2007/2008 INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE
General Code Development Committee

Dan Weed — Chair
Plan Analyst
Colorado Code Consulting LLC
Denver, CO
Rep: City of Central, CO

Mark Stimac, RA, CBO — Vice Chair
Director of Building and Zoning
City of Troy
Troy, MI

Jerry J. Barbera, PE
Assistant Manager
The Airport Building Department
Seattle, WA

Patrick Bridges
Patrick Bridges & Assoc. Inc.
Portland, OR
Rep: National Association of Home Builders (NAHB)

James P. Colgate, RA, ESQ
Executive Architect
New York City Department of Buildings
New York, NY

Robert Eugene
Senior Staff Engineer
Underwriters Laboratories
Lynnwood, WA

J. Scott Keim, PE
Construction Services Manager
Kumar and Associates, Inc.
Denver, CO

Jack P. Leyden, CBO
State Building Code Commissioner
State of Rhode Island
Providence, RI

Brice Miller
Technical Code Specialist
Fire Trak Corporation
Fort Collins, CO

John Morgan
Building Commissioner
City of Florissant
Florissant, MO

Sharon Myers
Plans Examiner
State of Ohio
Department of Commerce
Reynoldsburg, OH

Gregory N. Nicholls, AIA
Architect/Chief Building Official
City of Mason
Mason, OH

Carroll Lee Pruitt, FAIA, NCARB
President/CEO
Pruitt Consulting Inc.
Keller, TX

Sarah A. Rice
Project Director
Schirmer Engineering Corp.
Cincinnati, OH

Carol Sue Rouw
Architect/Project Manager
Treanor Architects, PA
St. Louis, MO

Staff Secretary:
Beth Tubbs, PE
Senior Staff Engineer
International Codes Council

INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE
GENERAL COMMITTEE
HEARING RESULTS

G1-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as there are provisions in the IRC that refer specifically to the IBC structural provisions for certain conditions. This revision would cause confusion as to whether or not to apply the IBC in those cases.

Assembly Action: **None**

G2-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART II – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This new language provides clarity, resolves issues and makes the term grade plane consistent with the terminology currently used in the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

G3-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based upon the ambiguity the term “reasonable” would add to the code and the burden it would place upon the jurisdiction. The term “reasonable” was felt to be too subjective.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the IFC is a minimum code. Adding "reasonable" is not measurable and would cause confusion in the application of the code. Disapproval is also consistent with the actions of the IBC-G and IRC-B/E Committees in Parts I and III, respectively.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is vague and should not be included in the charging text. Everyone has a different opinion of what reasonable is.

Assembly Action: **None**

G4-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language was felt to be unenforceable as there are many aspects of the building code that are related to property protection and such language would have a large effect on the application of the code. Additionally it was pointed out that structural integrity is in fact related to property protection as well as lifesafety and such statements are contrary to the intent of the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Protection of property is included in the current text and provides protection to the jurisdiction. This proposal appears to be a scoping issue. Disapproval is also consistent with the actions of the IBC-G and IRC-B/E Committees in Parts I and III, respectively.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is unnecessary as it is already the purpose and intent of the code to protect property. If the language were introduced it would be redundant.

Assembly Action: **None**

G5-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the issue addressed by this proposal is already addressed in the code currently. In addition there was concern that if a design was based upon an alternative approach it is often difficult to refer to a specific section to explain the rejection. Also, committee members raised a concern that the last sentence only refers to the registered design professional and not others that may be involved in the design process.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The new language will provide important feedback to the architect or engineer of record that provides specific section numbers.

Assembly Action: **Disapproved**

G6-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it provides consistency throughout the code with the number of plans and other documentation required to be submitted.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART III – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The specific number of construction documents to be submitted is a policy decision that is better left up to the local authority having jurisdiction.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART IV – IEBC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this proposed provision is unnecessary. The authority having jurisdiction can determine how many copies of documents that it needs.

Assembly Action: **None**

G7-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would create an undue documentation burden to both designers and the building official. A large amount of documents would be required for all construction permits including small alterations. There was a concern that such documentation would be virtually impossible to produce working with a large number of venders during a project.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IEBC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The information belongs on the design drawings. Addition of shop drawings further complicates the submittal process.

Assembly Action: **None**

G8-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the same concerns raised in G7-07/08 by the committee. The additional requirement for documentation would create an undue burden without added benefit.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IEBC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The term "compartmentation" is not defined in the code. Therefore this would be a confusing provision.

Assembly Action: **None**

G9-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The primary concern was with the use of laundry lists. The code requires many more aspects to be inspected beyond what is proposed. Having specific construction materials called out and not others may lead to confusion in terms of the priority placed upon their regulation. Additionally, the committee felt that the inspections being addressed by this proposal are already required by the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IEBC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The need to single out these particular items as requiring inspection was not clear.

Assembly Action: **None**

G10-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The provisions will increase the quality of construction in the area of smoke resistance to ensure that such aspects of the building perform as expected.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IEBC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The need to keep joints in smoke barriers and smoke partitions open to view until inspection is just as important as that for fire resistance rated construction.

Assembly Action: **None**

G11-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standards ASTM E2174-04 and ASTM E 2393-04 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standards **did not** comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as the standards are not in mandatory language and such provisions, if necessary, would be better located in Chapter 17.

Assembly Action: **None**

G12-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language appears to be duplicative and may conflict with states regulations for appeals boards. In addition, Appendix B is thought to provide sufficient additional guidance.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed new section would conflict with Section 108.2. A more appropriate place for it would be in Appendix A. Disapproval is also consistent with the actions of the IBC-G, IEBC and IRC-B/E Committees in Parts I, III and IV, respectively.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IEBC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The setting of time frames for appeal deadlines is more appropriately dealt with by the authority having jurisdiction.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART IV – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Each state or jurisdiction may be different in how they currently handle appeals under the law for that jurisdiction. This code change would mandate how all appeals are handled. The proposed language “any person” is too general and may unnecessarily delay the building process.

Assembly Action: **None**

G13-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides a necessary editorial clean up of the definition of the term basement and its use throughout the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

G14-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Clarifies throughout the code that a high rise building is a building with an occupied floor located more than 75 feet (22 860 mm) above the lowest level of fire department vehicle access.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed added text would be redundant since high-rise buildings must already comply with IBC Section 403. The deletion of the exception in Section 903.3.5.2 is inappropriate in light of the difficulties in retrofitting existing buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

G15-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

G16-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Defining the term 'labeled' provides a necessary definition and will add clarity and consistency to the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This definition for "labeled" needs to be the same definition throughout the I-Codes for purposes of uniform application of the codes for products requiring third party certification.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IFC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change will provide a clearer definition that is correlated with its companion term "Listed". Approval is also consistent with the actions taken on Parts I and II, and IV through VI to correlate with the other I-Codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART IV – IFGC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

LABELED. Equipment, <u>appliances,</u> materials or products to which have been affixed a label, seal, symbol or other identifying mark of a nationally recognized testing laboratory, inspection agency or other organization concerned with product evaluation that maintains periodic inspection of the production of the above-labeled items and whose labeling indicates either that the equipment, <u>appliance,</u> material or product meets identified standards or has been tested and found suitable for a specified purpose.

Committee Reason: The proposed definition will provide consistent text throughout the codes in the ICC family. The modification adds "appliances" because the IFGC regulates gas appliances which do not fall under the definition of equipment and which are required to be listed and labeled.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART V – IMC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

LABELED. Equipment, appliances, materials or products to which have been affixed a label, seal, symbol or other identifying mark of a nationally recognized testing laboratory, inspection agency or other organization concerned with product evaluation that maintains periodic inspection of the production of the above-labeled items and whose labeling indicates either that the equipment, material or product meets identified standards or has been tested and found suitable for a specified purpose.

Committee Reason: The latter part of this definition was reworded to better clarify what labeling a product signifies. The definition will be coordinated with all other I-codes. The modification added the term "appliances" back into the definition from the existing language to complete the list of items which receive labels.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART VI – IPMC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved to provide consistency across the I-Codes with respect to the technical definition of the term "label."

Assembly Action: **None**

PART VII – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the current language in the code for consistency across the International Codes with respect to the technical definition of the term "labeled."

Assembly Action: **Approved as Submitted**

G17-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Defining the term 'listed' provides a necessary definition and will add clarity and consistency to the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This definition for "listed" needs to be the same throughout the I-Codes for purposes of uniform application of the codes for products that need to be listed by an agency.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IFC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved for consistency with the action taken on code change G16-07/08, Part III.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART IV – IFGC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

LISTED. Equipment, appliances, materials, products or services included in a list published by an organization acceptable to the code official and concerned with evaluation of products or services that maintains periodic inspection of production of listed equipment, appliances or materials or periodic evaluation of services and whose listing states either that the equipment, appliance, material, product or service meets identified standards or has been tested and found suitable for a specified purpose.

Committee Reason: The proposed definition will provide consistent text throughout the codes in the ICC family. The modification adds "appliances" because the IFGC regulates gas appliances which do not fall under the definition of equipment and which are required to be listed and labeled.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART V – IMC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

LISTED. Equipment, <u>appliances,</u> materials, products or services included in a list published by an organization acceptable to the code official and concerned with evaluation of products or services that maintains periodic inspection of production of listed equipment or materials or periodic evaluation of services and whose listing states either that the equipment, material, product or service meets identified standards or has been tested and found suitable for a specified purpose.

Committee Reason: The definition was simplified to clarify the meaning of a listed item and to delete a requirement that did not belong in a definition. The modification added the term "appliances" back into the definition from the existing language to complete the list of items that can be listed.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART VI – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the current language in the code for consistency across the International Codes with respect to the technical definition of the term "listed".

Assembly Action: **Approved as Submitted**

G18-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: **T**he revised exception allowing assembly spaces in Group B occupancies intended for students above the 12th grade would be too broad. The exception could allow large spaces such as college basketball arena's to be dealt with as a Group E occupancy. Also this could allow training and technical schools to apply this exception which would be beyond the intent.

Assembly Action: **None**

G19-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal needs to be more specific to pools located in elevated spaces, such as on the roof of a building, versus outdoor spaces at grade not associated with a building. In addition it was felt that Group A-5 was a satisfactory classification for such pools currently.

Assembly Action: **None**

G20-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Some of the committee members preferred G21-07/08 to G20-07/08 as it was felt to more comprehensively deal with the issue. Other committee members felt that the provisions were currently working well and no change was necessary. There was also concern that such provisions were better placed in Chapter 5 if the focus was only supposed to be on allowing height and area allowances where Group E occupancies contained assembly spaces. Note that G21-07/08 was also disapproved.

Assembly Action: **None**

G21-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It was felt that the current exception was working well and no change was necessary. This approach of completely disconnecting the two occupancies was unnecessary. It was also pointed out that Table 508.4 would not require a separation between a Group E and Group A occupancy. See also G20-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it would improperly remove the fire alarm provisions for auditoriums, stadiums and other assembly areas in high schools.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based on the proponent's request.

