

IFC Committee Hearing # 4 Meeting Minutes

April 13, 2022 From 2 p.m. – 5 p.m.
City and County of Denver

1. Roll Call

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

Voting Members Present: 10

2. Discussion and voting on IFC proposals

- Motion: George McNeill motion to table #46 and #42 to the end since they've already been discussed by the committee & to hear other proposals.
- 2nd Motion: Michael Passas seconds the motion
- Vote: **Pass** (10 for, 0 against)

- b. [#46](#) IFC 503.9 Access to fire pumps

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

- Tony Caro & Robert Merlino presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Michael: Is the diagram going to be included?
- Glenn: Common practice is to reference the figure and I don't see a reference.
- Wayne: What was the intent behind the two zone requirement.
- Robert: Thought about scenario where it was a ?
- Robert: reference the figure under the exception.
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Tony: Motion to approve as modified
- 2nd Motion: Robert: seconds motion to approve as modified
- **Vote: Pass as modified** (9 for, 0 against)

d. [#55](#) IFC 907.6.1.1 System design

- Brian Lukus presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- George: thinks 1 hr survivability makes sense. Asked Brian to comment on where info in proposal about stackability was found & asked for Kevin (general contractor) perspective.
- Brian: Citation is at bottom of the document.
- Kevin Nagahashi with Hensel Phelps Construction: This is done in other scenarios where emergency feeders are running up through a shaft, so in those situations wouldn't be a big issue, but if shaft isn't already existing, there would be impacts having to add it to the design.
- Brian: Clarification, not requiring a shaft, requiring a 2 hr room.
- Michael: Room will need a door, so it would have an impact on the

floorplate because this would be like having 2 rooms in the building.

- George: That's my point, it would have a construction impact. Agrees with Brian that NFPA is thinking that putting emergency in with other electrical does pose a risk, but wanted to recognize there will be a cost impact.
- Michael: In some other cities there is a dedicated shaft, but not a dedicated room.
- George: 2 solutions, one is dedicated shaft with access panels, the other is a dedicated room.
- Brad: Is there anything more specific we could point to other than the entire code for the 1hr construction? Comply with NFPA 72 is broad.
- Tony: They've revamped the entire section for survivability in the latest version of the code.
- Brian: You can still comply using a level 3 cabling system. 72 has an option now to not have survivability and they say you can comply using a riser with 1 hr floor assembly. The reason why NFPA 72,12.4.4 is called out is because it's left up to the AHJ to define "protected area" & he's trying to define it for Denver.
- Tony: Level 2 is using a 2 hr shaft & Level 3 adds sprinklers, so by default we're Level 3 because we'd never have an unsprinkled high-rise.
- Brian: when this was written, I thought we were changing requirements for BDA systems. The intention is to locate the BDA equipment in this closet too. That's the second part of this.
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: George: Motion to approve as submitted
- 2nd Motion: Tony: seconds motion to approve as submitted
- Vote: Pass (10 for, 0 against)

e. [#17](#) IFC 907.6.4 Zones

- Tony Caro presented proposal.

- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- NA
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: George: Motion to approve as submitted
- 2nd Motion: Tony: seconds motion to approve as submitted
- **Vote: Pass** (10 for, 0 against)

f. [#P10.2](#) IFC 907.6.4.10 Duct detectors

- Tony Caro presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- George: this proposal could use a couple commas, but Glenn could do that.
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: George: Motion to approve as submitted
- 2nd Motion: Michael: seconds motion to approve as submitted
- **Vote: Pass** (10 for, 0 against)

g. [#66](#) IFC 909.8.2 Verification

- Tony Caro presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Michael: How can you verify the movement of the air? The way it reads is that you would need a flow switch, but that is old technology.
- Tony: There is no language change, this is how it's appeared by the 16 amendments. Can use the old style fan fail switches, but nowadays see CT switch or VFD. What John was trying to capture is in the smoke control fan book.
- George: Only a handful of people that do smoke control and they know what this means. Don't have a problem with this being there, the point

is that air is flowing.

- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Tony: Motion to approve as submitted
- 2nd Motion: Wayne: seconds motion to approve as submitted
- **Vote: Pass** (8 for, 0 against, 1 abstain)

h. [#23](#) IFC 916.9 Signage

- Tony Caro presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- NA
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Tony: Motion to approve as submitted
- 2nd Motion: Wayne: seconds motion to approve as submitted
- **Vote: Pass** (10 for, 0 against)

i. [#77](#) IFC 915 Carbon Monoxide

- Tony Caro presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Brad: Will you scroll down to see the date in red? That's the date the state instituted the requirement?
- Tony: Yes, that's why we're retaining it
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: George: Motion to approve as submitted
- 2nd Motion: Tony: seconds motion to approve as submitted
- **Vote: Pass** (10 for, 0 against)

j. [#24](#) IFC 916.10 Gas Detection

- Tony Caro presented proposal.
- Support
- NA

- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- NA
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Wayne: Motion to approve as submitted
- 2nd Motion: George: seconds motion to approve as submitted
- **Vote: Pass** (9 for, 1 against)

k. [#67](#) IFC 920.5 Annual Conveyance Permits

- Mike Stewart presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Brad: seems straightforward & what needs to be done for the database
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Brad: Motion to approve as submitted
- 2nd Motion: Russell: seconds motion to approve as submitted
- **Vote: Pass** (9 for, 0 against)

l. [#78](#) IFC 920.13 Elevator in Car Comm

- Tony Caro presented proposal.
- Support
- Mike Stewart: New elevators have capabilities to support video and other advancements, another reason we need to drop this.
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Michael: So does this mean we don't need a phone line anymore?
- Tony: No, it just means you don't have to have pots. It can be cellular or VOIP.
- George: Says two way in-car communication shall be provided.
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: George: Motion to approve as submitted
- 2nd Motion: Michael: seconds motion to approve as submitted
- **Vote: Pass** (10 for, 0 against)

m. [#62](#) IFC 920.23 Elevator Disconnect Matrix and Map

- Mike Stewart presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Tony: Supports the proposed amendment, what we're identifying are the disconnect locations. It's been a requirement since 2011 and this puts the responsibility on the elevator contractor.
- Russell: The elevator contractor will have to ask the electricians for this location, so maybe it should be elevator contractor & electricians.
- Tony: Agree with you, but the install permit is issued to the elevator contractor.
- Russell: At the time of permit, the elevator contractor won't know the locations.
- Tony: But the electricians will be the electrical drawings will have been approved through CPD. So the elevator contractor will have to look at the electrical drawings.
- George: There needs to be one person responsible for this.
- Michael: On the electrical side, we get the elevator info very late, when the project is well under construction.
- Tony: This is retroactive, so the existing buildings would have to rely on the elevator contractor servicing.
- Mike: This info wouldn't be required at the time of elevator permit, but it would have to be done when the inspectors are onsite.
- Russell: This will be easier on existing buildings.
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Tony: Motion to approve as submitted
- 2nd Motion: George: seconds motion to approve as submitted
- **Vote: Pass** (9 for, 0 against)

n. [#50](#) IFC 920.24 Fire Rated Belts

- Mike Stewart presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Shaunna: May need to modify wording, because the way this reads now is that the elevator has to be fire rated, not the belt.
- Glenn: That's correct, this language does need some massaging.

- Tony: Would like to support the proposal, in the 2019 Denver code the language changed where fire technicians are no longer able to access the hoistway to test. This has been a big challenge and cost impact (first and maintenance.)
- Robert: Also in support. This proposal would not exclude any elevator suppliers from working in Denver?
- Mike: There are only 3 manufacturers that are using these belts, the 3 major manufacturers. Don't know of any independent companies that are using belts.
- Wayne: Has there been any consideration to similar language in Chapter 30 of the IBC? In an effort to make it as easy as possible for design teams to find compliance requirements. In general support of this. A little bit of a reach to require this, but thinks it's the right thing to do.
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Russell: Motion to approve as submitted
- 2nd Motion: Tony: seconds motion to approve as submitted
- Glenn: May want to modify to address the belt fire rating, not the elevator.
- Brad: This is changing the intent of the language. We want to require them to install the belts.
- Mike: I am good with Brad's modification.
- Motion: Tony: Motion to approve as modified
- 2nd Motion: George: seconds motion to approve as modified
- **Vote: Pass as modified** (9 for, 0 against)

o. [#56](#) IFC 907.5.2.3.3 Visible Notification

- Brian Lukus presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Michael: is in favor of this
- Tony: building a lot of affordable housing, (essentially a single family that is being turned into apartments) in Denver and thinks we should keep this in to keep it equitable for R-3 and R-4. We wouldn't be providing the same level of protection.
- Brian: The current amendment goes back to that table & he feels this is not an effective way to address hearing impaired.

