

IFC Committee Hearing Meeting Minutes # 3

March 16, 2022 From 2 p.m. – 5 p.m.
City and County of Denver ([via Zoom](#))

1. Roll Call (Present/Absent/Subbing (Name))

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

Voting Members Present: 13

2. Discussion and voting on IFC proposals

- a. [#46](#) IFC 503.9 access to fire pumps
 - Robert Merlino presented proposal modification.
 - Simplified original amendment to specify location & how it's accessed & then provided exceptions in more formal format.
 - Support
 - NA
 - Opposition
 - NA
 - Committee Questions/ Comments
 - Brad: Why measuring to most remote portion of fire pump room as

opposed to the door?

- Robert: Could create a loophole where a door is put in an odd location just to meet this requirement. Measuring to pump itself could also motivate architect to locate pump first. Most remote portion of room is more consistent with how distances are measured in codes.
- Michael: Generous fire pump room is about 20x20ft. so if 20ft to the room, that's 40 ft total. The previous version wasn't well reasoned, but it was 25ft after you exit the stair. If there's an existing building & the fire pump needs to be replaced, is approval of the location of the pump required?
- Robert: if replacing a fire pump like for like, you don't have to do anything to the room. If you are upgrading the pump to a larger size, then you do have to meet requirements for the room. Based on how this is written now.
- Michael: Agrees if there is a significant remodel.
- Shaunna: This language says "preplanned & approved", which may mean it could be approved without upgrades.
- Brad: If I have a two-story building, the pathway doesn't have to be rated at all, based on this language.
- Tony: 4 stories or less have to be 1 hr rated, for stairways and enclosures.
- Brad: Is that the intent? If you have a 2 story building, do you need rated path to the fire pump?
- Tony: The intent was if 4 stories or less, want 1 hr, more stories is 2 hrs. Not sure it reads that way right now.
- Brad: Maybe it should just state that intent so it's not misinterpreted.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- John Woycheese: Noting that a two-story building would be a 3 story building if there is a subgrade fire pump. And the original intent was not to say the fire rating we're looking for, it's what the building would require for interior stairways. Concept was to match the egress capabilities so the firefighters in the pump room would have an equal opportunity to exit the pump room.
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Tony: This topic needs a lot of detail because it's being designed by architects, so don't want it to be too simple.
- Michael: 80ft seems like a good distance to the remote portion of the room.
- Brad: This means an architect would likely put a small room at the end of a long hallway. Would rather see a larger room closer to the exterior.
- Brian: Is this measured horizontally, or with rise too?
- Tony: If we make the length larger, then we're moving away from the intent to keep the firefighters close to the exit. How about 75ft? Does that make it closer to meet everyone's needs?

- Brian: 75ft would work for the project that is sitting on my desk.
- Stephen: thinks 75ft is a good number, we need to remember that we are going to be asked how we arrived at that number. 25ft from exterior to stair, 25ft of vertical, 25ft through room.
- Brian: Does this mean there has to be a door at the end of the stair to the fire pump room?
- Brad: ICC ruled on that & pretty sure they ruled don't need a door there.
- Tony: The unfortunate portion is that corridors can drop to 30 min rating depending on occupancy load. So thinks we should just say anything low-rise should be 1 hr & high-rise should be 2 hr. Both the pump room and route to get there. From NFPA20.
- Stephen: suggests we put from NFPA20 & the requirements in this code so the designer doesn't have to look up NFPA20.
- Shaunna: What does NFPA20 say?
- Tony: The exact wording is: Fire pump units serving high-rise...2 hr construction. Non-highrise bldgs. in accordance with table that depends on sprinkled or partially-sprinkled.
- Shaunna: Travel path from exterior to fire pump room must match the room?
- Stephen: Use "exit passageway"? Have in the past told architects couldn't connect the pathway to an exit passageway.
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Tony: Motion to approve as modified by on screen
- 2nd Motion: Stephen: Seconds Motion to approve as modified
- **Vote: Failed** (4 for, 8 against)
- Motion: Brad: Motion to table to April 13th meeting, Brad will modify in mean time with Robert, Tony & Glenn.
- 2nd Motion: Greg: Seconds Motion to table
- **Vote: Pass to table** (11 for, 1 against)

b. [#6](#) IFC 903.3.11 Pre-action

- John Woycheese presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Robert: last sentence- insulation ...shall be subject to approval of fire official, what's the point of leaving it up to approval when double interlock action systems are allowed per the language right above.
- John: What used to be 907.672 has been moved up to the section on pre-action systems, without modification of the language.