Assembly Action: **None**

G22-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the actions taken on G23-07/08 and G33-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

G23-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

304.1 (IFC [B] 202) Business Group B. Business Group B occupancy includes, among others, the use of a building or structure, or a portion thereof, for office, professional or service-type transactions, including storage of records and accounts. Business occupancies shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

Airport traffic control towers
Ambulatory health care facilities ~~(see section 421)~~
Animal hospitals, kennels and pounds
Banks
Barber and beauty shops
Car wash
Civic administration
Clinic—outpatient
Dry cleaning and laundries: pick-up and delivery stations and self-service
Educational occupancies for students above the 12th grade
Electronic data processing
Laboratories: testing and research
Motor vehicle showrooms
Post offices
Print shops
Professional services (architects, attorneys, dentists, physicians, engineers, etc.)
Radio and television stations
Telephone exchanges
Training and skill development not within a school or academic program

421.2 Smoke barriers. Smoke barriers shall be provided to subdivide every ambulatory care facility greater than 10,000 square feet (929 m^2) into a minimum of two smoke compartments per story. The travel distance from any point in a smoke compartment to a smoke barrier door shall not exceed 200 feet (60 960 mm). The smoke barrier shall be installed in accordance with Section 709.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal was felt to comprehensively address the issue of surgery centers that are not classified as Group I occupancies but need increased regulation based upon the conditions of the people being treated at these facilities. There were two modifications made. The first was simply an editorial revision to remove an unnecessary reference in the occupancy classifications to the new Section 421. The second clarifies that each story needs to be divided into at least 2 smoke compartments. This addresses multiple story facilities. The committee also felt that an issue to be addressed during public comment would be the threshold number of patients that classify an occupancy as an ambulatory health care facility.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

903.2.2 (IBC [F] 903.2.2) ~~Group B~~ ambulatory health care facilities. An automatic sprinkler system shall be ~~provided for~~ installed throughout all fire areas containing a ~~Group B~~ Ambulatory Health Care Facility occupancies when either of the following conditions ~~are met~~ exist at any given time:

1. Four or more care recipients are ~~rendered~~ incapable of self preservation ~~at any given time~~
2. One or more care recipients that are incapable of self preservation are located at other than the level of exit discharge.

[F] 907.2.2 Group B. A manual fire alarm system ~~that activates the occupant notification system in accordance with Section 907.6~~ shall be installed in Group B occupancies where one of the following conditions exists:

1. The combined Group B occupant load of all floors is 500 or more.
2. The Group B occupant load is more than 100 persons above or below the lowest level of exit discharge.
3. Fire areas containing a Group B occupancy classified as an ambulatory health care facility

   Exception: Manual fire alarm boxes are not required where the building is equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 and the occupant notification appliances will activate throughout the notification zones upon sprinkler water flow.

~~A manual and automatic fire alarm system shall be installed in all Group B ambulatory health care facilities.~~

[F] 907.2.2.2 Group B - Ambulatory health care facilities. Fire areas containing ambulatory health care facilities shall be provided with an electrically supervised automatic smoke detection system installed within the ambulatory health care facility and in public use areas outside of tenant spaces, including public corridors and elevator lobbies.

Exception: Buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 provided the occupant notification appliances will activate throughout the notification zones upon sprinkler water flow.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change. This code change represents a co-operative effort of concerned parties through the ICC Code Technology Committee's Care Study Group to resolve a long-standing problem in how the code deals with the subject facilities. This also correlates with the action taken by the IBC-G Committee in Part I. The modification represents additional consensus on the level of protection that should be afforded these facilities.

Assembly Action: **None**

G24-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

304.1.1 (IFC [B] 202) Definitions. The following words and terms shall, for the purposes of this section and as used elsewhere in this code, have the meanings shown herein.

CLINIC-OUTPATIENT. ~~A medical office or facility serving patients who are capable of self-preservation, or where not more than three patients are rendered incapable of self-preservation and the facility is on the level of exit discharge. Facilities with four or more patients who are rendered incapable of self-preservation or where one or more patients that are incapable of self preservation are located at other than the level of exit discharge are Ambulatory Health Care Facilities (see Section 421.)~~ Buildings or portions thereof used to provide medical care on less than a 24-hour basis to individuals who are not rendered incapable of self-preservation by the services provided.

Committee Reason: The definition clarifies the difference between ambulatory surgery centers as addressed in G23-07/08 and doctors offices. The modification is simply to correlate more closely with G23-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

G25-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

311.2 (IFC 202) Moderate-hazard storage, Group S-1. Buildings occupied for storage uses that are not classified as Group S-2, including, but not limited to, storage of the following:

Aerosols, Levels 2 and 3
Aircraft hangar (storage and repair)
Bags: cloth, burlap and paper
Bamboos and rattan
Baskets
Belting: canvas and leather
Books and paper in rolls or packs
Boots and shoes
Buttons, including cloth covered, pearl or bone
Cardboard and cardboard boxes
Clothing, woolen wearing apparel
Cordage
Dry boat storage (indoor)
Furniture
Furs
Glues, mucilage, pastes and size
Grains
Horns and combs, other than celluloid
Leather
Linoleum
Lumber
Motor vehicle repair garages complying with the maximum allowable quantities of hazardous materials listed in Table 307.1(1) (see Section 406.6)
Photo engravings
Resilient flooring
Silks
Soaps
Sugar
Tires, bulk storage of
Tobacco, cigars, cigarettes and snuff
Upholstery and mattresses
Wax candles

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it was felt that Group S1 is a more appropriate classification and that a Group H classification would be too limiting. The modification clarifies that repairs can occur in Group S-1 occupancies which as originally written would have been unclear.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

[F] TABLE 412.2.6 (IFC TABLE 914.8.2)
HANGAR FIRE SUPPRESSION REQUIREMENTS [a,b,c]

(No change to table contents)

a. Aircraft hangars with a door height greater than 28 feet shall be provided with fire suppression for a Group I hangar regardless of maximum fire area.
b. Groups shall be as classified in accordance with NFPA 409.
c. Membrane structures complying with Section 3102 of the *International Building Code* shall be classified as a Group IV hangar.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change. This code change represents a comprehensive effort to resolve a long-standing problem in how to apply the provisions of NFPA 409 as referenced without creating conflict with the construction requirements of the IBC. This also correlates with the action taken by the IBC-G Committee in Part I. The modification provides additional guidance on the appropriate treatment of membrane structures which are often used to shelter aircraft.

Assembly Action: **None**

G26-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Other types of beverages beyond simply wine were not addressed in the reason and the flashpoint data was not provided as noted in the reason. The committee had concerns as to how other alcohol would relate to this new classification in terms of possible unnecessary hazards posed.

Assembly Action: **None**

G27-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the action taken on G26-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

G28-07/08

This code change was heard by the IFC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

[F] 307.1 (IFC 202) (Supp) High-hazard Group H. High-hazard Group H occupancy includes, among others the use of a building or structure, or a portion thereof, that involves the manufacturing, processing, generation or storage of materials that constitute a physical or health hazard in quantities in excess of those allowed in control areas complying with Section 414, based on the maximum allowable quantity limits for control areas set forth in Tables 307.1(1) and 307.1(2). Hazardous occupancies are classified in Groups H-1, H-2, H-3, H-4 and H-5 and shall be in accordance with this section, the requirements of Section 415 and the *International Fire Code*.

Exceptions: The following shall not be classified as Group H, but shall be classified as the occupancy that they most nearly resemble:

1. through 13. (No change)
14. Canopies used to shelter dispensing operations where ~~flammable~~ compressed hydrogen gases are located on the roof of the canopy, provided that such canopies comply with Section 406 and the *International Fire Code.*

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the committee felt that it provides clarification that weather shelter canopies that store hydrogen gas on their roofs at gaseous motor-fuel dispensing facilities do not create a Group H occupancy. The modification further clarifies the intent of the exception that it applies only to hydrogen, a lighter-than-air flammable gas, and not to all flammable gases.

Assembly Action: **None**

G29-07/08

This code change was heard by the IFC Code Development Committee.

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard CPSC 16 CFR Part 1633-06 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard **did not** comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that it was beyond the scope and intent of the definition of flammable solid and an inappropriate attempt to get polyurethane foam designated as a flammable solid based on an inappropriate test standard that is intended for chemicals, not ordinary consumer products containing the foam material. Such a designation could have a negative impact on a variety of consumer issues including requiring otherwise ordinary occupancies to be classified as Group H due to the presence of polyurethane foam or products containing it, such as mattresses and upholstered furnishings. This is also consistent with the action taken on code change F288-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

G30-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

DETOXIFICATION FACILITY. Detoxification facilities serve patients who are provided treatment for substance abuse on a 24-hour basis and who are incapable of self-preservation or who are harmful to <u>themselves or</u> others.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: This proposal will help to better determine the types of facilities during the plan review process. The modification further clarifies that detoxification facilities focus on not only the patients possibly harming others but also focuses on the fact that they may be a harm to themselves.

Assembly Action: **None**

G31-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The sprinkler criterion for Group R-3 occupancies is more appropriate than that for Group A-3 occupancies due to the abilities of the occupants of these facilities.

Assembly Action: **None**

G32-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that G32-07/08 provided a better approach than G31-07/08. This proposal provides appropriate ranking procedure to determine occupancy classification for differing sizes of adult care facilities.

Assembly Action: **None**

G33-07/08

Errata: In Part III, the title of Table 1016.1 was incorrect.

TABLE 1016.1 (IFC [B] TABLE 1016.1)
~~CORRIDOR FIRE RESISTANCE RATING~~ EXIT ACCESS TRAVEL DISTANCE

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred G23-07/08 to this proposal but there were aspects that were felt to be beneficial. It was suggested that some of the concepts of this proposal should be combined into G23. Generally classifying as a B occupancy instead of I is easier as a whole new certificate of occupancy for an existing building converting to a ambulatory health care facility would not be required. Also, the proposal refers to "general anesthesia" versus other types of anesthesia which can also render people incapable of self preservation.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposed I-5 requirements were not necessary based on the actions of the IBC General, IBC Means of Egress and IPC Committees, and that these requirements were possibly redundant when compared to other Institutional Group requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Technical justification was not provided for the new Group I-5 travel distance in Table 1016.1, footnote d. It is not clear which door would be used to measure travel distance. G23-07/08 developed by the Code Technologies Committee may provide a better approach to this issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART IV – IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Proponent requested disapproval in favor of code change G23-07/08. This proposal would be in conflict with the Federal threshold of 1 person. Also, this subject is in the process of on-going review by the ICC Code Technology Committee's Care Study Group.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART V – IPC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is not a need to add Group I-5 to the table as unconscious people have no impact on plumbing fixture requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

G34-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal provides no guidance as to how an accredited facility would be classified. It has no effect on occupancy classification.

Assembly Action: **None**

G35-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based upon the fact that such facilities are already classified as Group R-3 occupancies the allowance of using the IRC is appropriate without the need for sprinklers. Such an exception would create confusion as to how to apply the IRC.

Assembly Action: **None**

G36-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

R-4 Residential occupancies shall include buildings arranged for occupancy as residential care/assisted living facilities including more than five but not more than 16 occupants, excluding staff.

Group R-4 occupancies shall meet the requirements for construction as defined for Group R-3, except as otherwise provided for in this code or shall comply with the *International Residential Code* provided the building is protected by an automatic extinguishing system installed in accordance with Section 903.2.7

~~**Exception:** Facilities complying with the *International Residential Code* need not meet the construction requirements of a Group R-3 provided that the building is protected by an automatic extinguishing system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved based upon the proponent's reason which is concerned with the lifesafety of occupants in Group R-4 occupancies this relates to both their ability to evacuate quickly and the number of occupants. The modification is felt to be cleaner language than the currently proposed exception. The meaning of the language is the same. There were some concerns expressed by committee members that proper justification for requiring sprinklers was not provided by the proponent.

