

IFC Committee Hearing Meeting Minutes # 2

February 23, 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- Absent
- Wayne Griswold- Present
- Aaron Foy- Absent
- 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: 13 (Varied over meeting but always had quorum)

2. Discussion and voting on IFC proposals

- a. [#74](#) IFC 307.4.2 Recreational fires
 - Glenn presented proposal modification.
 - Support
 - NA
 - Opposition
 - NA

- Committee Questions/ Comments
- [capture comments]
- Support (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Greg: Motion to approve as modified
- 2nd Motion: Tony: Seconds Motion to approve as modified
- **Vote: Pass** (10 for, 1 against)
- **Reason against: ? didn't see this?**

b. [#75](#) IFC 503.2.4 Turning radius

- Glenn presented proposal modification.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- John Woycheese: concerned about the way turning radius is written, thinks it's confusing because it makes it sound like turn radius is smaller.
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Tony: Heard back from DODI their suggestion is to change the word "lanes" to "facilities" to be more in line with their vision.
- Jaclyn: Thought this issue was that this was DODI's Vision Zero Program and could be used by developers not in the way it was intended.
- Glenn: Used the term "existing" fire apparatus roads wondering if it helps clarify the intention?
- Support (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- John Woycheese: Doesn't understand the point of it, can say pedestrian bike lanes can be ?
- Robert: Wpi;d need a reduction in turning radius the way the City is constructing the new bike/ turn lanes.
- Tony: The 2550 provides engineers with a little safety margin. So what DODI is doing with their traffic slowing patterns at intersections means trucks would have to roll over curbs when making turns, so each one would be handled on case by case basis, depending on the apparatus serving that part of town.
- Robert: what about when they're using physical barriers.
- George: the intent is just to have a review by the fire code official, so we could take out language & just say it has to be approved by the fire official. "...access road, as approved by the fire official."
- Brad: Do you want to limit the ability to take an exception to only existing fire access roads? Don't we want the ability to take exception on

a new road when fire official deems appropriate?

- Glenn: suggests modification “Where approved by the fire code official, pedestrian..” to satisfy the concerns he’s hearing.
- Motion: George: Motion to approve as further modified
- 2nd Motion: Michael: Seconds Motion to approve as further modified
- Greg: Can we use the base code language in 503.2.4 that says the required turning radius of the apparatus must be approved by fire code official?
- Michael: Likes the way it’s written by Glenn. From previous meeting, intent was to avoid a new building designer asking bike lane to be reduced.
- Brad: Having the dimensions in the code is beneficial because it prevents a phone call every time the road is designed. This increases phone calls. In the modified version, can get rid of the words “to be established” & not lose anything in the meaning.
- Tony: Is there a need to state even though you’re allowed to have those facilities they’re not allowed to obstruct the turning radius.
- George: We’re already saying the fire code has to approve it.
- Glenn: In current amendments under 503.2.1 for dimensions it further speaks about widths, etc. and there is language about drivability of the bicycle segregation devices in amendments.
- **Vote: Pass** (12 for, 0 against)

c. [#39](#) IFC 503.4.1 Traffic calming devices

- Tony presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- NA
- Support (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: George: Motion to accept as written
- 2nd Motion: Tony: Seconds Motion to accept as written
- **Vote: Pass** (11 for, 0 against, 0 abstain)

d. [#46](#) IFC 503.9 access to fire pumps

- Tony presented proposal.

- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Michael: Likes the modification because it needed to be simplified, but even as written questions may come up because of the wording “new” buildings, what about gut & remodeled? Fire pump may need to move. The word “directly” many times implies a door to the outside but can go down one level. Also thinks the word “dedicated” stairway in Exception 1 is confusing, often times they use the egress stair. What does “dedicated” mean?
- Tony: Hasn’t ever made anyone move an existing pump based on IBC provisions. Intent is that the room be located at the perimeter. Agree word “dedicated” isn’t necessary.
- Michael: The word directly implies a room on the building perimeter. Seems to me if there is an egress path within 25 feet if there is a path to it since you are allowed to go down to the basement.
- Brian: Question about “terminated within 25 ft of pump room door”. Could have a loophole to intent of having pump close to the perimeter of the building.
- Tony: Agree the intent is to keep the route to service the room protected.
- Wayne: Similar concern as Brian mentioned does it make sense to clarify total travel distance from pump to door to clarify intention.
- Tony: That would make sense since 2 members have the same comment.
- George: That was the intent.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- Kevin Nagahashi: Wondering about the “and terminated” if it was meaning the stairwell has to terminate at that one level below grade?
- Tony: Good observation, that wasn’t the intent.
- Glenn: Per code definitions, stairway from one level to another level is considered a “stairway”, spanning another level would be a different “stairway”
- Brian: Do we need to clarify what “dedicated” stairway means in Exception 1?
- Tony: That wasn’t the intent, so let’s get rid of the word dedicated.
- Michael: Do we need to clarify that it is some kind of protected egress stairway & not just a stairway open to public?
- Tony: Seen exit stairways with a 1hr or 2 hr rating being used.
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Tony: Motion to move to further modify