- George: this is acknowledging the 3 types of systems & double interlock requires additional approval from the Fire official.
- Tony: has only allowed double interlock for freezer systems, for 20+ years in Denver.
- Brad: will there be confusion about submittal requirements being in the suppression language?
- John: it's duplicated in all the sections.
- George: feels like this is step in the right direction. As long as the references back and forth are correct, it gets the protection and alarm folks on the same page.
- Brian: does it make sense to say double-interlock is only allowed in freezer applications?
- Stephen: Even in some freezer applications it's not been permitted, so that's why the language right now says subject to approval.
- Brian: 2011 code specified it's allowed in freezers, but since has been changed to per approved by fire code official.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: George: Motion to approve as submitted
- 2nd Motion: Stephen: Seconds Motion to approve as submitted
- **Vote: Pass to approve** (12 for, 0 against)

C. [#42](#) IFC 903.3.12 Master PRV at risers

- Tony Caro presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Robert: asked Tony to clarify where he is seeing this & how it's arranged
- Tony: common in open garages, but more recently used in occupied plates with a riser up the floors. One master PRV at the base of the riser. Seen it in 20 story buildings. With zone controls. So every time the component needs services or testing, the system for the whole building is out. And fire watch for the 20 story building is tough on the fire dept.
- Robert: Agrees this is bad design, but has cost concerns initially and ongoing for maintenance testing. Not crazy about the wording and would need significant rewrite to make it palatable.
- Tony: one the cost side, the standard in Denver has been a PRV on every floor. So feels like cost is similar either way. But certainly cost savings by using 1 PRV for the whole building.
- George: When he first reviewed this, it felt more generic, but now that

he hears the proposal he understands master PRV is referring to a single PRV for the whole building.

- Robert: sees master PRV upstream from the dry valves, but hasn't seen one PRV for the whole building.
- Brian: prohibit
- Tony: Seeing this in the last 5 years, particularly in high-rises and it's not prohibited by code so that's the issue.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Robert: Motion to table until April 13
- Robert: We can't table everything, we need to respond to what was presented. & it's ok to send it back for next time.
- Tony: we all agree this is bad design and that it needs to be addressed
- 2nd Motion: George: Seconds Motion to table and have Robert, Tony & George work on the language.
- Stephen: speaking in opposition to tabling- understands urgency and the issue of poor design & doesn't think word smithing will fix the issues.
- **Vote: Pass to table** (8 for, 3 against, 1 abstain)

d. [#43](#) IFC 903.3.13 Modifications to old sprinkler systems

- John Woycheese presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Brad: where do the reduced values come from?
- John: Done back in August, don't remember. Believe they were in the references that have been
- Support (Rebuttal)
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Robert: Motion to disapprove
- 2nd Motion: Michael: Seconds Motion to disapprove.
- Robert: NFPA already provides reduced values. This is a nationwide issue, not specific to Denver and should be addressed nationally if deemed appropriate. Not sure how the 30 years was chosen. No engineering basis for determining a Cvalue of a pipe.
- Michael: Would like to add last week he visited a building with no ceiling and there was all different types of pipe. Not sure how anyone would determine age of pipe. In agreement with Robert.
- John: To respond to comment about age: Typical expected age of a

sprinkler system is 30 years, so that's the reason 30 years was picked. The point is not each individual pieces of pipe, it's more about the age of the system. Denver has done engineering analysis on piping and that there has been corrosion expected regarding pipe diameter and surface roughness. NFPA requires an internal investigation every 5 years of sprinkler piping, but may not happen. So this would promote that investigation.

