

TO: Task Force on Hearings  
FROM: Tom Frost, Mike Pfeiffer  
RE: Summary of Palm Springs Members Forum

The following alternatives or comments received:

February 20, 2008: Approximate attendees 100; Commenters 17

- A two year cycle with no interim supplement: 2 Code Development hearings; 1 Final Action hearing
- The ability to table proposed changes
- Retain current system
- Go with a 4-year cycle to provide for final action hearings at every ABM
- Opposed to remote voting
- Place more importance on successful assembly action
- Have the hearings at the same centrally located site every cycle; Palm Springs too expensive
- Reduce the size of the committees; committees often dominated by 1-2 members
- An annual cycle would be impossible to keep up with
- Opposes a 4-year cycle. Difficult for other organizations, (i.e. SDO's) used to 3-year cycle. State statutes tied to 3 year cycle
- Can't keep up with 18 month cycle, 12 month cycle impossible
- Go to a single 3 year cycle with 2 committee meeting and 1 final action hearing
- Move hearing away from Annual Meeting
- Opposed to 3 tracks
- Proctored remote sites good idea
- IBC-S works. Extensive deliberations among participants prior to Code Development hearings
- Have a committee that reviews standards for scoping issues
- Doing an excellent job, 'You got it right'
- 'Terrific process.' Have to have it at least every 3 years to keep up with technological changes. Do not combine with Annual Meeting.
- Could evolve into one large meeting with regional participation
- Opposed to 4 year cycle
- Opposed to 3 tracks
- Supplement useful for alternative approval
- Four year cycle creates correlation problems.
- Current 18 month cycles provide just enough time
- Helps small jurisdictions combine ABM and hearings
- IRC should not be a stand-alone code.
- Have only one committee hear a given change (i.e. IRC Energy vs. IECC)

- Shut mike off when time expires
- 'I don't think this system is broke'- needs tweaking and refinement
- Create computer database to support pending code changes

February 22, 2008; Approximate attendees 80; Commenters; 19

- Add another level of review before changes go before the committee
- Different cycles for different codes would be a disaster
- Use electronic voting without raising hands first
- Three tracks would not work
- Higher weight to assembly action
- Remote voting not a good idea
- Quit submitting 'editorial' changes
- Three year cycle is the way to go
- Consider further study
- Create word-smithing committee
- Standardize format for modifications
- Energy; IRC vs. IECC –hear testimony twice
- Break committees down by subject, not code i.e., fire, egress, energy
- Time limits on committee comments
- Too many modifications
- Post modifications in advance
- Little credence put on enforcement issues
- Moderators came off as abrasive
- Limit number of industry reps on the committee
- Two thirds majority to overturn committee too high at Final Action Hearings
- Eliminate multiple code changes by same proponent, pick one
- Reduce time to 90/45 seconds for testimony
- Get rid of Part II's
- Start clock when moderator calls change whether ready or not
- Ability to submit floor modifications fosters incomplete submittals
- Committee stop 'me too' discussion
- Refer IRC energy changes to IECC
- Reason we get so many changes is that we have been successful
- 'Remote voting will destroy the process'
- Keep the show of hands before going to electronic voting
- Increase cycle to 5 years, same as SDO's
- Tightly control modifications by requiring them to be filed ahead of the hearings
- Allow no modifications at the hearings
- Moderators do good job of cutting people off
- Reverse order of testimony, have opponent go first
- Create the ability to table

- Submit proposal; post; solicit comments; revise based on comments; publish proposal
- Do not let the search for efficiency violate the process
- Cut down floor modifications, 'its getting way out of hand'
- Support remote electronic voting
- Submit modifications early enough for people to do their work

February 28, 2008 Approximate attendees; 40, Commenters 12

- Maintain the 3 year cycle
- Committees should provide leadership to testifiers
- Take advantage of committee expertise-not use them for word-smithing
- 'Got to do something with floor modifications'
- Modifications can be dealt with in a public comment
- 'This is a great environment'
- Staff and moderators are doing the best they can
- Triple tracking a bad idea
- Part II's are a problem, egress is egress whether in IRC or IBC
- Lots of unintended consequences with a 4 year cycle
- Do not need to keep industry on the committees
- Get rid of 2/3 majority required to overturn committee action
- Process seems to be more adversarial than the legacy codes
- Floor modifications should not be allowed to 'hijack' a code change
- Multiple modifications hard to digest/correlate
- Chairs ruling on modifications overturned by assembly-substantial modifications allowed as a result
- Appoint committee members for 3 years-provides for institutional knowledge on second cycle submittals
- Energy committee should handle all energy changes, take energy out of IRC committee
- Allow tabling of changes with modifications
- Hear opposition first
- Send modifications to committee prior to hearings
- Get rid of supplemental hearings
- Committees are too large
- One 3 year cycle-better quality code changes
- Disband ICC and go back to regions