- 2nd Motion: George: Seconds Motion to further modify
- Tony modifying Exception 1 language per Shaunna screen.
- Brad: How do you enforce that if the stairway isn't enclosed?
- Tony: Intent to keep the crews in a protected path.
- Brad: don't recall every requiring the stair to be enclosed. Though typically it is a dedicated stair.
- Shaunna suggests from landing
- Michael: Interpreted the amendment that it's a stair dedicated to the fire pump from the outside, that is enclosed and protected. As soon as you exit the stair you have 25 ft to get to the pump. So we need a stair with direct access to the outside, it can be 25, 30 ft, 40 ft, as soon as you exit the stair you get 25 ft max with no intervening rooms. That's the way he's interpreted it.
- Robert: When he's seen these in the past it's always been in a rated enclosure. So if the intent is to provide a rated pathway for the firefighter to get to the pump room, should the language be: Egress path from exterior to fire pump room to provide minimum level of protection as fire pump room.
- Tony: Good addition cause it's consistent with Section 5.2 NFPA 20.
- Shaunna modifying on screen.
- George: Doesn't feel like we're changing code, we're just trying to be more clear- but spending a lot of time changing words without the intent to change the code.
- Shaunna: Making change that the path to be protected.
- Michael: Intent is allowed to have fire pump room below grade and needs to have a protected path to outside.
- Robert: NFPA gives an out & the language is confusing.
- Motion: Robert: Motion to table and will modify & bring forth at next meeting. Working group Robert, Glenn, Tony, John Woycheese.
- 2nd Motion: Tony: **Seconds Motion to bring back at next meeting.**
- Vote: **No vote occurred.**

e. #45 IFC 504.4 Roof hatch

- Brian Lukus presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- John Woycheese: Modification in IFC and IBC don't reference each other, so future modifications could get out of sync. Usually brackets include cross reference.
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- Michael: Exception #1 says pressurized stairway, is that necessary or could we remove it?

- Brian L: If it's removed a roof hatch would be required in a high-rise bldg. The intention is for low-rise buildings & allows the firefighters to use a fan to use the stairway as a chimney.
- Brad: Are we looking to have the ability to vent with the hatch?
- Brian L: Chapter 10 is for a means of egress & that's not what this is for, so it would best live in Chapter 5.
- Brad: Is there a reason to add a point from Chapter 10 back to Ch. 5?
- Glenn: There is a related proposal to put it in chapter 12 of the IBC too & that it would live identically in both codes. But would have to be approved by IBC committee (they haven't heard it yet on IBC committee).
- Shaunna is the SME for IBC and can take the decision here to that committee.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: George: Motion to accept as written
- 2nd Motion: Craig: Seconds Motion to accept as written
- Tony: Cross referencing doesn't exist in current Denver amendments.
- Brian L: Agrees with what John W. says that there should be a reference in brackets to cross reference. But doesn't think that should sway the decision.
- **Vote: Pass** (13 for, 0 against, 0 abstain)

f. [#59](#) IFC 507.5.1 Where required

- Tony presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- NA
- Support (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: George: Motion to accept as written
- 2nd Motion: Greg: Seconds Motion to accept as written
- **Vote: Pass** (12 for, 0 against)

g. [#52](#) IFC 508.1 Fire command center

- Rich Tenorio presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- George: Glenn needs to look at numbering.
- Greg: If the base code added it, do we need this amendment?
- George: the Denver amendment needs to replace it
- Tony: base code doesn't have 909 fire command room so do need amendment.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: George: Motion to accept as written
- 2nd Motion: Brian: Seconds Motion to accept as written (Glenn to fix numbering)
- **Vote: Pass** (13 for, 0 against)

h. [#38](#) IFC 508.2 Fire command rooms

- Tony Caro presented proposal.
- Support
- John Woycheese: Statement about high-rise buildings should be added because this could be taken to require a room as well.
- Tony: You're thinking there would be confusion about whether a fire command center or a fire command room is required.
- Russell: In low-rise there isn't a requirement for fire command center, but sometimes require phones, etc. For example a lobby panel may be required and that's sometimes put into a room instead of the lobby.
- Brian Lukus: Recommend adding where fire surveillance equipment is required by ASME A17.1.
- Russell: Video equipment is required by 2019 ASME A17.1 & IBC chapter 30.
- Tony: Is the elevator communication system required by 3001
- Mike Stewart: No there is nothing in 3001 that requires the 60 ft issue, it's found in the elevator code & is based on elevator travel distance. Now it's a text base communication and video monitored. Will lobbies, it's more of a RAF(?) system for areas of refuge.
- George: Fire command room is required when elevator of 60 ft. because equipment has to be behind closed door. What about schools?
- Tony: No change, this provision has been in the code since the 16 amendments.