- Robert: in support of internal inspections, but doesn't think this is the way to go about that.
- Tony: would like to support john & this concept, a lot of the warehouses built in the 60s & 70s -very tedious and this section could be a middle of the road. The code does require full sprinkler testing after 50 years, and this has become more prevalent and a bigger problem recently.
- Stephen- supports motion for disapproval because this is language that belongs in NFPA as a standard and not as a requirement.
- **Vote: Pass to disapprove** (9 for, 3 against, 0 abstain)

e. [#40](#) IFC 903.4.2 Alarms

- John Woycheese presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Brad: Helps clear up the code
- Support (Rebuttal)
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Brad: Motion to approve as submitted.
- 2nd Motion: George: Seconds Motion to approve as submitted.
- **Vote: Pass to approve** (12 for, 0 against, 0 abstain)

f. [#54](#) IFC 903.4.3 Floor control valve

- John Woycheese presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Robert: Supports the change, helps clarify. May want one other change- Get rid of exception 2 & combine exception 1 into the main body of the text to further simplify. In the new bldg. code (2021 IBC), anywhere there are standpipes will require NFPA13.

John: works for him. But limitation is that small 4 story buildings would not be required to have standpipes because there is a square footage limitation. Understands the point of simplification, but doesn't think it hurts to have it in there.

- Support (Rebuttal)
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Robert: Motion to approve as submitted.
- 2nd Motion: Tony: Seconds Motion to approve as submitted.
- **Vote: Pass to approve** (12 for, 0 against, 0 abstain)

g. [#47](#) IFC 904.13.1 Manual activation

- Tony Caro presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Robert: Supports the change, helps clarify. May want one other change- Get rid of exception 2 & combine exception 1 into the main body of the text to further simplify. In the new bldg. code (2021 IBC), anywhere there are standpipes will require NFPA13.

John: works for him. But limitation is that small 4 story buildings would not be required to have standpipes because there is a square footage limitation. Understands the point of simplification, but doesn't think it hurts to have it in there.

- Support (Rebuttal)
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Brad: Motion to approve as submitted.
- 2nd Motion: Russel Mack Holt: Seconds Motion to approve as submitted.
- Glenn: remove the one in the main body
- John: agrees with motion as modified.
- Brad: with that change, the manual activation device has to be outside the cooking area for the code official to approve. Has worked on projects where the location didn't meet this 10ft. Removing it constrains the fire code officials ability to choose. So recommends keeping the two exceptions.
- **Vote: Pass to approve** (13 for, 0 against, 0 abstain)

h. [#12](#) IFC 905.3.1 Standpipes

- John Woycheese presented proposal.

- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Stephen: so this would mean no 1.5" connections?
- John: could use a coupling to connect a 1.5" hose to 2.5".
- Tony: it's class II standpipes for occupant use. Now we have a 2.5" outlet & crews can use a reducer if they'd like.
- Glenn: exceptions part comes from current amendments & also amending base model code 905.3.1 When it's final, if approved, it will be clear to the reader the exceptions are deleted, but they are moved.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Tony: Motion to approve as submitted.
- 2nd Motion: Michael Passas: Seconds Motion to approve as submitted.
- **Vote: Pass to approve** (13 for, 0 against, 0 abstain)

i. [#15](#) IFC 907.2.1.3 Egress illumination

- John Woycheese presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- George likes that it cleans it up
- Support (Rebuttal)
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: George: Motion to approve as submitted.
- 2nd Motion: Tony: Seconds Motion to approve as submitted.
- **Vote: Pass to approve** (13 for, 0 against, 0 abstain)

j. [#65](#) IFC 907.2.13.6 Elevator status control panels

- Mike Stewart presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Russell: Thinks should add 12. ATS emergency power transfer light for

emergency power to the proposal so the panel would indicate when it goes from building power to emergency power.