Assembly Action: **None**

G37-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language used implies outdoor playground equipment versus such equipment within a building. The criteria "over 10 feet high" would include elements such as basketball nets which seems inappropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

G38-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This allows a reasonable option for design where malls are open to the sky. Open mall provisions would not limit other more traditional methods of compliance for individual or strip mall retail configurations.

Assembly Action: **None**

G39-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART II – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

402.4.1.1 Occupant formula. In determining required means of egress of the mall, the number of occupants for whom means of egress are to be provided shall be based on gross leasable area of the covered mall building (excluding anchor buildings) and the occupant load factor as determined by the following equation.

OLF = (0.00007) (*GLA*) + 25 **(Equation 4-1)**
where:
OLF = The occupant load factor (square feet per person).
GLA = The gross leasable area (square feet).

Exception: Tenant spaces attached to a covered mall building but with a means of egress system that is totally independent of the covered mall building shall not be considered as gross leasable area for determining the required means of egress for the covered mall building.

~~**402.4.1.5 Exterior tenant spaces** Tenant spaces that do not have an entrance opening onto a mall shall have a main entrance opening directly to the exterior. The main entrance shall be of sufficient width to accommodate not less than one-half the occupant load of the tenant space.~~

~~**402.4.1.5.1 Exit passageways.** Where exit passageways provide a secondary means of egress from both an interior and exterior tenant space, the exit passageway shall be of sufficient width to accommodate both the occupant load from the mall and not less than one-half the occupant load of the each exterior tenant discharging into the exit passageway.~~

Committee Reason: Based on a request by the proponent, Sections 402.4.1.5 and 402.4.2.5.1 were deleted and not considered as part of this proposal because there were problems with the proposed language. The exception to Section 402.4.1.1 was approved and would provide a reasonable allowance for spaces attached to a mall but that do not egress through the mall. A concern was expressed for situations where non-required exits would provide access into the mall.

Assembly Action: **None**

G40-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would not address malls that include aspects such as transportation terminals. Generally the revision would make the covered mall building requirements more confusing.

Assembly Action: **None**

G41-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The revisions approved for G38-07/08 were preferred to this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

G42-07/08 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

G43-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The language clarifies when a smoke control system is intended to be required. Sending the reader back to the atrium provisions is confusing as the definition of an atrium specifically excludes malls.

Assembly Action: **None**

G44-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is more consistent with code terminology throughout the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

G45-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Allowing the use of the ICCPC as an option for High rise buildings greater than 420 in building height seems appropriate and provides a full package for design including a comprehensive administrative process.

Assembly Action: **None**

G46-07/08

This proposal was heard by the IFC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Fire protection system design criteria and information belong in Chapter 9. The utility and effectiveness of top and bottom sprinkler riser interconnection is questionable. It is also questionable as to the availability of remotely controlled sprinkler riser valves. Proposed Section 403.2.2 needs correlation with Section 903.3.5.2. The ICC Code Technology Committee agrees with the need for redundancy but disagrees with the approach taken in this proposal. There is also a NIST task group working on this topic.

Assembly Action: **None**

G47-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the proponent's request.

Staff Note: Note that this item was withdrawn by the proponent after the hearings were concluded.

Assembly Action: **None**

G48-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change would coordinate with G81-06/07. The additional language clarifies the application of the definition for "building height."

Assembly Action: **None**

G49-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Technical justification was not provided to warrant such a significant change to the fire resistive requirements for the structural elements of high rise buildings. This proposal would go beyond the protection of just the columns but instead would include the structural frame and bearing walls.

Assembly Action: **None**

G50-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

403.3.2 Shaft enclosures. For buildings not greater than 420 feet (128 m) in height, the required fire-resistance rating of the fire barriers enclosing vertical shafts, other than exit enclosures and elevator hoistway enclosures, ~~shall be~~ is permitted to be reduced to 1 hour where automatic sprinklers are installed within the shafts at the top and at alternate floor levels.

Committee Reason: The modification was editorial for consistent code language. The proposal clarifies that the provision reducing the required fire resistance for shafts is an allowance and not a requirement.

Assembly Action: **None**

G51-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The ICCPC is felt to be a better option than this proposal. G45-07/08 as approved already allows the ICCPC as an option. Another concern is that this proposal would still require the prescriptive code provisions as a minimum even if the analysis shows that the protection is adequate at a lower fire resistance rating.

Assembly Action: **None**

G52-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the action taken on G51-07/08. In addition the 4 hour fire resistive rating seemed over restrictive.

Assembly Action: **None**

G53-07/08

This proposal was heard by the IFC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

[F] 403.7 Emergency responder radio. An emergency responder radio communications system shall be installed ~~where required to provide the required level of radio coverage for emergency responders by allowing radio frequencies to be transmitted and received throughout the building. Amplifiers shall be able to handle the frequencies in operation by the local emergency responder agencies. A permanent sign shall be installed in the fire command center indicating the presence of the amplification system and the frequencies served.~~ in accordance with Section 511.1 of the *International Fire Code*.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved for coordination with the action taken on code change F87-07/08. The modification makes a simple reference to the correct section of the *International Fire Code* that contains radio communications system requirements for new buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

G54-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved with a concern of the impact of a minimum requirement of 3 elevators in a small footprint high- rise building. Generally 3 fire service access elevators were felt to be excessive.

Assembly Action: **None**

G55-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the hose stream requirements within ASTM E119 were subjective with respect to when the hose stream should be applied and how the results should be interpreted. Further, the committee indicated that there was a lack of substantiating documentation to show that the robustness of elevator hoistway enclosure walls was a problem.

Assembly Action: **None**

G56-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed exit enclosure design pressure of 2 psi seems excessive. The load path and the extent of the required analysis for this loading condition are unclear. It is also unclear whether the required pressure should also be applied to the doors of the exit enclosure in addition to the walls.

Assembly Action: **None**

G57-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistent with proposed code change G55, the committee agreed that the hose stream requirements within ASTM E119 were subjective with respect to when the hose stream should be applied and how the results should be interpreted. Further, the committee indicated that there was a lack of substantiating documentation to show that the robustness of exit stairway enclosure walls was a problem.

Assembly Action: **None**

G58-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard NFPA 731-06 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard **did** comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The requirements were felt to be overly restrictive and the standard did not provide the technical information needed. Statistics do not seem to support the need for such a monitoring system.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

G59-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The provisions would mandate a pressurized stair and at the same time leave the smokeproof stair requirements in Section 403. Having both sets of requirements causes confusion. In addition instead of referencing 909 the criteria is listed within the proposed section. This may cause a coordination problem with Section 909.

Assembly Action: **None**

G60-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the action taken on G59-07/08. This new language is not coordinated with the current smokeproof enclosure requirements. Pressurization in the main floor lobby would be hard to achieve due to the size of the space that pressure differences would be required to be generated in.

Assembly Action: **None**

G61-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC MOE Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Forcing the stairway enclosures to be 1/3 of the diagonal of the building apart will have a profound effect on the design and costs of the building. This should not be done without technical justification and studies on if this proposed requirement will have the desired results.

Assembly Action: **None**

G62-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC MOE Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based on a request from the proponent.

Assembly Action: **None**

G63-07/08

This proposal was heard by the IFC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Proponent requested disapproval based on the action taken on code change G64-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

G64-07/08

This proposal was heard by the IFC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

403.15 Smoke exhaust. Buildings and structures shall be equipped with natural or mechanical ventilation for removal of products of combustion in accordance with one of the following:

1. Easily identifiable, manually operable windows or panels shall be distributed around the perimeter of each floor at not more than 50 foot intervals. The area of operable windows or panels shall not be less than 40 square feet per 50 linear feet of perimeter.

Exceptions:

1. In Group R-1 occupancies, each guest room or suite having an exterior wall shall be permitted to be provided with 2 square feet of venting area in lieu of the area specified in item 1.
2. Windows shall be permitted to be fixed ~~tempered glass panes provided that no coating or film is applied that will modify the natural breaking characteristics of the glass~~ , provided that glazing can be cleared by firefighters.

2. Mechanical air-handling equipment providing one exhaust air change every ~~10~~ 15 minutes for the area involved. Return and exhaust air shall be moved directly to the outside without recirculation to other portions of the building.
3. Any other approved design that will produce equivalent results.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change which will provide the fire department with an effective tool for the removal of smoke from high-rise buildings during post-fire salvage and overhaul operations. The modification is a clearer statement of the desired performance characteristic of fixed windows.

Assembly Action: **None**

G65-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee.

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASTM C1629/C1629M-06 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard **did** comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee generally agrees with this proposed enhancement of exit enclosure integrity, but as written it is specific for only one material. It would require other enclosure materials such as concrete and masonry to comply with a reference standard that is specific to panels of gypsum and fiber-reinforced cement.

Assembly Action: **None**

G66-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC MOE Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal will undue the work approved at the Final Action hearings in Rochester. This is a key element for occupants and emergency responders in the event of a full building evacuation. Justification was not provided for the deletion of this requirement.

Assembly Action: **None**

G67-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC MOE Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The additional stairway provides flexibility for fire service access in the event of simultaneous full building evacuation. Without occupant evacuation elevators or some other method the third stairway is justified. There are massive consequences for these super tall buildings and these consequences must be considered.

Assembly Action: **None**

G68-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies that where the sprayed fire-resistive materials (SFRM) are installed, the bond strengths specified in 403.18 are required to be achieved throughout the height of the building, and not just on those portions of the building exceeding the heights specified in Table 403.18.

Assembly Action: **None**

G69-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the bond strength requirements for sprayed fire-resistive materials (SFRM) should remain in the code based on a lack of technical justification to take them out and the fact that dislodging of SFRM does occur in buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

G70-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Generally the location proposed was felt to be inappropriate. Some committee members felt that Chapter 7 was an appropriate place to move the provisions but not within Section 712. Others felt that 404 is the appropriate location as it is used as a design option and is not simply a passive fire resistant building component.

Assembly Action: **None**

G71-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The concept of presented in Section 404 for Atria is an important design tool and should not be deleted. The proponent noted particular concerns with very large atriums. It was suggested that the focus of future revisions be on those larger atriums of concern.

Assembly Action: **None**

G72-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The revised language prohibits an important and often used design option by changing the scope of the atrium requirements from spaces connecting 2 or more stories to spaces connecting 3 or more stories.

Assembly Action: **None**

G73-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Atriums are considered a floor opening, not a penetration, and revising the definition to classify atriums as a penetration was felt to be inappropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

G74-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is clearer as to what is intended by the code for spaces open to the atrium with respect to smoke control design.

Assembly Action: **None**

G75-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the code with regard to the egress requirements for atriums. More specifically, if the space does not exit through the atrium compliance with travel distance requirements is intended to be in accordance with Chapter 10.

Assembly Action: **None**

G76-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the application of the code. The proponent's reason statement provided adequate substantiation.

Assembly Action: **None**

G77-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This revision provides more detail to designers and updates the code to address the actual size of cars currently found in parking garages.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed addition of a second loading condition for designing vehicle barriers is warranted based on the data that was provided by the proponent.

