2006/2007 INTERNATIONAL EXISTING BUILDING CODE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Steven L. McDaniel — Chair
Building Official
City of Corning
Corning, NY

Jonathan Siu — Vice Chair
Principal Engineer
City of Seattle, Department of Planning and Development
Seattle, WA

Raymond J. Andrews, RA
Assistant Director for Code Development
New York State Department of State
Albany, NY

James N. Bartl
Director of Code Enforcement
Mecklenburg County Government
Charlotte, NC

John Catlett
Codes Compliance Administrator
City of Williamsburg
Williamsburg, VA

Michael Devore
Fire Protection Specialist
State Farm Insurance
Bloomington, IL

Shelley Hunter
Deputy Fire Marshal
South Metro Fire Rescue
Golden, CO

A. Hal Key, PE
Fire Protection Engineer
Mesa Fire Department
Mesa, AZ

Michael D. Platt
State Fire Marshal
State of South Carolina
Rep: National Association of State Fire Marshals
Columbia, SC

Michael Santa, CBO
Building Official
City of Nashua, Dept. of Building Safety
Rep: New Hampshire Building Officials Association
Nashua, NH

Jerome Sanzone
Building Official
City of Pompano Beach
Pompano Beach, FL

William Schock
Chief Building Official
City of San Leandro
Rep: California Building Officials
San Leandro, CA

Gray Smith, AIA, AICP
Principal
Gray Smith's Office
Philadelphia, PA

Brian Woodward, PE
President
Fire Safety Engineers, Inc.
Las Vegas, NV

Thomas M. Yotka, CBO
Construction Official
Township of Long Hill
Gillete, NJ

Committee Secretary
Ed Wirtschoreck
Manager, Standards
International Code Council
Country Club Hills, IL

INTERNATIONAL EXISTING BUILDING CODE HEARING RESULTS

EB1-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed addition gives latitude to the code official to deal with alterations involving special conditions in their jurisdiction.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB2-06/07

Errata: The following (published in the "Errata to the 2006/2007 Proposed Changes to the International Codes and Analysis of Proposed Referenced Standards" provided at the code development hearings) replaced the original proposal:

101.5 Compliance methods. The repair, alteration, change of occupancy, addition or relocation of all existing buildings shall comply with one of the methods listed in Sections 101.5.1 through 101.5.3 as selected by the applicant. Application of a method shall be the sole basis for assessing the compliance of work performed under a single permit unless otherwise approved by the code official. Sections 101.5.1 through 101.5.3 shall not be applied in combination with each other.

> **Exception:** Alterations complying with the laws in existence at the time the building or the affected portion of the building was built shall be considered in compliance with the provisions of this code unless ~~the building has sustained substantial structural damage as defined in Section 506.2, or~~ the building is undergoing more than a limited structural alteration as defined in Section 807.5.3. New structural members added as part of the ~~repair or~~ alteration shall comply with the International Building Code. ~~Repairs and~~ Alterations of existing buildings in flood hazard areas shall comply with ~~Sections 501.4 and~~ Section 601.3~~, respectively~~.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal adds clarity by eliminating "substantial damage" and "repair" requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB3-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

102.4 Referenced codes and standards. The codes and standards referenced in this code shall be considered part of the requirements of this code to the prescribed extent of each such reference. Where differences occur between provisions of this code and referenced codes and standards, the provisions of this code shall govern.

> **Exception:** Where enforcement of a code provision would violate the conditions of the listing of the equipment or appliance, the conditions of the listing ~~and manufacturer's instructions~~ shall govern.

Committee Reason: The proposed language will require the most restrictive provisions of the code and the equipment listing to be applicable, therefore allowing the highest level of safety to prevail. The modification is to avoid instances where the manufacturer's instructions may violate the equipment listing and to be consistent with other code committees actions.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB4-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

104.9 Approved materials and equipment. Materials, equipment, and devices approved by the code official shall be constructed and installed in accordance with such approval.

104.9.1 Used materials and equipment. The use of used materials which meet the requirements of this code for new materials is permitted. Used equipment and devices shall ~~not~~ be permitted to be reused ~~unless such elements have been reconditioned, tested and placed in good and proper working condition and approved by~~ subject to the approval of the code official.

~~**104.9.2**~~ **104.11.1 Research reports**. Supporting data, where necessary to assist in the approval of materials or assemblies not specifically provided for in this code, shall consist of valid research orts from approved sources.