- Brad: Does the current code require visible notification in all units?
- Brian: no, it's based on a table in the code. So if those units are leased, it is really difficult to move tenants around to free up a unit that has this visible alarm.
- Brad: Torn about this, it feels like we need this in more units.
- Brian: What he's heard is that the units that have this alarm aren't being used for hearing impaired, it's just an up-front cost burden without benefit.
- George: Thousands of units and there have been two instances that this has been asked for & in both cases it was easy to make the changes.
- Brad: So R-3 and R-4 have to have a visible alarm in every unit and R-1 refers to the table in the base code. George, how much more would it be to provide the visual notification above the pre-wiring?
- George: Doesn't have a #, but it's not insignificant. Pre-wiring is not required for R-2 per commentary, only to have a plan.
- Wayne: It could just mean leaving voltage drop for future install.
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Tony: Motion to adopt as submitted with intent to modify Modification is to leave R-3 and R-4 in
- 2nd Motion: Brad: seconds motion to approve as submitted with intent to modify
- Brian: R-3 has other uses than congregate units, so would rather see the owner needing to address this when necessary.
- Wayne: If we remove the provisions for an R-2, then we're saying R-3 and R-4 may be of greater concern, was that the intent?
- Tony: The way we're having single family converted to lodging houses, there is a big hazard there because they're Type 5 construction.
- Brian: The type of building Tony is talking about would be covered by the exemption, because it's a single dwelling unit (with multiple sleeping units.)
- **Vote: Pass** (8 for, 2 against)
- **Vote: Pass as modified** (8 for, 1 against)

- Tony Caro presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Brad: Do you want to exempt R-3 and R-4 under the IBC as well?
- Tony: Mostly what we've seen coming in is IRC types.
- Brad: The way it's written now covers all of this. So should specify IRC only if that's the intent.
- Michael: If I buy a generator from Costco & install it at my house, what is the process?
- Tony: Permitted through CPD electrical group. If natural gas, fire dept doesn't review them.
- Robert: Shaunna, can you pull up base IFC section 1203.1 for this? Section doesn't apply unless the generator is required by the code.
- Tony: 105.6 would require you to have an operational permit, but don't have to comply with anything else in this section.
- Shaunna: because of the base code application to only the IBC, the proposal would only apply to IBC.
- Shaunna: modified to get rid of exception and adding word required to make it clear.
- Tony: The intent of the committee who drafted this proposal was to protect fire fighters from being electrocuted if there is a generator they don't know about. So these modifications aren't meeting the intent.
- Robert: This proposed language is conflicting with the existing 1203.1 amendments. Don't even know where to start.
- Brad: Would it be appropriate to take a vote? We agree with what this proposal is trying to achieve, could we make a motion.
- Shaunna: You could agree to have a working group come up with the language if you all agree on the intent.
- Glenn: Are we only trying to exclude IRC structures, or exclude IBC R-3 and R-4 too?
- Tony: I think we are trying to exclude IBC R-3 and R-4 too, because the hazard isn't there.
- Shaunna: Intent is it applies to all generators, even the optional ones. And excludes single family and townhomes.
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Brad: Motion to approve with modification
- 2nd Motion: Robert: seconds motion to approve with modification
- Working group: Tony, Glenn, Shaunna
- **Vote: Pass** (9 for, 0 against)

- q. [#48](#) IFC 3903.5 Gas Detection
- Brian Lukus presented proposal.
 - Support
 - NA
 - Opposition
 - NA
 - Committee Questions/ Comments
 - Brad: Any memory of why 20% was originally set?
 - Brian: Don't remember. 10% was debated a lot because that's what first responders use, but they use it in a different way.
 - Opposition (Rebuttal)
 - NA
 - Motion: Wayne: Motion to approve as submitted
 - 2nd Motion: Robert: seconds motion to approve as submitted
 - **Vote: Pass** (9 for, 0 against)
- r. [#53](#) IFC 3904.2 Vertical growing systems
- Brian Lukus presented proposal.
 - Support
 - NA
 - Opposition
 - NA
 - Committee Questions/ Comments
 - Robert: Do you guys have facilities that encountered this and how have you addressed it?
 - Brian: We've worked with the applicant. The highest grow in Denver is 30 ft. Sees vertical growing increasing in the future.
 - Tony: Also important to point out the level of fuel loading these locations have, so important to treat them as a higher hazard like Chapter 32 does.
 - Wayne: Not referencing a specific commodity classification, this references back to Chapter 32?
 - Brian: That's correct.
 - Opposition (Rebuttal)
 - NA
 - Motion: Wayne: Motion to approve as submitted
 - 2nd Motion: George: seconds motion to approve as submitted
 - **Vote: Pass** (9 for, 0 against)

City of Denver will reach out to everyone on the committees once details are set for how the remaining proposals will be heard.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 MT