Assembly Action: **None**

G78-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: More refinement in the language proposed is requested. More specifically reference openings and whether the openings were the required or actual openings. There was concern with this concept in garages without fire suppression systems. The concept would not provide enough open space to fight a fire. Another concern related to how this works with below grade parking structures.

Assembly Action: **None**

G79-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal decreases the amount of open area without proper justification. It was also suggested that the height be increased to 7 feet as that reflected the clear heights in most garages as opposed to the currently proposed 6 feet as an opening height.

Assembly Action: **None**

G80-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The current value of 30 feet was felt to be too conservative and inconsistent with other code requirements. The committee felt that changing to the value to 20 would be a reasonable revision.

Assembly Action: **None**

G81-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC MOE Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: These provisions regarding door locking in Group I-1 were disapproved. The reason statement did not provide any justification to show that people being locked in the bathroom was a problem in these types of facilities. In areas where this is a concern the care providers would install locks that could be opened from the outside on their own, so this is not needed in the code. The MOE committee did approve E48-07/08 for Group R-4 to include a similar requirement in Section 1008.1.8.5.

Assembly Action: **None**

G82-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard NFPA 99-05 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard **did** comply with ICC standards criteria. This standard is already referenced in the IFC.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It is unclear if the requirements intended by the reference to the standard were only for installation of hyperbaric equipment or was intended to be a more extensive reference to the standard. Also, it appears that the proposal incorrectly references Chapter 19 instead of Chapter 20 of the standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

G83-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Sally port is a commonly used term and is appropriate to define for Group I-3 occupancies.

Assembly Action: **None**

G84-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

408.2 (Supp) Other occupancies. Buildings or portions of buildings in Group I-3 occupancies where security operations necessitate the locking of required means of egress shall be permitted to be classified as a different occupancy. Occupancies classified as other than Group I-3 shall meet the applicable requirements of this code for that occupancy provided provisions are made for the release of occupants at all times. ~~Where the provisions of this code for occupancies other than Group I-3 are more restrictive than the provisions for Group I-3 occupancies, the Group I-3 occupancy provisions shall be permitted to be used.~~

Means of egress from detention and correctional occupancies that traverse other use areas shall, as a minimum, conform to requirements for detention and correctional occupancies.

Exception: It is permissible to exit through a horizontal exit into other contiguous occupancies that do not conform to detention and correctional occupancy egress provisions but that do comply with requirements set forth in the appropriate occupancy, as long as the occupancy is not a Group H use.

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies application of this section which is intended to allow other types of occupancies within buildings containing Group I-3 occupancies.

Assembly Action: **None**

G85-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The trap door is a reasonable allowance for Group I-3 occupancies. The dimensions provided are reasonable and provide the necessary access for guards to perform their duties in guard towers.

Assembly Action: **None**

G86-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Atriums are already allowed elsewhere in the code and such an allowance does not need to be restated. Generally the proposed language is unclear and needs to be revised to clarify intent -specifically, the term traverse is incorrectly used with regard to egress.

Assembly Action: **None**

G87-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There are numerous flaws with the terminology. For example, the term floor level is used very differently throughout the IBC than as applied in this proposal. In addition, the proponent discussed maximum opening size and story limitations which are not specifically addressed in this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

G88-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The provisions were felt to be located within the smoke barrier requirements which was confusing. The testing demonstrating the performance of such provisions was not provided.

Assembly Action: **None**

G89-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the intent of the windowless building provisions for smoke control. A pressurization system would not provide a tenable environment in the area of fire origin. This clarification will specifically require that a tenable environment be provided.

Assembly Action: **None**

G90-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Sufficient justification to support the decrease in stage height requiring a proscenium wall was not provided. There was concern that it is not just the height but also the width of the opening.

Assembly Action: **None**

G91-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The term floor slab may not describe all situations. In many cases it may be the floor assembly. Also, the proposal would need to clarify what part of the floor needs to be protected within the assembly space.; the entire floor assembly or just that portion supporting the stage.

Assembly Action: **None**

G92-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC MOE Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

411.7 (Supp) Exit marking. Exit signs shall be installed at the required exit or exit access doorways of amusement buildings in accordance with this section and in accordance with Section 1011. Approved directional exit markings shall also be provided. Where mirrors, mazes or other designs are utilized that disguise the path of egress travel such that they are not apparent, approved and listed low-level exit signs that comply with Section 1011.4, and directional path markings listed in accordance with UL 1994, shall be provided and located not more than 8 inches (203 mm) above the walking surface and on or near the path of egress travel. Such markings shall become visible in an emergency. The directional exit marking shall be activated by the automatic fire detection system and the automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 907.2.11.2.

~~**411.7.1 Externally illuminated exit signs.** Where demonstrated to be reliable and sufficient and where approved, externally illuminated exit signs shall be permitted to be installed.~~

Committee Reason: Section 411.7.1 was deleted because the term 'demonstrated to be reliable and sufficient' is vague and unenforceable. In addition, the proposal does not indicate who would be responsible to demonstrate this to the code official. The proposed language in Section 411.7, by it's reference to Section 1011, would address exterior exit signage adequately.

Assembly Action: **None**

G93-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

412.2.4 Heating equipment. Heating equipment shall be placed in another room separated by 2-hour ~~fire-resistance-rated~~ fire barriers constructed in accordance with Section 706 or horizontal assemblies constructed in accordance with Section 711, or both. Entrance shall be from the outside or by means of a vestibule providing a two-doorway separation.

Exceptions:

1. Unit heaters and vented infrared radiant heating equipment suspended at least 10 feet (3048 mm) above the upper surface of wings or engine enclosures of the highest aircraft that are permitted to be housed in the hangar and at least 8 feet (2438 mm) above the floor in shops, offices and other sections of the hangar communicating with storage or service areas.
2. A single interior door shall be allowed, provided the sources of ignition in the appliances are at least 18 inches (457 mm) above the floor.

Committee Reason: The proposal is consistent with code terminology and revisions in the 2007 Supplement. The modification removes and unnecessary term as fire barriers and horizontal assemblies are already fire-resistive.

Assembly Action: **None**

G94-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: It is reasonable to add alternating tread devices as ladders are already permitted.

Assembly Action: **None**

G95-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No justification was provided for the deletion of the allowance for a fire escape or ladder.

Assembly Action: **None**

G96-07/08

This proposal was heard by the IFC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The current text is preferred because its intent is to receive the report as a tool to be used by the code official in making an accurate occupancy group classification. The proposal's intent appears to be to submit the report only if a Group H occupancy has already been determined.

Assembly Action: **None**

G97-07/08

This code change was heard by the IFC code development committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that, based on testimony, a fix is needed but this is not it and that Table 415.3.1, now that explosives are resolved, needs to more closely reflect what should be required for materials under item 2 of Section 415.3.1. It was also indicated that it is questionable whether the IFC should be regulating issues of public highways, traffic, etc. as in the proposed table.

Assembly Action: **None**

G98-07/08

This proposal was heard by the IFC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change. The proposal clarifies that flammable and combustible liquids can result in either a Group H-2 or a Group H-3 occupancy classification whereas the current text implies only Group H-2.

Assembly Action: **None**

G99-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

G100-07/08

This code change was heard by the IFC Code Development Committee.

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard NFPA 58-04 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard **did** comply with ICC standards criteria. The standard is already referenced in the IFC and IFGC.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proponent's reason statement accurately and adequately substantiates the need for the change to delete confusing text that is not correlated with the IFC and IFGC and is redundant with the referenced standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

G101-07/08

This proposal was heard by the IFC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal does not include a minimum thickness criterion such as exists for untreated wood in the current text. There needs to be a minimum thickness specified to allow the bulk needed for the treated wood to char under fire exposure conditions.

Assembly Action: **None**

G102-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal as it would be difficult to determine and enforce whether the space is “available to the public to transact business.”

Assembly Action: **None**

G103-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the storage limitation allowed in a live/work unit is for the non-residential portion of the unit.

Assembly Action: **None**

G104-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the separation requirements in the current Section 419 of the code and how it applies to live/work units and mixed use occupancy requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

G105-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It is inappropriate to delete the live/work unit requirements. They are a helpful tool for design. Perhaps the focus of the proponent should be to prohibit Group A occupancies from being located in live/work units.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Taking the exception out of the IRC that deals with live/work units would be a mistake. This language needs to remain in the code to allow these type of units to be established under the IRC. The density of our metropolitan areas is an issue and live work units enable us to more effectively utilize confined spaces.

Assembly Action: **None**

G106-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee expressed concerns regarding possible contradictions with other Building Code requirements, specifically on plumbing fixture counts. Also it was suggested that this may better fit within Chapter 12.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed change contains undefined terms including close proximity and congregate living facilities and other language that is not appropriate for use in the IRC.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IPC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The IPC needs to be in alignment with the IEBC and IBC with regard to Group R-3 occupancies being used as congregate living facilities. To avoid any confusion as to the number of plumbing fixtures required for such facilities, a new row for R-3 for congregate living facilities makes it clear that the fixture requirements are not any different than for R-2 dormitories or R-4 assisted living facilities.

Assembly Action: **None**

G107-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that such extensive information from the IFC was not necessary in the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: For consistency with the action of the IBC-G Committee on Part I. The IBC and IFC need close correlation on the subject of this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

G108-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee had a concern that the proposal would be difficult to enforce. Determining "higher than normal risk" would be difficult. Additionally, documents like the ICCPC already provide the necessary framework and process to address the issues of concern of this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

G109-07/08

PART I – IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee supports the addition of the proposed storm shelter reference standard to the building code and does not take any technical issues with that document. The committee's disapproval is based on the standard not yet being finalized and it is hoped that the proponent will submit a public comment to allow this standard to be accepted at the final action hearings.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

R325.1 General. This section applies to the construction of storm shelters <u>when</u> constructed as separate detached buildings or <u>when</u> constructed as safe rooms within buildings for the purpose of providing safe refuge from storms that produce high winds, such as tornados and hurricanes. In addition to other applicable requirements in this code, storm shelters shall be constructed in accordance with ICC/NSSA-500.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: This change brings a new standard into the code for the construction of storm shelters. The modification clarifies that a storm shelter is not required but when one is constructed it must comply with ICC/NSSA-500.

Assembly Action: **None**

G110-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal introduced a new concept for heights and areas based upon ISO fire flow requirements. The proposal was developed through the Balanced Fire Protection Features Study Group of the Code Technology Committee of ICC. The proponents asked for specific feedback from the committee. A variety of reasons for disapproval were provided by the committee. More specifically there was some concern with large size of the sprinklered fire compartments and the need to reduce the number of significant figures in the table. Additionally, more technical and scientific justification was requested as well as a definition for "fire compartment area." Finally, the concept of frontage should be addressed as the code has always given credit for such open areas.

Assembly Action: **None**

G111-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is concern with the difficulty of enforcing the proposed language. Additionally determining the code in which the building was issued a certificate of occupancy can be very difficult. Use of certain edition of a legacy code could also be difficult as the building could have been built far before that code was in affect and the requirements could be very different. Also, it may be difficult to determine if the building was constructed using tradeoffs, such as for sprinklers.

Assembly Action: **None**

G112-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal is approved to be consistent with the committee action on G94-07/08. A ladder is already permitted, so it is reasonable to also allow alternating tread devices.

Assembly Action: **None**

G113-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed revisions to Table 503 appear to have a variety of possible errors and needs further work.