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that the proposed language gives guidance to code users on how to deal with used materials. Further, the inclusion of research reports requirements will aid the code official in their evaluation of alternative materials and methods of construction. The modification appropriately locates the provisions for research reports as a subsection of alternative materials. Further, the modification gives the code official latitude to require information other than reconditioning. Also, testing is not always defined and could lead to inconsistencies in enforcement.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB5-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The term "devices" under electrical in Section 105.2 is a broad term and may lead to inconsistent enforcement. Further, the term "suitable experimental laboratories" in item 4 under electrical is subjective and could also be inconsistently interpreted. Lastly, the fees requirements in Section 105.5 may not be suitable for many jurisdictions and should therefore be left up to the individual jurisdictions to determine.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB6-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: To be consistent with other code committee actions and at the request of the proponent this code change was disapproved so as not to provide further inconsistences between the administrative provisions of the I-codes. Lastly, the term"approved" is more understandable than the term "endorsed" in Section 106.3.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB7-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: These provisions are already covered in Sections 104.4 and 104.11 of the IEBC and are therefore not necessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB8-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed sentence to Section 110.1 is confusing in that is appears to repeat the provisions within the previous sentence. Further, this proposed language would not allow for a jurisdiction to provide variances.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB9-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

111.3 Authority to disconnect service utilities. The code official shall have the authority to authorize disconnection of utility service to the building, structure, or system regulated by this code and the referenced codes and standards ~~set forth in Section 102.4~~ in case of emergency where necessary to eliminate an immediate hazard to life or property or when such utility connection has been made without the approval required by Section 111.1 or 111.2. The code official shall notify the serving utility and, wherever possible, the owner and occupant of the building, structure, or service system of the decision to disconnect prior to taking such action. If not notified prior to disconnecting, the owner or occupant of the building, structure, or service system shall be notified in writing, as soon as practical thereafter.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the code official should also have the authority to disconnect service utilities where such connections were made without approval as required in Sections 111.1 or 111.2. The modification removes redundant language in that the sentence already refers to referenced codes and standards.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB10-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The attempts made at refining the violation provisions create the potential for greater differences between this code and local laws. Therefore, the committee prefers the existing language that simply references state or local laws.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB11-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that regardless of the reason for a stop work order, a written explanation of a stop work order should be required.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB12-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The existing text within Section 115 appropriately covers abatement of and notice for unsafe conditions.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB13-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code official's authority to order the vacation of a building or structure based on imminent danger is already contained in Section 116.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB14-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that removing the last portion of the current definition makes it less clear as to when a change of occupancy occurs; therefore the current language is preferred.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB15-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Requiring the area of a change of occupancy to be included in the "work area", regardless of the amount of alterations involved with the change of occupancy, is too restrictive. Further, this proposal could be interpreted to require floors above and below the area of the change of occupancy to be included in the work area if a new shaft is installed connecting those floors. This is also too restrictive.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB16-06/07

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book.

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that this pre-publication draft standard of ASCE 41-06 is far superior to the FEMA document currently referenced in the code and the standard is available and in use although not yet formally published; therefore, its reference is appropriate at this time.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB17-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Revising the term "flame spread" to "flame spread index" is correct and consistent with the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB18-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Providing an accessible route to all dining areas, regardless of where the same services and decor are provided, could be a burden for alterations to existing buildings. This is much less of a burden for new construction because it can be incorporated in the design phase of the project. Therefore, this language should remain in the IEBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB19-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

704.1.1 ~~Full floor sprinkler systems~~ Corridor ratings. Where an approved automatic sprinkler system is installed throughout the story, the required fire resistance rating for any corridor located on the story shall be permitted to be reduced in accordance with the *International Building Code*. In order to be considered for a corridor rating reduction, such system shall provide coverage for the stairwell landings serving the floor and the intermediate landings immediately below.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that incremental improvements such as providing a sprinkler system throughout a floor of an existing building in order to reduce the corridor fireresistance rating on that floor as allowed in the IBC for a fully suppressed building would encourage the installation of sprinkler systems in existing buildings. The modification clarifies the type of sprinkler system intended for installation.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB20-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposed changes clarify that the requirements are triggered by work areas having exits or corridors that are being shared by more than one tenant or serving an occupant load greater that 30, rather than being triggered by work areas being shared by more than one tenant.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB21-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that an automatic fire sprinkler system should be required for alterations involving a Group B work area that exceeds 50 percent of the floor area in a building that has sufficient municipal water supply to the floor, and which the building height or area would require the sprinkler increase allowed by the IBC for new construction for a Group occupancy.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB22-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that, based on the unique hazards associated with a windowless story, an automatic fire suppression system should be required if municipal water supply is available to the building rather than the floor itself, and assuming that a new fire pump would not be required.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB23-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed revision gives the code official an opportunity to specifically review and approve, or disapprove, a proposed local alarm service fire sprinkler system supervision system.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB24-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would require the means of egress requirements of Chapter 7 to apply to single tenant work area, which is not consistent with the original intent of this section.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB25-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that means of egress complying with a building code other than an edition of the IBC may very well be appropriate and not constitute a distinct hazard to life.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB26-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would require the minimum number of exit requirements of Section 705.3.1 to apply to single tenant work areas, which is not consistent with the original intent of this section, nor consistent with the original intent of Section 705.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB27-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the minimum provisions for windows accessing a fire escape were appropriate for inclusion into the IEBC because they provide prescriptive enforceable requirements consistent with similar provisions in the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB28-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Proposed Section 707.1 appears to conflict with Section 707.4 with respect to additional loads on existing structural elements. Further, the proposed requirements are technically covered in other portions of Section 707 of the IEBC. Lastly, the proposed Section 707.1 indicates that it is applicable to additions and alteration whereas Chapter 7 deals only with alterations.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB29-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies that Level 3 alterations require sprinkler systems to be installed in the work areas only when such systems are required for Level 2 and Level 3 alterations, rather than for all work areas undergoing alteration Level 3, even if the system would not be required for new construction in accordance with the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB30-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

