



INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL

2015 – 2017 CODE
DEVELOPMENT CYCLE
Group A (2015)

2015 REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION
HEARINGS ON THE 2015 EDITIONS OF THE GROUP A
INTERNATIONAL CODES

HELD IN MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE
APRIL 19 – 27, 2015

PUBLIC COMMENT DEADLINE:
JULY 17, 2015

**INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL
2015-2017 CODE DEVELOPMENT CYCLE**

**2015 REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING
ON THE 2015 EDITIONS OF THE**

INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE®

*Egress
Fire Safety
General
Structural (heard by IBC – FS or IBC – G)*

INTERNATIONAL EXISTING BUILDING CODE®

Non structural

INTERNATIONAL FUEL GAS CODE®

INTERNATIONAL MECHANICAL CODE®

INTERNATIONAL PLUMBING CODE®

INTERNATIONAL PRIVATE SEWAGE DISPOSAL CODE®

INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE®

INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL CODE®

*Mechanical
Plumbing*

INTERNATIONAL SWIMMING POOL AND SPA CODE®

**HELD IN MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE
APRIL 19 – APRIL 27, 2015**

**PUBLIC COMMENT DEADLINE:
JULY 17, 2015**



First Printing

Publication Date: June 2015

Copyright © 2015

By

International Code Council, Inc.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. This 2015-2017 Code Development Cycle 2015 Report of the Committee Action Hearing on the 2015 Editions of the *International Codes* is a copyrighted work owned by the International Code Council, Inc. Without advanced written permission from the copyright owner, no part of this book may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including, without limitations, electronic, optical or mechanical means (by way of example and not limitation, photocopying, or recording by or in an information storage retrieval system). For information on permission to copy material exceeding fair use, please contact: Publications, 4051 West Flossmoor Road, Country Club Hills, IL 60478 (Phone 1-888-422-7233).

Trademarks: "International Code Council," the "International Code Council" logo are trademarks of the International Code Council, Inc.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Introduction | i |
| Public Comment Deadline July 17, 2015 | i |
| ICC Website | i |
| Errata to the Committee Action Hearing Results | i |
| Modifications by Public Comment | ii |
| Public Comment Hearing Consideration | ii |
| cdpACCESS Update..... | ii |
| Electronic Voter Validation Reminder..... | ii |
| Call for Adoption Information..... | ii |
| Code Change Numbers Not Used | ii |
| 2015/2016/2017 ICC Code Development Schedule..... | iii |
| ICC Code Development Procedures (Council Policy CP #28)..... | vi |
| Report of the Committee Action Hearing - Table of Contents..... | xxii |

INTRODUCTION

This publication contains the 2015 Group A Report of the Committee Action Hearing (ROCAH) on the proposed revisions to the *International Building Code (Egress, Fire Safety, General and Structural provisions heard by either the Fire Safety or General committee)*, *International Existing Building Code non structural provisions*, *International Fuel Gas Code*, *International Mechanical Code*, *International Plumbing Code*, *International Private Sewage Disposal Code*, *International Property Maintenance Code*, *International Residential Code (Mechanical and Plumbing)* and the *International Swimming Pool and Spa Code*. The hearing was held in Memphis, Tennessee, April 19 – 27, 2015.

This report includes the recommendation of the code development committee and the committee's reason on each proposed item. It also includes the results of the Online Assembly Motion Vote via cdpACCESS which occurred subsequent to the hearings during the period of May 14 – 28, 2015. Where the committee or assembly action was "Approved as Modified", the proposed change, or a portion thereof, is included herein with the modification indicated in strikeout/underline format. Where this report indicates "Withdrawn by Proponent" the proposed change was withdrawn by the proponent and is not subject to any further consideration.

[Click here](#) for the text of the original code change proposals.

Proposals on which there was a successful assembly action will be automatically included on the Public Comment Agenda for Individual Consideration and voting by eligible voting members in accordance with Section 6.1 (2) of CP28 Code Development (CP28) (see page ii).