Assembly Action: **None**

G114-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal, which tries to divide out nightclubs, is problematic and will be difficult to enforce. Alcohol consumption may not be the only issue causing an increased risk to occupants.

Assembly Action: **None**

G115-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Large losses in B occupancies are not seen in any of the 3 legacy code areas, thus taking the least restrictive approach is justified. The focus should be on the IBC not on the legacy codes at this point in time.

Assembly Action: **None**

G116-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The Group I-1 heights and area requirements do not need to match Group I-2 as they have a completely different package of requirements based upon the difference in the ability of the occupants. Additionally the use of "0" stories is confusing.

Assembly Action: **None**

G117-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The lifesafety statistics for Group M occupancies in the IBC has been better than for the legacy codes therefore decreases in the height limitations are not warranted.

Assembly Action: **None**

G118-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: All Group R occupancies are now required to be protected by sprinklers in the IBC, therefore, this revision is inappropriate. When this table was originally constructed such occupancies were not required to be sprinklered.

Assembly Action: **None**

G119-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Justification to reduce or revise height and area limitations for buildings based upon the legacy code requirements is not sufficient.

Assembly Action: **None**

G120-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon action on G119-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

G121-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provided appropriate editorial clean up of "building area" throughout Chapter 5; essentially clarifying that the term "area" was referring to "building area."

Assembly Action: **None**

G122-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provided appropriate editorial clean up of "building height" throughout Chapter 5.; essentially clarifying that the term "height" was referring to "building height."

Assembly Action: **None**

G123-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would create a conflict with currently constructed buildings undergoing alterations under these new provisions. This is also consistent with actions taken on code change G113-07/08 through G120-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

G124-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The current approach provided in the code is felt to be appropriate and was specifically based upon existing codes at the time the IBC was originally drafted.

Assembly Action: **None**

G125-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the committee action on G124-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

G126-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the proponent's request.

Assembly Action: **None**

G127-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Technical justification was not presented to justify removing the allowance for NFPA 13R sprinkler systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

G128-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change clarifies which story within a building a mezzanine is associated.

Assembly Action: **None**

G129-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The additional proposed language clarifies the intent of the exception.

Assembly Action: **None**

G130-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Allowing alternating tread devices where ladders are permitted is appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

G131-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The location of the proposed section is not appropriate. The criteria of 12 feet, as opposed to the proposed 20 feet, is already addressed in Chapter 10.

Assembly Action: **None**

G132-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The additional language clarifies how to measure W with two buildings on the same lot.

Assembly Action: **None**

G133-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Reducing the area increase allowances for sprinklers will not be consistent with legacy codes therefore the committee felt it was inappropriate to accept.

Assembly Action: **None**

G134-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was not felt to be necessary and does not address sloping site buildings very well.

Assembly Action: **None**

G135-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This code change appropriately addresses multistory mixed occupancy buildings. The code currently does not address this issue in detail.

Assembly Action: **None**

G136-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal with concern that the allowance for multiple basements without inclusion in the total area would result in buildings with too many stories below grade.

Assembly Action: **None**

G137-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this approach which would limit the total building area by limiting the multiplier to 2. It was felt to be too limiting and does not match with any of the legacy approaches. Departing from the legacy approaches in this regard was felt to be inappropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

G138-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the action taken on G137-07/08

Assembly Action: **None**

G139-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No direction is provided for unrated construction which may lead to confusion in applying this exception and associated section related to the determination of total building area.

Assembly Action: **None**

G140-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

G141-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The exception for buildings containing rack storage would have too broad of an application if placed within Section 504.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

G142-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal appropriately references the correct Section 507.3 which is for sprinklered buildings versus Section 507.2 which is for a nonsprinklered buildings. The proposal also appropriately revises the reference from an outdated standard NFPA 230 to Chapter 23 of the IFC which contains the intended requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

G143-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The rating of the fire barriers separating occupancies should be based upon the requirements of Section 508 and 706 as required. The code mandated separations within Section 508 and 706 are based upon relative risk.

Assembly Action: **None**

G144-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows;

507.3.1 Mixed occupancy buildings with Group A-1 and A-2. Group A-1 and A-2 occupancies <u>of other than Type V construction</u> shall be permitted within mixed occupancy buildings of unlimited area complying with Section 507.3, provided:

1. Group A-1 and A-2 occupancies are separated from other occupancies as required for separated occupancies in Section 508.3.3.4 with no reduction allowed in the fire-resistance rating of the separation based upon the installation of an automatic sprinkler system;
2. <u>Each</u> ~~the~~ area of the portions of the building used for Group A-1 or Group A-2 occupancies shall not exceed the maximum allowable area permitted for such occupancies in Section 503.1; and
3. All exit doors from Group A-1 and A-2 occupancies shall discharge directly to the exterior of the building.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies a complicated exception that is specifically allowing Group A1 and A2 occupancies of a limited size in an unlimited area building. The first modification was to clarify that the type of construction excludes Type V. The second modification was a clarification that each occupancy is looked at on its own and not as an aggregate.

Assembly Action: **None**

G145-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code change was disapproved based upon the action on G143-07/08 and the concern with 50% limitation proposed in Exception Section 3.3. More specifically, Section 508 deals with necessary separation requirements for occupancies.

Assembly Action: **None**

G146-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides consistency with terms used throughout the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

G147-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved based upon proponent's reason; which is to allow balconies in one story unlimited area Group A-3 buildings of Type II construction. The new section provides the same requirements for unlimited area Group A-3 buildings for Type III and IV construction with the additional limitation on the height of the assembly floor.

Assembly Action: **None**

G148-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: G147-07/08 was preferred to the format and language in G148-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

G149-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the proponents request and concern that it would change the application of the section drastically.

Assembly Action: **None**

G150-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the language for unlimited area aircraft paint hangars. The term "entirely" was difficult to understand.

Assembly Action: **None**

G151-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The concept of special risk areas appears to be more difficult to apply than the incidental accessory occupancies requirements currently found in Section 508.2.5 of the 2007 Supplement.

Assembly Action: **None**

G152-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that deleting the non separated occupancy requirements would be deleting an option that is widely utilized and such a deletion will not resolve concerns with the separated occupancy requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

G153-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed revision correlates stationary storage battery systems appropriately with the IFC.

Assembly Action: **None**

G154-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed revision correlates stationary storage battery systems appropriately with the IFC.

Assembly Action: **None**

G155-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed requirements need to be correlated with NFPA 20 before such provisions can be placed within Table 508.2.5.

Assembly Action: **None**

G156-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approval as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This code change clarifies that the supporting fire resistive construction for fire barriers and horizontal assemblies separating incidental accessory occupancies is not required for Types IIB, IIIB and VB construction.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies the current code requirements by separating the requirements for the continuity of the vertical fire barrier from the allowance for the fire resistance ratings of the supporting construction relating to Type IIB, IIIB, and VB construction that does not require continuity of the fire resistive rating when supporting separations for incidental accessory occupancies.

Assembly Action: **None**

G157-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

508.2.5.2 (Supp) Nonfire-resistance rated separation and protection. Where Table 508.2.5 permits an automatic fire extinguishing system without a fire barrier, the incidental accessory occupancies shall be separated from the remainder of the building by construction capable of resisting the passage of smoke. The walls shall extend from the top of the foundation or floor/ceiling assembly below to the underside of the fire-resistance-rated floor/ceiling assembly above or fire-resistance-rated roof/ceiling assembly above or to the underside of the floor or roof sheathing, deck or slab above. Doors shall be self- or automatic closing upon detection of smoke in accordance with Section 715.4.7.3. ~~and shall not be undercut in excess of the clearance permitted in accordance with NFPA 80. Walls surrounding the incidental accessory occupancy shall not have air transfer openings unless provided with smoke dampers in accordance with Section 710.7.~~ Doors shall not have air transfer openings and shall not be undercut in excess of the clearance permitted in accordance with NFPA 80. Walls surrounding the incidental accessory occupancy shall not have air transfer openings unless provided with smoke dampers in accordance with Section 710.7.

Committee Reason: Currently Section 508.2.5.1 prohibits air transfer openings to be installed in the door to an incidental use area. The code is silent regarding the protection of the wall when the incidental use area wall is allowed to be constructed to resist the passage of smoke rather than be constructed as a one-hour fire–resistance-rated assembly. Without adding this language, the wall could effectively have unlimited air transfer openings while the door is regulated to prohibit air transfer openings. Currently the building designer and code

official are left with no guidance as to the requirements. The addition of this language would define the level of protection needed to allow penetrations of the wall that separates an incidental use area from other portions of the building. Section 710.7 currently provides the charging statement to require dampers in similar smoke partitions. The exact specifications are then given in Section 716.3 as referenced in Section 710.7. This is a logical path and uses language that already exists in the code for similar assemblies. The modification to the proposal simply addresses a better layout of the language proposed.

Assembly Action: **None**

G158-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon action on G104-07/08 which was a more comprehensive revision to the 3rd exception to Section 508.2.4 thus eliminating the need for this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

G159-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was opposition to deleting and replacing the entire table with the format and values of the 2003 IBC. The preference is that if problems exist with the separations that individual revisions should be proposed to the table.

Assembly Action: **None**

G160-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Group I-2 occupancies already have smoke compartment requirements in Section 407 therefore the separation requirements currently in Table 508.4 were considered adequate.

Assembly Action: **None**

G161-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides needed separation between different classifications of H occupancies. See also proponent's reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

G162-07/08

Errata: Replace Footnote "a" in two places in the last column of the table for non sprinklered Group H-3, H-4 and H-5 Occupancies.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal is an editorial revision for the location in Table 508.4 for Footnote "c" that provides clarity to the table regarding the application of separation requirements for a mixed occupancy building with Groups R and U.

Assembly Action: **None**

G163-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was a good clarification that a minimum of 1 hour fire resistive construction is required for separation of areas housing private or pleasure vehicles.

Assembly Action: **None**

G164-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would introduce different types of construction within the same building without the separation and associated requirements in the pedestal building concept in Section 509.2.

Assembly Action: **None**

G165-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the action on G164-07/08 regarding the concern that there is no separation provided between the two different construction types.

Assembly Action: **None**

G166-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the actions on G164-07/08 and G165-07/08 . The proposal does not provide the needed separation between construction types.

Assembly Action: **None**

G167-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

509.9 (Supp) Multiple buildings above or below Group S-2 parking garage<u>s</u>. Where two or more buildings are provided above the horizontal assembly separating a <u>Group S-2 open or closed parking garage</u> ~~building below~~ from the buildings above in accordance with the special provisions in Section 509.2, 509.3 or 509.8, the buildings above the horizontal assembly shall be regarded as separate and distinct buildings and shall comply with all other provisions of this code as applicable to each separate and distinct building.

Committee Reason: The proposal revises Section 509.9 to more comprehensively account for the special provisions of Sections 509.2, 509.3 and 509.8, each of which permit multiple buildings above the horizontal assembly to be considered as separate and distinct buildings. The modification was to restore the phrase "Group S-2 open or closed parking garage" as without this phrase the section was thought to lose it's intent.

Assembly Action: **None**

G168-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent sought to clarify that each of the buildings above the horizontal assembly were considered as separate from one another, but the committee felt that the code was already clear enough in this regard.

Assembly Action: **None**

G169-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language provided by the proponent was felt to be too broad and may bring into the exception too many important components of the roof assembly that need to be regulated. It was suggested a more narrow focus to the footnote be provided.

