

IMC, IPC, IFGC Committee Hearing # 1 Minutes

April 20, 2022 From 2 p.m. – 5 p.m.

City and County of Denver

1. Roll Call

Committee Member	In Attendance?
Mark Jelinske	X
Brian Kannady	X
Gary Cardenas	X
Michael Passas	X
Matt Edwards	X
Jeff Tejral	NON-VOTING
Austin Krcmarik	
Danny Boncich	X
Chuck Bartel	X
Frank Gonzales	
Louis Jugert	

Per Eric, we can proceed with 6 present committee members.

7 Committee members present

2. Discussion and voting on proposals

a. [#6](#) IPC 1106.5

- Support:
- None
- Opposition:
- None
- Committee Questions:
- What is considered the strainer when determining the circumference? Answer: The width of the strainer at the roof drain.
- If someone were to use the equivalent circumference method to comply, how would they provide documentation? Answer: Probably on a set of drawings kept with the city of Denver.
- Are there pieces missing from the diagram such as the Francis formulas and a legend for the variables? Answer: If approved, we can double check that there are no missing elements.
- Rebuttal (Support):

- N/A
- Rebuttal (Opposition):
- N/A
- Discussion:
- **Motion: To approve with a future amendment to include missing elements from commentary (Francis formula and legend).**
- **Vote passes unanimously – 7 votes**

b. [#P28.1](#) IPC 712.4 Sumps and Ejectors (*proponent not present, Chuck filling in*)

- Support:
- None
- Opposition:
- None
- Committee Questions:
- Are you intending to try to limit the amount of items that you can serve with a single pump? (Looking from an enforcement angle)
- Rebuttal (Support):
- N/A
- Rebuttal (Opposition):
- N/A
- Discussion:
- Is the intent to limit food waste devices? The intent is to give a small exception to breakroom sinks or something that is not required to tenant finishes.
- If the committee thinks this is too limiting, we could as “or similar” per Shaunna’s suggestion.
- We can adjust to be a type a sink as opposed to the kind of room it’s in.
- **Motion: To approve as amended**
- **Vote passes unanimously – 7 votes**

c. [#P28.2](#) IPC-717, 718

- Support:
- None
- Opposition:
- None

- Committee Questions:
- None
- Rebuttal (Support):
- N/A
- Rebuttal (Opposition):
- N/A
- Discussion:
- Is the intent that they would be required to pull a permit? If its inside then they would require a plumbing permit, if its outside it would require a wastewater permit.
- **Motion to approve as submitted**
- **Vote passes unanimously**

d. [#P9.1](#) IMC Standard References Update CH 15

- Support:
- The changes are necessary due to the changes of the AMAT. There is legislature currently in Colorado that would disallow the use of refrigerants, and this would work in conjunction with that.
- Opposition:
- None
- Committee Questions:
- Is there anything in ASHRAE that prohibits the use of these refrigerants. Answer: Nothing in ASHRAE prohibits the use of these next generation refrigerants.
- Do you see any concern if we accept this proposal without updating the mechanical sections themselves? We have written this code to align with the code as much as possible. It is better to align nationally than locally in my opinion.
- Rebuttal (Support):
- The ASHRAE 15 2019 edition includes the requirements of A2L refrigerants.
- Rebuttal (Opposition):
- N/A
- Discussion:
- The easy way is to allow ASHRAE 15. A2L refrigerants are not addressed in the fire code.
- **Motion to table**
- **Vote: Passes unanimously – 7 votes**

- e. [#P14](#) IMC 607.5.7
- Support:
 - None
 - Opposition:
 - None
 - Committee Questions:
 - None
 - Rebuttal (Support):
 - N/A
 - Rebuttal (Opposition):
 - N/A
 - Discussion:
 - Don't think it's necessary
 - **Motion to disapprove.**
 - **Vote: Passes unanimously – 7 votes**
- f. [#P15.1](#) IMC 401.2 Air Leakage for Mech Vent
- Proponent has decided to rescind proposal
- g. [#1](#) IMC 401,403,501 Ventilation and Exhaust
- Support:
 - None
 - Opposition:
 - None
 - Committee Questions:
 - How are the amendments in the 2019 code being modified? Answer: The intent was to require supply. There can be slight ventilation differentials. Existing amendments will be modified to support this one.
 - The intent was not to have a complex system that ramps up and down depending how many exhaust fans are on.
 - Rebuttal (Support):
 - N/A
 - Rebuttal (Opposition):
 - N/A

- Discussion:
- Can't support, how can you balance ventilation when you only have a small amount of outside air coming in compared to exhaust air.
- **Motion to approve as amended.**
- **Vote passes unanimously – 7 votes.**

Hearing adjourned at 5:01PM MT