PUBLIC COMMENT DEADLINE JULY 17, 2015

Persons who wish to recommend an action other than that taken at the Committee Action Hearing may submit a public comment in accordance with Section 6.0 of the CP28. **The deadline for receipt of public comments is July 17, 2015. Public comments must be submitted online via cdpACCESS by 11:59 pm Pacific.** Proposals which receive a public comment will be included on the Public Comment Hearing Agenda for Individual Consideration and voting by eligible voting members in accordance with Section 7.5 of CP28. Proposals which do not receive a public comment or a successful assembly action will be included in the consent agenda and be voted with a motion to sustain the action taken at the Committee Action Hearing.

SUBMIT PUBLIC COMMENTS ONLINE AT THE cdpACCESS WEBSITE: www.cdpACCESS.com

Please note: The word processing software utilized by cdpACCESS, for submittal of public comments, does not permit the use of the "cut and paste" feature from Word documents.

ICC WEBSITE

While great care has been exercised in the publication of this document, errata may occur. Errata will be posted on the [Current Code Development Cycle Website](#).

ERRATA TO THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

Code change E155-15 is noted in the Committee Action Hearing results as having received an assembly motion for As Submitted. While an assembly motion was made, it did not receive a second. As such, the motion failed and the Assembly Action noted in this report is "None".

MODIFICATIONS BY PUBLIC COMMENT

Section 6.4.4 of CP28 allows modifications to be proposed by a public comment to a code change proposal for consideration at the Public Comment Hearing. For the modification to be considered at the Public Comment Hearing, the public comment must request Approval as Modified with the specific modification included in the public comment. In accordance with Section 6.4.1, the modification must be within the scope of the original code change proposal, committee action or successful assembly action.

PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING CONSIDERATION

In summary, the items that will be on the PCH agenda for Individual Consideration and action are:

1. Proposed changes that received a successful Assembly Action (CP28 Section 5.7); and
2. Proposed changes that received a public comment (CP28 Section 6.0).

Following the Public Comment Hearings, the results of the Individual Consideration Agenda will be the basis for the Online Governmental Consensus Vote to determine the final action on these proposals (CP28 Section 8.0). The Online Governmental Consensus Vote is scheduled to start approximately two weeks after the conclusion of the Public Comment Hearings.

cdpACCESS UPDATE

Current 2015 Group A Cycle

Public comment submittal assistance will be provided on the [cdpACCESS webpage](#). We will be posting a video tutorial which outlines the navigation steps as well as holding webinars. A webinar schedule will be posted.

2016 Group B Cycle

cdpACCESS is open for code change proposal submittals for the 2016 Group B Cycle. The deadline is January 11, 2016. Be sure to consult the 2015/2016/2017 ICC Code Development Schedule on page iii for the applicable codes and important scoping information.

ICC continues to receive feedback from users. Be sure to visit the “Support Options” on the [cdpACCESS webpage](#) for more information.

ELECTRONIC VOTER VALIDATION REMINDER (August 31, 2015 deadline)

Attention all Governmental Member Voting Representatives: If your Primary Representative has not validated your voting credentials for 2015, there's still time. [The Electronic Voter Validation site](#) is open and will remain available until August 31. If you wish to vote at the Long Beach, CA 2015 Annual Conference and Public Comment Hearings on September 27 – October 7, 2015, or the Online Governmental Consensus Vote that follows the Public Comment Hearings, your voting credentials must be validated by August 31, 2015.

If your voting credentials have already been validated in the 2015 calendar year, you do **not** have to be revalidated. Not sure if your credentials are up to date? ***Check your GMVRs' status online today!***

CALL FOR ADOPTION INFORMATION

Please take a minute to visit the [International Code Adoptions](#) to update information as it relates to your jurisdiction.

CODE CHANGE NUMBERS NOT USED

Where the tentative order of discussion in the code change agenda indicates that a code change number is “Not Used”, it was identified in the posted Committee Action Hearing Results as “NU” (e.g. FG15-15.....NU). The following is a list of code change numbers not used and as such are not listed in this Report of the Committee Action Hearing: FG15; M7; M16; M74; P32; P85; and P116.