Assembly Action: **None**

G170-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The footnote creates confusion on the application of the table by referencing Section 1025.1.1 for bleachers and grandstands. The need for the reference is not clear.

Assembly Action: **None**

G171-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This concept presented in this proposal can already occur through the application of the ICCPC. Additionally, there were concerns with long term documentation as provisions are not addressed in this proposal in that regard.

Assembly Action: **None**

G172-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The added footnotes provide clarity to the code by referencing relevant fire resistive separation requirements for Group H Occupancies and Group S-2 aircraft hangers.

Assembly Action: **None**

G173-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the proponent's request.

Assembly Action: **None**

G174-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the action taken on G171-07/08. Also, more information regarding failure criteria is needed.

Assembly Action: **None**

G175-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

G176-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee had concern with adding an increased allowance for fire retardant treated wood in non combustible construction. There was concern for the potential of high-rise buildings containing an excessive amount of combustible materials.

Assembly Action: **None**

G177-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

G178-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The revised definition brings consistency with the IRC for the term “sunroom”.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This new language for the definition of Sunroom is not appropriate for the IRC. The scope of the IRC and the structures it deals with is more accurately portrayed with the current definition.

Assembly Action: **None**

G179-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the code and is consistent with the provisions of the IRC for attic vents.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change adds necessary clarity on how to figure the minimum opening requirements for attic vents.

Assembly Action: **None**

G180-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard TMS 0302-07 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard **did** comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The new standard and proposed language makes it easier to understand how to apply the sound transmission requirements for masonry.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change brings a new standard into the code to promote Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating for masonry assemblies. Also, there are liability issues with sound transmission and this should help the builder in this regard.

Assembly Action: **None**

G181-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language proposed is more complicated and would possibility eliminate non-absorbent requirements for the partition associated with a urinal.

Assembly Action: **None**

G182-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal will make sure that partitions adjacent to water closets and urinals will be constructed of non-absorbent materials.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IPC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Material requirements for walls or partitions is best covered by the IBC and not the IPC. Elimination of the text in the IPC avoids the current discrepancies between the IBC and IPC on types of finish required for walls and partitions.

Assembly Action: **None**

G183-07/08

This code change was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Errata: Replace the proposal with the following:

1301.1.1, 202 (New); IECC 404.2 (New), 202 (New)

Proponent: Dave Collins, AIA, The Preview Group, Inc., representing the AIA Codes Committee

THIS PROPOSAL IS ON THE AGENDA OF THE IECC CODE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE. SEE THE TENTATIVE HEARING ORDER FOR THIS COMMITTEE.

1. IBC Revise as follows:

1301.1.1 Criteria. Buildings shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the *International Energy Conservation Code*. The energy use of all structures shall be 50% less than the average building site energy intensity per square foot as determined by the building occupancy and location in the U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration (EIA) 2003 Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS). Where a building occupancy is used for an activity that does not align closely the activities listed, the code official is authorized to determine the activity that the building occupancy most nearly resembles:

US DOE EIA	Occupancy
Education	(E)
Food Sales	(B)
Food Services	(A-2)
Health Care	
Inpatient	(I-2)
Outpatient	(B)

Lodging	(R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, I-4)
Mercantile	(M)
Retail (Other Than Mall)	(M)
Enclosed and Strip Malls	(See Section 402)
Office	(B)
Public Assembly	(A-1, A-3, A-4)
Public Order and Safety	(B, I-3)
Religious Worship	(A-3)
Service	
Warehouse and Storage	(S-1.S-2)
Other	(F-1, F-2, H)
Vacant	(U)

SECTION 202
DEFINITIONS

SITE ENERGY INTENSITY. Site energy intensity is the energy use in a building and facilities on the site expressed in kBtu's used per year per area of total useful area of a building – (kBtu/ft^2/yr).

2. IECC Add new text as follows:

101.6 Site energy intensity criteria. The energy use of all structures shall be 50% less than the average building site energy intensity per square foot as determined by the building occupancy and location in the U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration (EIA) 2003 Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS). Where a building occupancy is used for an activity that does not align closely the activities listed, the code official is authorized to determine the activity that the building occupancy most nearly resembles:

US DOE EIA	Occupancy
Education	(E)
Food Sales	(B)
Food Services	(A-2)
Health Care	
Inpatient	(I-2)
Outpatient	(B)
Lodging	(R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, I-4)
Mercantile	(M)
Retail (Other Than Mall)	(M)
Enclosed and Strip Malls	(See Section 402)
Office	(B)
Public Assembly	(A-1, A-3, A-4)
Public Order and Safety	(B, I-3)
Religious Worship	(A-3)
Service Warehouse	
and Storage	(S-1,S-2)
Other	(F-1, F-2, H)
Vacant	(U)

SECTION 202
GENERAL DEFINITIONS

SITE ENERGY INTENSITY. Site energy intensity is the energy use in a building and facilities on the site expressed in kBtu's used per year per area of total useful area of a building – (kBtu/ft^2/yr).

Reason: The United States leads the world in per capita consumption of energy. Buildings are fully 48% of the consumption of energy nationwide. The US Department of Energy has compiled data showing how the energy is being used by various types of buildings. The following table shows the distribution of the samples as of 2003.

Table A1. Summary Table for All Buildings (Including Malls), 2003

	Number of Buildings (thousand)	Total Floor Space (million square feet)	Mean Square Feet per Building (thousand)	Median Square Feet per Building (thousand)
All Buildings	4,859	5.0	71,658	14.7
Building Floorspace (Square Feet)				
1,001 to 5,000	2,586	2.4	6,922	2.7
5,001 to 10,000	948	7.2	7,033	7.4
10,001 to 25,000	810	15.0	12,659	15.6
25,001 to 50,000	261	35.0	9,382	36.0
50,001 to 100,000	147	67.0	10,291	70.2
100,001 to 200,000	74	130.0	10,217	138.6
200,001 to 500,000	26	260.0	7,494	287.6
Over 500,000	8	700.0	7,660	937.6
Principal Building Activity				
Education	386	7.0	9,874	25.6
Food Sales	226	2.8	1,255	5.6
Food Service	297	3.5	1,654	5.6
Health Care	129	6.0	3,163	24.6
Inpatient	8	106.0	1,905	241.4
Outpatient	121	6.0	1,258	10.4
Lodging	142	12.5	5,096	35.8
Mercantile	657	6.9	11,192	17.0
Retail (Other Than Mall)	443	4.8	4,317	9.7
Enclosed and Strip Malls	213	12.3	6,875	32.2
Office	824	4.0	12,208	14.8
Public Assembly	277	6.7	3,939	14.2
Public Order and Safety	71	5.0	1,090	15.5
Religious Worship	370	6.0	3,754	10.1
Service	622	2.8	4,050	6.5
Warehouse and Storage	597	5.2	10,078	16.9
Other	79	4.6	1,738	21.9
Vacant	182	3.7	2,567	14.1
Year Constructed				
Before 1920	333	4.9	3,784	11.4
1920 to 1945	536	4.0	6,985	13.0
1946 to 1959	573	4.0	7,262	12.7
1960 to 1969	600	5.0	8,641	14.4
1970 to 1979	784	5.8	12,275	15.6
1980 to 1989	768	4.2	12,468	16.2
1990 to 1999	917	5.0	13,981	15.2
2000 to 2003	347	5.6	6,262	18.1

As a first step toward improvement of energy consumption in buildings, we can begin to reduce the energy consumption in new construction and renovations as they are being undertaken, making a significant impact on their long-term consumption of energy. This is a welfare issue affecting the health and productivity of our society. By making significant reductions in the use of energy in buildings the codes will have an enduring affect on our economy and the depletion of valuable resources.

Awareness of the impact of building energy use and the need to address this is a rising concern among various communities. Codes and standards are being developed and adopted locally to include various types of guideline systems for sustainable design such as LEED, Green Globes, EnergyStar, and others. While these are an important aspect of improved building design, they do not yet address the threshold of energy consumption and improved energy efficiency that we believe is critical. By incorporating a maximum energy use criteria, the ICC family of codes will set a precedent for communities to follow, making measurable change.

Standards such as ASHRAE 90.1 and the proposed standard for high performance buildings ASHRAE/USGBC/IESNA SPC 189, *Standard for High-Performance Green Buildings Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings*, both will include criteria that are similar to this proposal. While these standards may be available in the near future, it is imperative that the codes make a statement as to how the subject should be addressed now.

Use of the CBECS data to establish energy consumption criteria addresses two very important aspects of this issue. Defining the energy target at the outset of the design process gives the design team a clear, achievable target. This target will allow the design team to focus its effort on achieving the target through a range of design strategies without reference to other model designs. Having the criteria based on reductions in real world, actual energy use for each occupancy type in a given region provides a second identifiable achievement. The code is not seeking reductions in the theoretical energy consumption determined through design efforts. Using CEBECS data to determine the criteria will lead to reductions in what buildings really use.

Cost Impact: The code change proposal will increase the cost of construction.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the committee appreciates the aggressive sentiment of this proposal, the proponent did not provide a basis for a 50% reduction. In addition, there would be considerable confusion regarding the calculation of that value.

Assembly Action: **None**

G184-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Providing this section within the IBC is beneficial as it is often overlooked by designers that are not familiar with the IPC.

Assembly Action: **None**

G185-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved for consistency with the action taken on G184-07/08. Such provisions are often overlooked by designers not familiar with the IPC.

Assembly Action: **None**

G186-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASME A17.7/CSA B44.7-07 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard **did** comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that listing the new performance elevator standard as an option would force a building official to have to accept such a design. Additionally the structure of the proposal was confusing and keeping A17.1 with the main list of standards is preferred.

Assembly Action: **None**

G187-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The requirements are too broad and do not provide guidance as to how to come up with a solution. The fact that this would apply to all buildings, including non sprinklered buildings, seemed excessive.

Assembly Action: **None**

G188-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

3002.4 (Supp) Elevator car to accommodate ambulance stretcher. Where elevators are provided in buildings four or more stories above grade plane or four or more stories below grade plane, at least one elevator shall be provided for fire department emergency access to all floors. The elevator car shall be of such a size and arrangement to accommodate an ambulance stretcher 24-inch by 84-inch (610 mm by 2134 mm) with not less than 5 inch (127mm) radius corners, ~~ambulance stretcher~~ in the horizontal, open position and shall be identified by the international symbol for emergency medical services (star of life). The symbol shall not be less than 3 inches (76 mm) high and shall be placed inside on both sides of the hoistway door frame.

Committee Reason: Ambulance stretchers found to date, are made from tubular metal, formed with radius or chamfered corners. Adding this change reflects actual stretcher size and will allow the industry to better meet the requirement with more flexibility and appropriately sized cars, while still meeting the size requirement desired by the IBC. This change will also have added benefit of providing direction to the stretcher suppliers to aid in standardizing their products.

Assembly Action: **None**

G189-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

3004.1 Vents required. Hoistways of elevators and dumbwaiters penetrating more than three stories shall be provided with a means for venting smoke and hot gases to the outer air in case of fire.

Exceptions:

1. In occupancies of other than Groups R-1, R-2, I-1, I-2 and similar occupancies with overnight sleeping quarters, venting of hoistways is not required where the building is equipped throughout with an approved automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2.
2. Sidewalk elevator hoistways are not required to be vented.
3. Elevators contained within and serving open parking garages only.
4. Elevators within individual residential dwelling units.

