

INTERNATIONAL PERFORMANCE CODE HEARING RESULTS

PC1-03/04

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The intent of this proposal was to more clearly delineate what needed to happen to allow a design to depend upon the actions of the emergency responders. Instead was felt to potentially place designers in a role of dictating a level of response from emergency responders under control of a public entity, which would be inappropriate. The bounding conditions generated through the design process will provide the necessary information regarding the limits of the design and when those limits must be reevaluated.

Assembly Action: **None**

PC2-03/04

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The current language adequately addresses the issue of dependance upon emergency responders. Generally the administrative requirements provide the necessary tools to evaluate whether the design sets appropriate bounding conditions.

Assembly Action: **None**

PC3-03/04

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was concern with deleting language "under direct control of the owner." The original focus of this section was to allow designers to use emergency responders as part of the design only when under the direct control of the building owner (i.e. private fire brigade). Also, the proposed language, similar to PC1-03/04 would appear to allow designers to dictate the level of response provided by the local emergency responders.

Assembly Action: **None**

PC4-03/04

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The hazard of materials is adequately addressed in the first paragraph of each section, therefore the new text is not needed in these sections.

Assembly Action: **None**