2015/2016/2017 ICC CODE DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE
(Updated September 12, 2014)

| STEP IN CODE DEVELOPMENT CYCLE | DATE | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | 2015 – Group A Codes IBC- E, IBC - FS, IBC -G, IEBC, IFGC, IMC, IPC, IPMC, IPSDC, IRC – M, IRC- P, ISPSC, IZC | 2016 – Group B Codes Admin, IBC-S, IECC-C, IECC/IRC-R, IFC, IRC - B, IWUIC | 2017 – Group C Code IgCC |
| 2015 EDITION OF I-CODES PUBLISHED | June 2, 2014 | | March 31, 2015 (approx.) |
| DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS FOR ALL CODE COMMITTEES | June 2, 2014 for the 2015/2016/2017 Cycle. Call for committee posted January 31, 2014 June 1, 2017 for the 2018/2019/2020 Cycle. Call for committee to be posted in January/2017. | | |
| DEADLINE FOR cdpACCESS ONLINE RECEIPT OF CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS | January 12, 2015 | January 11, 2016 | January 9, 2017 |
| WEB POSTING OF “PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE I-CODES” | March 13, 2015 | March 8, 2016 | March 10, 2017 |
| COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING (CAH) | April 19 – 30, 2015 Memphis Cook Convention Center Memphis, TN | April 17 – 27, 2016 Kentucky International Convention Center Louisville, KY | April 23 – 30, 2017 Kentucky International Convention Center Louisville, KY |
| ONLINE CAH ASSEMBLY FLOOR MOTION VOTING PERIOD | Starts approx. two weeks after last day of CAH. Open for 2 weeks. | Starts approx. two weeks after last day of CAH. Open for 2 weeks. | Starts approx. two weeks after last day of CAH. Open for 2 weeks. |
| WEB POSTING OF “REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING” | June 5, 2015 | June 1, 2016 | June 2, 2017 |
| DEADLINE FOR cdpACCESS ONLINE RECEIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENTS | July 17, 2015 | July 22, 2016 | July 28, 2017 |
| WEB POSTING OF “PUBLIC COMMENT AGENDA” | August 28, 2015 | September 9, 2016 | September 15, 2017 |
| PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING (PCH) ANNUAL CONFERENCE DATES NOTED BY AC | September 30 – October 7, 2015 Long Beach Convention Center Long Beach, CA AC: September 27 - 29 | October 19 – 25, 2016 Kansas City Convention Center Kansas City, MO AC: October 16 – 18 | October 25 – 31, 2017 Greater Columbus Convention Center Columbus, OH AC: October 22 – 24 |

| STEP IN CODE DEVELOPMENT CYCLE | DATE | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2015 – Group A Codes IBC- E, IBC - FS, IBC -G, IEBC, IFGC, IMC, IPC, IPMC, IPSDC, IRC – M, IRC- P, ISPSC, IZC | 2016 – Group B Codes Admin, IBC-S, IECC-C, IECC/IRC-R, IFC, IRC - B, IWUIC | 2017 – Group C Code IgCC |
| ONLINE GOVERNMENTAL CONSENSUS VOTING PERIOD | Starts approx. two weeks after last day of PCH. Open for 2 weeks. | Starts approx. two weeks after last day of PCH. Open for 2 weeks. | Starts approx. two weeks after last day of PCH. Open for 2 weeks. |

Group A Codes/Code committees:

- IBC-E: IBC Egress provisions. Chapters 10 and 11
- IBC-FS: IBC Fire Safety provisions. Chapters 7, 8, 9 (partial), 14 and 26. Majority of IBC Chapter 9 is maintained by the IFC in Group B. See notes
- IBC-G: IBC General provisions. Chapters 3 – 6, 12, 13, 27 – 33
- IEBC: IEBC non structural provisions. See notes
- IFGC
- IMC
- IPC
- IPMC (code changes heard by the IPMZC code committee)
- IPSDC (code changes heard by the IPC code committee)
- IRC-M: IRC Mechanical provisions. Chapters 12 – 23 (code changes heard by the IRC - MP code committee)
- IRC-P: IRC Plumbing provisions. Chapters 25 – 33 (code changes heard by the IRC - MP code committee)
- ISPSC
- IZC (code changes heard by the IPMZC code committee)

Group B Codes/Code committees:

- Admin: Chapter 1 of all the I-Codes except the IECC and IRC. Also includes the update of currently referenced standards in all of the 2015 Codes
- IBC-S: IBC Structural provisions. IBC Chapters 15 – 25 and IEBC structural provisions. See notes
- IECC-C: IECC Commercial energy provisions
- IECC/IRC-R: IECC Residential energy provisions and IRC Energy provisions in Chapter 11
- IFC: The majority of IFC Chapter 10 is maintained by IBC-E in Group A. See notes
- IRC-B: IRC Building provisions. Chapters 1 – 10
- IWUIC (code changes heard by the IFC code committee)