Committee Reason: This revision eliminates the requirement for venting the elevator hoistway when elevators are located in open parking garages . Parking garages have vehicle ramps that are open to all garage levels. Since the vehicle ramps are open to each other, migration of smoke and hot gases from garage level to another garage level would be via the ramps. Due to lack of pressure build up during a fire, elevator shafts would not transfer smoke from one garage level to another garage level. The modification was to limit the scope of exception 3 to open parking garages due to concerns related to smoke build up in enclosed parking garages.

Floors within residential dwelling units are permitted to be open to each other per IBC Section 707.2 Exception 1. Since any smoke would be migrating through the stair opening, venting in the elevator hoistway is not required.

Assembly Action: **None**

G190-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The manual controls need to be capable of both opening and closing the vents.

Assembly Action: **None**

G191-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The concept of automatic opening vents should be an option; not the only solution provided. Energy use concerns will vary with regard to constantly open vents depending upon the climate conditions of the region. Energy use may need to be addressed, but not by entirely removing the option of open vents in all cases.

Assembly Action: **None**

G192-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Slope criteria needs to include a distance from the escalator. In addition, concerns were raised that a minimum slope was provided but no upper limit on slope was provided. This raised some concerns on how this may affect compliance with the accessibility requirements. Finally, it was suggested that some type of criteria, such as rainfall, was provided.

Assembly Action: **None**

G193-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: A definition should accompany such a revision of terminology. The term Fire Service Access Elevators was deemed sufficient to describe the intent of the provisions.

Assembly Action: **None**

G194-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The hose stream test does not mimic real world conditions during fire fighting operations. Therefore, adding such a requirement for fire service elevators may provide little or no benefit. In addition, the topic of stair and hoistway hardening is one that needs a more global review.

Assembly Action: **None**

G195-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is not clear how it would deal with multiple elevators in a single hoistway, and how the light level would be measured. Generally, the committee felt that such requirements were unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

G196-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The reference to Chapter 7 should be more specific to Section 715.4.3.1. In addition the issue being addressed by this proposal is better addressed within Chapter 7 instead of within Section 3007.

Assembly Action: **None**

G197-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt it was a good idea to provide guidance on the size of the lobbies but there was a concern that the justification for the size of the area needed to be provided. There was added concern that the requirement may conflict with the exception to Section 3007.3.

Assembly Action: **None**

G198-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal does not denote that this is required if the air was from within the machine room. Also remoteness of supply needs to be addressed.

Assembly Action: **None**

G199-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Technical justification was not provided to warrant such an increase in fire resistance rating from 1 to 2 hours for wires or cables providing normal and standby power, control signals, communication with the car, lighting and heating, air conditioning, ventilation and fire detecting systems for fire service access elevators.

Assembly Action: **None**

G200-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The concerns are valid but the current proposal appears onerous. Many of the provisions need clarifying. Performance criteria may be a better approach.

Assembly Action: **None**

G201-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standards ASTM F 2200-05 and UL325-02 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standards **did** comply with ICC standards criteria. Note that UL325 is already referenced in the IRC.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The provisions need to be limited to gates associated with buildings. Currently as written the proposal does not meet the scope and intent of the IBC.

Staff note: F70-07/08 contained a proposal with similar requirements for the IFC. That code change was Approved as Modified.

Assembly Action: **None**

G202-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The phrase "rolls and folds" appears to limit the definition as there may be other mechanisms or terms to describe the operation of a retractable awning.

Assembly Action: **None**

G203-07/08

PART I – IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agrees that reformatting these IBC sections on alterations, additions and repairs provides a badly needed code clarification of the existing building provisions in Chapter 34.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is necessary for existing stairways undergoing alterations.

Assembly Action: **None**

G204-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal appropriately gives recognition to the IEBC as a viable design tool. The reference to the IEBC is simply recognized as a compliance option for existing buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

G205-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

SECTION 3402 (IEBC 202)
DEFINITIONS

DANGEROUS. Any building or structure or portion thereof that meets any of the conditions described below shall be deemed dangerous:

1. The building or structure has collapsed, partially collapsed, moved off its foundation, or lacks the support of ~~any portion of~~ ground necessary to support it.
2. There exists a significant risk of collapse, detachment, or dislodgment of any portion, member, appurtenance, or ornamentation of the building or structure under ~~typical day-to-day~~ service loads.

3403.2 (IEBC [B] 302.2) Structural. Additions or alterations to an existing structure shall not increase the force in any structural element by more than 5 percent, unless the increased forces on the element are still in compliance with the code for new structures, nor shall the strength of any structural element be decreased to less than that required by this code for new structures. Where repairs are made to structural elements of an existing building, and uncovered structural elements are found to be dangerous, such dangerous conditions shall be eliminated ~~mitigated or made safe to the satisfaction of the code official~~.

Committee Reason: The committee agrees that adding a definition of the term "dangerous" will clarify the intent of the IBC existing building provisions. The modifications remove unnecessary or unclear wording and they are consistent with actions by the IEBC committee.

Assembly Action: **None**

G206-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee.

Errata: Add definition and Section 3403.3 to the proposal as follows:

1. Add new definition as follows:

SUBSTANTIAL STRUCTURAL DAMAGE. A condition where:

1. In any story, the vertical elements of the lateral force-resisting system have suffered damage such that the lateral load-carrying capacity of the structure in any horizontal direction has been reduced by more than 20 percent from its pre-damage condition; or
2. The capacity of any vertical gravity load-carrying component, or any group of such components, that supports more than 30 percent of the total area of the structure's floor(s) and roof(s) has been reduced more than 20 percent from its pre-damage condition and the remaining capacity of such affected elements, with respect to all dead and live loads, is less than 75 percent of that required by this code for new buildings of similar structure, purpose and location.

2. Revise text as follows:

3403.3 (Supp) Nonstructural. Nonstructural alterations ~~or repairs~~ to an existing building or structure are permitted to be made of the same materials of which the building or structure is constructed, provided that they do not adversely affect any structural member or the fire-resistance rating of any part of the building or structure.

The work shall not make the building less conforming to the building, plumbing, mechanical, electrical or fire codes of the jurisdiction, or to alternative materials, design and methods of construction, or to any previously approved plans, modifications, alternative methods, or compliance alternatives, than it was before the alteration ~~repair~~ was undertaken.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee opposes the proposed triggers in the definition of substantial structural damage. No study was provided on the cost-benefits of mitigation.

Assembly Action: **Approved as Submitted**

G207-07/08

PART I – IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agrees with the intention of providing better direction on application of the flood hazard requirements, but the current proposal is poorly worded. Any upgrade would trigger compliance and it is not appropriate to require meeting Section 1612 in all instances.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IEBC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Use of the IRC as a technical reference is confusing and inappropriate, given that the Existing Building Code does not apply to buildings built in accordance with the IRC.

Assembly Action: **None**

G208-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The new section clarifies that existing buildings only need to comply with flood design for new construction when the conditions under "substantial improvement" are met.

Assembly Action: **None**

G209-07/08

PART I – IBC STRUCTURAL

Errata Part I - IBC: Revise the following sections:

3403.2.3.1 (IEBC [B] 302.2.3.1) Additions to existing buildings.
Item 2: Replace "this code and ASCE 7" with "Section 1613"
Item 3: Replace "this code and ASCE 7" with "Section 1613"

3403.2.3.2 (IEBC [B] 302.2.3.2) Alterations.
1st paragraph: Replace "this code and ASCE 7" with "Section 1613"
Exception: Replace "this code and ASCE 7" with "Section 1613" in 2 places
Exception 5: Replace "this code and ASCE 7" with "Section 1613"

3406.4 Change of occupancy.
Exception 1: Replace "this code and ASCE 7" with "Section 1613"
Exception 2: Replace "this code and ASCE 7" with "Section 1613"

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify proposal as follows:

3403.2.3 (IEBC[B] 302.2.3) Seismic. Seismic requirements for additions and alterations shall be in accordance with this section. Values of R, Ω_0, and C_d for the existing seismic force-resisting system shall be those specified by this code for an Ordinary system unless it is demonstrated that the existing system will provide performance equivalent to that of an Intermediate or Special system.

3403.2.3.1 (IEBC[B] 302.2.3.1) Additions to existing buildings. An addition that is structurally independent from an existing structure shall be designed and constructed with the seismic requirements for new structures. An addition that is not structurally independent from an existing structure shall be designed and constructed such that the entire structure conforms to the seismic-force-resistance requirements for new structures unless the following conditions are satisfied:

1. The addition conforms with the requirements for new structures,
2. The addition does not increase the seismic forces in any structural element of the existing structure by more than 10 percent cumulative since the original construction, unless the element has the capacity to resist the increased forces determined in accordance with Section 1613, and
3. Additions do not decrease the seismic resistance of any structural element of the existing structure by more than 10 percent cumulative since the original construction, unless the element has the capacity to resist the forces determined in accordance with Section 1613. If the building's seismic base shear capacity has been increased since the original construction, the percent change in base shear may be calculated relative to the increased value.

3403.2.3.2 (IEBC[B] 302.2.3.2) Alterations. Alterations are permitted to be made to any structure without requiring the structure to comply with Section 1613, provided the alterations conform to the requirements for a new structure. Alterations that increase the seismic force in any existing structural element by more than 10 percent cumulative since the original construction or decrease the design strength of any existing structural element to resist seismic forces by more than 10 percent cumulative since the original construction shall not be permitted unless the entire seismic-force-resisting system is determined to conform to Section 1613 for a new structure. If the building's seismic base shear capacity has been increased since the original construction, the percent change in base shear may be calculated relative to the increased value.

Exception: Alterations to existing structural elements or additions of new structural elements that are not required by ~~Section 1613~~ this Chapter and are initiated for the purpose of increasing the strength or stiffness of the seismic-force-resisting system of an existing structure need not be designed for forces conforming to Section 1613, provided that an engineering analysis is submitted indicating the following:

1. The design strength of existing structural elements required to resist seismic forces is not reduced.
2. The seismic force to required existing structural elements is not increased beyond their design strength.
3. New structural elements are detailed and connected to the existing structural elements as required by Chapter 16.
4. New or relocated nonstructural elements are detailed and connected to existing or new structural elements as required by Chapter 16.
5. The alterations do not create a structural irregularity as defined in Section 1613 or make an existing structural Irregularity more severe.
6. The alterations do not result in the creation of an unsafe condition.

3406.4 Change of occupancy. When a change of occupancy results in a structure being reclassified to a higher occupancy category, the structure shall conform to the seismic requirements for a new structure of the higher occupancy category. Values of R, Ω_0, and C_d for the existing seismic force-resisting system shall be those specified by this code for an Ordinary system unless it is demonstrated that the existing system will provide performance equivalent to that of an Intermediate or Special system.

Exceptions:

1. Specific seismic detailing requirements of this code or Section 1613 for a new structure shall not be required to be met where it can be shown that the level of performance and seismic safety is equivalent to that of a new structure. Such analysis shall consider the regularity, overstrength, redundancy and ductility of the structure within the context of the existing and retrofit (if any) detailing provided.
2. When a change of use results in a structure being reclassified from Occupancy Category I or II to Occupancy Category III and the structure is located in a seismic map area where S_{DS} < 0.33, compliance with the seismic requirements of this code and Section 1613 are not required.