- Robert: Is the intent to require min dimension of 8 ft in 2 dimensions? If yes, doesn't line up with 48sf.
- George: No the intent is 8 ft wall with equipment and you can back up 6 ft. So the intent is 8x6 room.
- Wayne: Looking at previous amendments & fire command room is not defined. Refer back to 508.1.1, seems like fire command room as defined is not the same requirements as fire command center.
- Tony: It is the same for location & access.
- Glenn: Clear up use of "location" where fire command room is required because it's talking about "conditions" not really location in building. Glenn recommends just using "in the following" & leave out location.
- George: Wayne, are you satisfied?
- Wayne: Still thinks it's confusing use of room vs. center & if we're trying to differentiate, it should be a defined term.
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- George: Glenn needs to look at numbering.
- Greg: If the base code added it, do we need this amendment?
- George: the Denver amendment needs to replace it
- Tony: base code doesn't have 909 fire command room so do need amendment.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: George: Motion to accept with intent to modify (to take out the word "location")
- Greg saying want ASME A17.1 modification too.
- John Woycheese: 508.1.1 needs to be coordination too. Don't want to overwrite that section.
- 2nd Motion: Tony: Seconds Motion to accept modified.
- **Vote: Pass** (11 for, 0 against, 1 abstaining)

i. [#64](#) IFC 510.1 RES

- Tony Caro presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- George: Added portions essentially what's been in the policy?
- Tony:

- George: Concerned about the UL listing because not sure all manf. have been listed
- Tony: There are 5 manufacturers that do meet the UL listing.
- Brian: Under system monitoring, the intent isn't to modify the device, correct?
- Greg: Sentence added about Denver being able to enter property at any reasonable time. What is the impact of this?
- Tony: Line shop had dedicated crew that works on these systems, so may need to validate buildings around a new high-rise. But it's always coordinated with building mgt.
- Support (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Russel: Motion to accept as written
- 2nd Motion: Tony: Seconds Motion to accept as written
- **Vote: Pass** (13 for, 0 against)

j. [#2](#) IFC 903.2.9.1 spray booths

- John Woycheese presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments
- NA
- Support (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- NA
- Motion: Russel: Motion to accept as written
- 2nd Motion: Wayne: Seconds Motion to accept as written
- **Vote: Pass** (13 for, 0 against)

k. [#41](#) IFC 903.2.10.2 Car stackers

- Tony Caro presented proposal.
- Support
- NA
- Opposition
- NA
- Committee Questions/ Comments

- Robert: NFPA 13 Section A4.3.5 has pretty specific guidance on what would be required for car stackers and how close cars can be to sprinkler heads. So what is trying to be accomplished is already in NFPA 13.
- Tony: 13 dictates up to two level, but this is trying to address 2 level stackers.
- Robert: Then this language should say it's intended for 2 level stackers.
- Tony: Is that implied for performance design?
- Robert: if these systems are being installed per NFPA13 this should be a non- issue.
- Tony: Where we're running into issues is that vehicles are too tall for what the stackers were intended for & the roof of the vehicle touches the sprinkler. So this proposal would clarify the requirement.
- Robert:
- Support (Rebuttal)
- John Woycheese: Can there be a requirement to have a limiting bar to make sure car heights are lower than what the stacker can handle? Like when you coming into a parking garage?
- Robert: Is there an issue with width of stackers and being able to meet NFPA sprinkler requirements?
- Robert: Propose an amendment (written in chat) & Glenn writing in his word document.
- Wayne: Since we're proposing an amendment include "Shall comply with obstruction requirements of NFPA13"
- Robert: Yes, I agree with that too.
- Opposition (Rebuttal)
- Brian Lukus: doesn't think last sentence is needed, everything in the fire code is a performance based design.
- Robert: Agrees with Brian & proposes we get rid of last sentence.
- Tony: For designers who haven't worked with car stackers, does this make it more clear for them?
- Brian Lukus: They are rare & NFPA13 is evolving, doesn't think it's needed.
- Robert: NFPA13 points through the Annex.
- George: tenets of Denver amendments is to clarify when it's not code yet & make it simple. If we need this now because there isn't enough info in NFPA13, thinks we need to include it in code if NFPA13 isn't there yet.
- Tony: This is becoming more frequent to see larger than 2 car systems. Thinks it helps designers understand what's required.
- Robert: Should there be a policy about how to design this instead of a direct code requirement?
- Tony: San Fran Fire Dept is the only AHJ that has language to direct designers. Not sure how quickly they'd be able to get a policy out there.

- Motion: George: Motion to accept as modified
- 2nd Motion: Russell: Seconds Motion to accept as modified
- Vote: **Pass** (10 for, 2 against)

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 MT