804.1.2 Rubbish and linen chutes. Rubbish and linen chutes located in the work area shall be provided with sprinklered protection or approved fire suppression system where protection of the rubbish and linen chute would be required under the provisions of the *International Building Code* for new construction.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that rubbish and linen chutes are inherently dangerous and should have sprinkler protection when such protection is required in new construction. The modification clarifies that suppression systems other than water sprinklers could be used and approved for this application.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB31-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: To be consistent with the application of the progressive requirements of the IEBC, the committee agreed that alterations Level 3 should comply with all provisions of Levels 1 and 2 alterations.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB32-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

912.4.1 Means of egress for change to higher hazard category. When a change of occupancy classification is made to a higher hazard category (lower number) as shown in Table 912.4, the means of egress shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 10 of the *International Building Code*.

Exceptions:

1. Stairways shall be enclosed in compliance with the applicable provisions of Section 803.1.
2. Existing stairways including handrails and guards complying with the requirements of Chapter 8 shall be permitted for continued use subject to approval of the code official.
3. Any stairway replacing an existing stairway within a space where the pitch or slope cannot be reduced because of existing construction shall not be required to comply with the maximum riser height and minimum tread depth requirements.
4. Existing corridor walls constructed on both sides of wood lath and plaster ~~on both sides~~ in good condition or ~~constructed of~~ 1/2-inch-thick (12.7 mm) gypsum wallboard ~~on both sides~~ shall be permitted. Such walls shall either terminate at the underside of a ceiling of equivalent construction or shall extend to the underside of the floor or roof next above.
5. Existing corridor doorways, transoms, and other corridor openings shall comply with the requirements in Sections 705.5.1, 705.5.2, and 705.5.3.
6. Existing dead-end corridors shall comply with the requirements in Section 705.6.
7. An existing operable window with clear opening area no less than 4 square feet (0.38 m2) and with minimum opening height and width of 22 inches (559 mm) and 20 inches (508 mm), respectively, shall be accepted as an emergency escape and rescue opening.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that in order to provide a reasonable level of fire resistive continuity corridor walls complying with Exception 4 of Section 912.4 need to extend up to a ceiling of similar fire resistive construction or to the underside of the floor or roof above. The modification is to allow the lath and plaster and gypsum wallboard on either side of the wall assembly.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB33-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

912.5.1 Height and area for change to higher hazard category. When a change of occupancy classification is made to a higher hazard category as shown in Table 912.5, heights and areas of buildings and structures shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 5 of the *International Building Code* for the new occupancy classification.

Exception: In other than Groups H, F-1 and S-1, in lieu of fire walls, use of fire barriers having a fire-resistance rating of not less than 2 hours constructed in accordance with Section 706 of the *International Building Code* shall be permitted to meet area limitations in buildings protected throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 of the *International Fire Code*. ~~Walls shall be constructed to conform to the requirements of ACI 530/ASCE 5/TMS 402, ACI 530.1/ASCE 6/TMS 602, or CA 600.~~

~~ACI~~
~~ACI 530-05 Building Code Requirements for Masonry Structures~~
~~ACI 530.1-05 Specifications for Masonry Structures~~

~~ASCE~~
~~ASCE 5-05 Building Code Requirements for Masonry Structures~~
~~ASCE 6-05 Specifications for Masonry Structures~~

~~GA~~
~~GA 600-03 Building Fire-resistance Design Manual,16th Edition, April, 2000~~

~~TMS~~
~~TMS 402-05 Building Code Requirements for Masonry Structures~~
~~TMS 602-05 Specifications for Masonry Structures~~

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that use of fire barriers in lieu of fire walls in existing sprinklered buildings was commonly approved in current practice. Further, in keeping with the spirit of the IEBC this proposal provides a reasonable level of safety without requiring the existing building to meet all of the requirements for new construction, which will further promote the reuse of existing buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB34-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that certain fire-retardant coatings could damage interior finishes that they are intended to protect. Further, the NFPA standard referenced is limited to wood surfaces, yet the proposal is not limited to wood; this needs to be clarified.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB35-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The current language is adequate in that it allows a code official and owner the latitude to determine the appropriateness of a fire-retardant coating.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB36-06/07

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that certain fire-retardant coatings could damage interior finishes that they are intended to protect. Further, the NFPA standard referenced is limited to wood surfaces, yet the proposal is not limited to wood; this needs to be clarified. Lastly, the current language is adequate in that it allows a code official and owner the latitude to determine the appropriateness of a fire-retardant coating.

Assembly Action: **None**

EB37-06/07

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the updated standard editions provided by the standards developers was appropriate for inclusion in the referenced standards chapter of the IEBC.

Assembly Action: **None**