Committee Reason: This proposal provides guidance to engineers on selecting R-values and other coefficients for existing buildings with structural systems that do not meet the seismic detailing requirements for new buildings. The modification corrects the Exception to Section 3403.2.3.2 to refer to this chapter (Chapter 34) which is what was intended.

Assembly Action: None

PART II – IEBC

Errata Part II – IEBC: Revise Section 506.1.1.3, Item 1 as follows:

506.1.1.3 (Supp) Reduced IBC level seismic forces. When seismic forces are permitted to meet reduced *International Building Code* levels, they shall be one of the following:

1. Seventy-five percent of the forces prescribed in the *International Building Code*. ~~The *R* factor~~ Values of R, Ω_0, and C_d used for analysis in accordance with Chapter 16 of the *International Building Code* shall be those ~~the *R* factor as~~ specified in Section 506.1.1.2 of this code.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There seemed to be some confusion regarding whether the proposed language accomplished the intent of the proponent. The committee felt that it was important to include all three factors, and felt that the intent of the proponent would be appropriate. However, the confusion was with the actual language and whether the outcome was different than the intent of the proponent. Therefore, the committee disapproved the proposal.

Assembly Action: None

G210-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify proposal as follows:

3403.2.3.2 (IEBC 302.2.3.2) Alterations. Alterations are permitted to be made to any structure without requiring the structure to comply with Section 1613, provided the alterations conform to the requirements for a new structure. Alterations that increase the seismic force in any existing structural element by more than 10 percent cumulative since the original construction or decrease the design strength of any existing structural element to resist seismic forces by more than 10 percent cumulative since the original construction shall not be permitted unless the entire seismic-force-resisting system is determined to comply with Section 1613 for a new structure. If the building's seismic base shear capacity has been increased since the original construction, the percent change in base shear may be calculated relative to the increased value.

Exception: Alterations to existing structural elements or additions of new structural elements that are not required by ~~ASCE 7~~ this Chapter and are initiated for the purpose of increasing the strength or stiffness of the seismic-force-resisting system of an existing structure need not be designed for forces complying with Section 1613, provided that an engineering analysis is submitted indicating the following:

1. The design strength of existing structural elements required to resist seismic forces is not reduced.
2. The seismic force to required existing structural elements is not increased beyond their design strength.
3. New structural elements are detailed and connected to the existing structural elements as required by Chapter 16.
4. New or relocated nonstructural elements are detailed and connected to existing or new structural elements as required by Chapter 16.

5. The alterations do not create a structural irregularity as defined in ASCE 7 or make an existing structural irregularity more severe.
6. The alterations do not result in the creation of an unsafe condition.

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: This proposal cleans up these provisions by making the appropriate reference to earthquake load requirements, without directing you to the ASCE 7 standard. The modification corrects the Exception to Section 3403.2.3.2 to refer to this chapter (Chapter 34) which is more appropriate, since the requirement is given in this chapter rather than ASCE 7.

Assembly Action: **None**

G211-07/08

PART I – IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the intent of the Exception to Section 3403.2.3.2 which allows voluntary seismic upgrades to a building's seismic-force-resisting system without fully complying with the earthquake load provision.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IEBC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The reference in Item 2 to Chapter 16 of the IBC conflicts with Section 101.7.

Assembly Action: **None**

G212-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language requiring removal of existing items within a building is confusing and ambiguous. Also the terminology used does not work with the terminology in the code. Use of the term "alteration" for instance is more consistent with current code language. The proposal needs substantial revisions to become viable.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action of the IBC-G Committee. The committee felt that the nature of the proposal is outside the scope of the IFC but within the scope of the IBC and IEBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

G213-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While this appears to be consistent with code philosophy for alterations, the proposal must be limited so that it is clear that only the elements being altered need to comply, not that the entire unit must comply when something is being altered. It should be made clear that abatement of substandard housing conditions should not be considered alterations that trigger this requirement. In addition, the technical requirements in ICC A117.1 keep changing for Type B units. A building could have complied when constructed and would now be considered non-compliant. A consistent benchmark must be addressed.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IEBC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The trigger requiring compliance with accessibility provision is too low and unreasonable.

Assembly Action: **None**

G214-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It is overly restrictive to require an existing building to come into full compliance when only a portion is being altered. This also would be a conflict with Section 3409.3 which states that only the portions of a building being altered must comply with new provisions; this is the philosophy of the code in dealing with existing buildings. Enforcement of this provision would be political suicide for a building official who tried to enforce these provisions. The ADA has a 20% limit for additional costs – there are no limits for the cost of compliance for this provision, therefore it could be impractical to require full compliance. It needs to be clarified what level of alterations has to be undertaken to require this. In addition, the technical requirements in ICC A117.1 keep changing for Type B units. A building could have complied when constructed and would now be considered non-compliant. A consistent benchmark must be addressed.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IEBC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The trigger requiring compliance with accessibility provision is too low and unreasonable.

Assembly Action: **None**

G215-07/08

PART I – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

3409.6 (IEBC [B] 308.6) (Supp) Alterations. A building, facility or element that is altered shall comply with the applicable provisions in Chapter11 and ICC A117.1, unless technically infeasible. Where compliance with this section is technically infeasible, the alteration shall provide access to the maximum extent technically feasible.

Exceptions:

1. The altered element or space is not required to be on an accessible route, unless required by Section 3409.7.
2. Accessible means of egress required by Chapter 10 are not required to be provided in existing buildings and facilities.
3. The alteration to Type A individually owned dwelling units within a Group R-2 occupancy shall meet the provision for a Type B dwelling unit and shall comply with the applicable provisions in Chapter 11 and ICC A117.1.

3409.8.7 (IEBC [B] 308.8.7)(Supp) Accessible dwelling or sleeping units. Where Group I-1, I-2, I-3, R-1, R-2 or R-4 dwelling or sleeping units are being altered or added, the requirements of Section 1107 for Accessible units and Section 907 for visible alarms apply only to the quantity of spaces being altered or added.

~~**3409.8.8 (IEBC [B] 308.8.8)Type A dwelling or sleeping units.** Where more than 20 Group R-2 dwelling or sleeping units are being altered or added, the requirements of Section 1107 for Type A units and Section 907 for visible alarms apply only to the quantity of spaces being altered or added.~~

~~**3409.8.9 (IEBC [B] 308.8.9)Type B dwelling or sleeping units.** Where 4 or more Group I-1, I-2, R-1, R-2, R-3 or R-4 dwelling or sleeping units are being added, the requirements of Section 1107 for Type A units and Section 907 for visible alarms apply only to the quantity of spaces being added.~~

Committee Reason: The modification is to delete the proposed language for Sections 3409.8.8 and 3409.8.9 because this is already addressed in the existing text. It was noted that Section 3409.8.9 was intended for Type B requirements, not Type A requirements – this was a typographical error. The deletion of Exception 4 to Section 3409.6 was approved. While Type A units are not required by the Fair Housing Act (FHA), Section 3409.6 Exception 4 does take the codes further away from compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and should be deleted.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IEBC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal fixes a disparity between the IBC and IEBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

G216-07/08

This code change was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is primarily an editorial change that rewords the requirements for a structural analysis of an existing building to make the intent of the code more clear.

Assembly Action: **None**

G217-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There are other features that are just as significant such as vertical openings that are not listed in Section 3410.5.1. The section needs to be revised to be more inclusive of other aspects if the concept of "compartmentation" is to be added to the section.

Assembly Action: **None**

G218-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

3410.6.2.1 (IEBC [B] 1301.6.2.1) Allowable area formula. The following formula shall be used in computing allowable area:

$A_a = (1 + I_f + I_s) \times A_t$ **(Equation 34-2)**

where:

A_a = Allowable area.
A_t = Tabular area per story in accordance with Table 503 (square feet)
I_s = Area increase factor for sprinklers (Section 506.3).
I_f = Area increase factor for frontage (Section 506.2).

Committee Reason: The proposal correlates the equations in Chapter 34 with that of current Section 506.1. The modification simply added a key for At that was inadvertently not included in the proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

G219-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Increasing the construction type factor was felt to be too restrictive for existing buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

G220-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART II – IFC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

G221-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal appropriately updates to the most current edition of referenced standards within the IBC for sections related to the General Building Code requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

G222-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

G223-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASHRAE/USBGC/IESNA 189.1-07 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard **did** comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the request of the proponent. The standard is not yet in a complete form for adoption into the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

G224-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

G225-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The concept of relying on certification of federal funding to determine the number of patients as a way of determining the type of medical facility did not seem appropriate in a building code.

Assembly Action: **None**

G226-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

3108.1 (Supp) General. Towers shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the provisions of TIA-222.

> **Exception:** Single freestanding poles used to support ~~lightweight electrical equipment such as cell phone~~ antennas not greater than 70 feet (21336 mm) above grade shall not be required to be non-combustible.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved based upon the proponent's reason; that these types of towers were permitted under UBC and have a good safety record. The modification makes the reference more general to antennas as the description of "lightweight electrical equipment such as cell phone antennas" was potentially limiting for similar poles supporting other types of antennas.

Assembly Action: **None**

G227-07/08

Errata: Add the following proposal:

3002.4
Proponent: Chad Lawry, City of Vancouver, WA, representing City of Vancouver Firefighters

Revise as follows:

3002.4 Elevator car to accommodate ambulance stretcher. Where elevators are provided in buildings ~~four~~ two or more stories above grade plane or ~~four~~ two or more stories below grade plane, at least one elevator shall be provided for fire department emergency access to all floors. The elevator car shall be of such a size and arrangement to accommodate a 24-inch by 84-inch (610 mm by 2250 mm) ambulance stretcher in the horizontal, open position and shall be identified by the international symbol for emergency medical services (star of life). The symbol shall not be less than 3 inches (76 mm) high and shall be placed inside on both sides of the hoistway door frame.

Reason: The purpose of the code change is the safe egress of patients and emergency responders during medical emergencies. Justification: When an elevator car is too small to accommodate an ambulance stretcher, patients and emergency responses are at increased risk when negotiating stairways. When a patient is strapped to a backboard due to back or neck injuries, the stretcher cannot be set to a reclined
position in order to fit in a typical elevator which is designed to accommodate a wheelchair. It is virtually impossible to provide effective CPR while carrying a patient up or down stairs. However, effective CPR can be provided in an elevator. As with many jurisdictions, our local ambulances and Fire Department medic units are staffed by only 2 people. Due to back injuries and near mishaps carrying large patients down stairs, our Firefighters are requesting simple code change for this high-risk, high-frequency activity. Scope: This pertains to all new construction subject to the requirements of the International Building Code. The proposed code revision will not require elevators where they are not already required by the building codes.

Cost Impact: The proposal will negligibly increase the cost of construction. As an example, according to a sales representative of American Crescent Elevator Mfg., Corp. (310 Stephens Street Picayune, Ms. 39466
Sales: 800-748-9711 Fax: 601-798-9444), the cost of a 2100 pound capacity elevator accommodating wheel chairs is roughly $35,000 installed compared to a 2500 pound capacity elevator accommodating stretchers at roughly $36,000 installed. The impact is a 2.77% increase in the cost of one elevator. EXAMPLE: In $1,000,000 project, the cost impact is approximately one tenth of 1%

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was felt to be too restrictive and may be a disincentive for building owners to install elevators. This may reduce the level of accessibility provided in buildings.

Assembly Action: None