- Brad: Probably shouldn't use ATS, should use Automatic Transfer Switch
- Tony: already receiving that signal
- Russell: fire fighters are looking to see when transfer happens.
- Tony: there is a generator panel next to the emergency panel, so think we're already getting this.
- Russell: This would show the elevators are transferring to emergency power.
- Tony: How will this be accomplished? There is a single signal for the building moving to emergency power. So why would the elevators be any different since they are getting their power from the same bldg. system.
- Greg: this is for new equipment, correct? Agree with Tony, this seems like a bit of an overkill.
- Russell: Yes, for new equipment. If we want to educate the fire inspectors to look at the correct indicator light, that would work, but this has been a real issue the last few years.
- Glenn recommends using "include" instead of "add".
- Russell: okay
- Greg: what will this do to the size of the panel? Will this take up more space?
- Russell: This will add inscription, a light that will come on when the elevators switch over.
- Greg: verbiage would be open & then lit or unlit?
- Mike: yah.
- Greg: Does ASME give direction for what the verbiage should be? To avoid elevator mfgs having different verbiage.
- Mike: No, ASME doesn't give language. Not too concerned on language, the idea is when lit, the doors need to be fully open.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Russell: Motion to approve as modified.
- 2nd Motion: George: Seconds Motion to approve as modified.
- Tony: If we're going to include item 12, need to correct the language. Dictated language to Shaunna. Concerned we're creating more work for inspectors, because the life safety inspectors are already looking. & where does it end if we add lights for each component.
- **Vote: Fails** (4 for, 8 against, 1 abstain)
- Motion: George: Motion to approve as submitted.
- 2nd Motion: Michael: Seconds Motion to approve as submitted.
- **Vote: Passes as submitted** (12 for, 1 against, 0 abstain)

- k. [#60](#) IFC 903.3.9 and 907.3.3 Elevator Sprinklers and Detection
- John Woycheese presented proposal.
 - Support
 - NA
 - Opposition
 - NA
 - Committee Questions/ Comments
 - George: two numbers from 190-200, did you verify it doesn't need to be 205?
 - John: section 903 or 907 referenced 190 and 200 degree. Did do research that there are several devices within that range, but didn't do research to see if above 200 would be required. Wanted to make sure there were several devices by different manufacturers within that range. Can't have two heat detectors, if requires recall & shunt, must have smoke detectors.
 - Tony: Would be important to clarify to the committee that Denver has removed stand along method for dealing with elevators. This more closely aligns with NFPA and national standards.
 - John: There are still some Denver specific nuances.
 - Robert: There are two references to NFPA13, would be easier to reference just NFPA and get rid of reference to section 936.
 - Support (Rebuttal)
 - Opposition (Rebuttal)
 - NA
 - Motion: Robert: Motion to approve as modified.
 - 2nd Motion: Tony: Seconds Motion to approve as modified.
 - Russell Mack Holt: What's the difference between smart heat and linear heat?
 - John: Linear heat allows testing to be conducted outside hoistway.
 - **Vote: Passes as modified** (13 for, 0 against, 0 abstain)
- l. [#P44](#) IFC 907.3.3.2 Sprinklers
- Glenn presented proposal.
 - Support
 - NA
 - Opposition
 - NA
 - Committee Questions/ Comments
 - Brad: So this is suggesting removal of machine rooms?
 - Glenn: No, just clarifying "machine rooms, machine spaces" otherwise

“spaces” is just floating there.

- John: could also put “or” Machine rooms “or” spaces.
- George: likes Machine spaces instead of “or”
- Support (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Tony: Motion to approve as modified.
- 2nd Motion: Greg: Seconds Motion to approve as modified.
- **Vote: Passes as modified** (13 for, 0 against, 0 abstain)

- m. [#55](#) IFC 907.6.1.1 System design
- n. [#17](#) IFC 907.6.4 Zones
- o. [#P10.2](#) IFC 907.6.4.10 Duct detectors
- p. [#66](#) IFC 909.8.2 Verification
- q. [#23](#) IFC 916.9 Signage
- r. [#77](#) IFC 915 Carbon Monoxide
- s. [#24](#) IFC 916.10 Gas Detection
- t. [#67](#) IFC 920.5 Annual Conveyance Permits
- u. [#78](#) IFC 920.13 Elevator in Car Comm
- v. [#62](#) IFC 920.23 Elevator Disconnect Matrix and Map

Meeting adjourned at 5:08 MT