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.
• **2nd 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.
- **2nd 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.
2nd 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 16th 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.
  - 2nd **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.
  - 2nd **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\textsuperscript{nd} 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 DHPE, 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
• **2nd Motion**: Brad seconds.
• **Motion**: George to table this to the next meeting (Feb 23rd) so Glenn can write up the language.
• **2nd Motion**: Brad seconds.
• **Vote**: Table to Feb 23rd 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.
• 2nd 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 23rd
  • 2nd Motion: Greg seconds.
  • Vote: Table to Feb 23rd Meeting (14 for, 0 against)

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 MT