere in the code.
  - Greg: is there any volume definition that specifies definition of a tank?
  - Glenn: Tank is defined in IFC base code as vessel that contains more than 60 gallons.
  - Support (Rebuttal)
  - N/A
  - Opposition (Rebuttal)
  - N/A
  - Motion: Jaclyn: Motion to approve as written.
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion: Greg seconds.
  - Shaunna needs to hyphenate above-ground.
  - **Vote: Pass** (14 for, 0 against- unanimous)



### 3. Discussion and voting on IFC Chapter 2

- [#57](#) IFC Sleeping room definition
  - Glenn presented proposal on behalf of McKayla?
  - Support
  - Mark Jelinske- Supportive, but please consider what are the ramifications of this? For example in healthcare, Dr. sleeping rooms or sleep study rooms in B occupancies? How would that affect this? If this costs more money, it may mean designers don't put in the sleeping rooms.
  - Opposition
  - John Woycheese- typically the IFC is under the sole discretion of the fire official.
  - Committee Questions/Comments
  - Shaunna: brought up in the IBC committee- if there is a closet does that make too many things a sleeping room? What if there is not a closet but it's used as a sleeping room then can't be regulated as a sleeping room.
  - Glenn: related to I occupancies, the closet does make it an issue of question.
  - Craig: there are several buildings that have wellness rooms where people sleep, what about breastfeeding rooms? So overall there would need to be a closet to call it a sleeping room unless noted by building official.
  - Jaclyn: there is another definition for a sleeping unit, will this definition conflict?
  - Glenn: Sleeping unit is different than dwelling unit in that it doesn't involve cooking. So spaces more like dormitories. Could make reference to sleeping room in I occupancies not being in R occupancies.
  - George: Does it need to be defined as much as it could create issues if it is defined?
  - Tony: Agrees with George. Big impact is Section 10-31 that addresses rescue openings. Basements in R-2,3,4 occupancies you are required to install rescue openings, so Tony doesn't think this proposal buys anything more than what's already in the code today.

- Support (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Motion: Stephen: Motion for disapproval as submitted based on previous discussion & action of IBC committee.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion: George seconds.
- Vote: **Does not pass** (0 for, 14 against- unanimous)

#### 4. Discussion and voting on **IFC Chapter 3**

- [#74](#) IFC 307.4.2 Recreational fires
  - Tony Caro presented
  - Support
  - N/A
  - Opposition
  - N/A
  - Committee Questions/Comments
  - Language prior to stating the distance exactly matches the current amendment in the commercial code.
  - Stephen: Language reads that if CDPHE permits it, it could override the 25ft prohibition in the IFC.
  - George: More interested in the administrative part of this. The IFC has jurisdiction over recreational fires, but fire dept. wants DPHE to do the administration.
  - Tony: In the City, DPHE controls when you can or can't have burns. DPHE knows about the IFC parameters & can ask for the fire to be extinguished, and can call fire enforcers if needed.
  - Stephen: That helps clarify it a little bit, but a non-red-flag permissible burn day doesn't mean you don't have to meet the IFC requirements.
  - Tony: Maybe we need to reword it to make it more clear.
  - Glenn: DPHE prohibits open burning unless it's permitted by DPHE.
  - Support (Rebuttal)
  - John Woycheese: Start with "Recreational fires, when permitted by DPHE, cannot be within..."
  - Mark Jelinkse: Supports making it two sentences.

- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- N/A
- Motion: George: Motion to approve with intent to modify. “Recreational fires, when permitted by DPHE, ...”
- Glenn: suggests the same modification in the parent section 307.4 to another amendment that is going on to be consistent.
- Brad: Doesn’t like that it’s not clear that a permit is required by DPHE.
- Glenn: Do we put the permit requirement at the start of 307.1 General & not need this other amendment? Get rid of 307.4
- Shaunna: ask Glenn to write it up
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion: Brad seconds.
- Motion: George to table this to the next meeting (Feb 23<sup>rd</sup>) so Glenn can write up the language.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion: Brad seconds.
- **Vote: Table to Feb 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting** (14 for, 0 against)

## 5. Discussion and voting on **IFC Chapter 5**

- [#63](#) IFC 503.2.1 Dimensions
  - Tony Caro presented
  - Support
  - N/A
  - Opposition
  - N/A
  - Committee Questions/Comments
  - Stephen: Clarifying this is a good modification. This question gets asked of every consultant & it clarifies it so it doesn’t drag out through the review process.
  - Aaron: Coming from homebuild perspective: Greencourt design where we have garage access but not necessarily a front street. In these developments what looks like an alley is designed as a street & meets street standards, would this impact those types of designs?
  - Tony: Fire code requires a 20ft unobstructed width for new streets.
  - Jaclyn: Usually when working with developers, they are meeting requirements for private roads.
  - Support (Rebuttal)

- N/A
  - Opposition (Rebuttal)
  - N/A
  - Motion: George Motions to accept as written.
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion: Michael seconds.
  - Vote: **Pass** (14 for, 0 against)
- 
- [#75](#) IFC 503.2.4 Turning radius
    - Tony Caro presented
    - Support
    - N/A
    - Opposition
    - N/A
    - Committee Questions/Comments
    - Stephen: Can this provision be utilized in other locations in the City that aren't approved by Dodi of the Mayor's office?
    - Tony: The way it reads is that it could be used. That's a good point.
    - Stephen: Opening up the flood gate for developers & could open up the City for subjective decision making. How are we going to address that subjectivity?
    - Tony: Maybe we should add specificity & refer to the Mayor's Vision Zero initiative.
    - Support (Rebuttal)
    - N/A
    - Opposition (Rebuttal)
    - N/A
    - Motion: Stephen: Motion to table to next meeting on Feb 23<sup>rd</sup>
    - 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion: Greg seconds.
    - Vote: **Table to Feb 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting** (14 for, 0 against)

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 MT