Group C Codes/Code committees:

- IgCC
 - IgCC – General: Chapters 1 – 5, 8 – 11 and Appendices
 - IgCC – Energy/Water: Chapters 6 and 7

Notes:

- Be sure to review the document entitled “2015/2016/2017 Code Committee Responsibilities” which will be posted. This identifies responsibilities which are different than Group A, B and C codes and committees which may impact the applicable code change cycle and resulting code change deadline. As an example, throughout Chapter 9 of the IBC (IBC- Fire Safety, a Group A code committee), there are numerous sections which include the designation “[F]” which indicates that the provisions of the section are maintained by the IFC code committee (a Group B code committee). Similarly, there are numerous sections in the IEBC which include the designation “[BS]”. These are structural provisions which will be heard in Group B by the IBC – Structural committee while the non structural provisions will be maintained in the 2015 Group A Cycle by the IEBC code committee. The designations in the code are identified in the Code Committee Responsibilities document.
- Proposed changes to the ICC Performance Code will be heard by the code committee noted in brackets ([]) in the section of the code and in the Code Committee Responsibilities document.
- Definitions. Be sure to review the brackets ([]) in Chapter 2 of the applicable code and the Code Committee Responsibilities document to determine which code committee will consider proposed changes to the definitions.



CP #28-05 CODE DEVELOPMENT

Approved: 9/24/05

Revised: 9/27/14

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 **Purpose:** The purpose of this Council Policy is to prescribe the Rules of Procedure utilized in the continued development and maintenance of the International Codes (Codes).
- 1.2 **Objectives:** The ICC Code Development Process has the following objectives:
 - 1.2.1 The timely evaluation and recognition of technological developments pertaining to construction regulations.
 - 1.2.2 The open discussion of code change proposals by all parties desiring to participate.
 - 1.2.3 The final determination of Code text by public officials actively engaged in the administration, formulation or enforcement of laws, ordinances, rules or regulations relating to the public health, safety and welfare and by honorary members.
 - 1.2.4 The increased participation of all parties desiring to participate through an online submittal and voting process that includes opportunities for online collaboration.
- 1.3 **Code Publication:** The ICC Board of Directors (ICC Board) shall determine the title and the general purpose and scope of each Code published by the ICC.
 - 1.3.1 **Code Correlation:** The provisions of all Codes shall be consistent with one another so that conflicts between the Codes do not occur. A Code Scoping Coordination Matrix shall determine which Code shall be the primary document, and therefore which code development committee shall be responsible for maintenance of the code text where a given subject matter or code text could appear in more than one Code. The Code Scoping Coordination Matrix shall be administered by the Code Correlation Committee as approved by the ICC Board. Duplication of content or text between Codes shall be limited to the minimum extent necessary for practical usability of the Codes, as determined in accordance with Section 4.5.
- 1.4 **Process Maintenance:** The review and maintenance of the Code Development Process and these Rules of Procedure shall be by the ICC Board. The manner in which Codes are developed embodies core principles of the organization. One of those principles is that the final content of the Codes is determined by a majority vote of the governmental and honorary members. It is the policy of the ICC Board that there shall be no change to this principle without the affirmation of two-thirds of the governmental and honorary members responding.
- 1.5 **Secretariat:** The Chief Executive Officer shall assign a Secretariat for each of the Codes. All correspondence relating to code change proposals and public comments shall be addressed to the Secretariat. The Secretariat shall have the authority to facilitate unforeseen situations which arise in the implementation of this council policy. Staff shall maintain a record of such actions.
- 1.6 **Recording:** Individuals requesting permission to record any meeting or hearing, or portion thereof, shall be required to provide the ICC with a release of responsibility disclaimer and shall acknowledge that ICC shall retain sole ownership of the recording, and that they have insurance coverage for liability and misuse of recording materials. Equipment and the process used to record shall, in the judgment of the ICC Secretariat, be conducted in a manner that is not disruptive to the meeting. The ICC shall not be responsible for equipment, personnel or any other

provision necessary to accomplish the recording. An unedited copy of the recording shall be forwarded to ICC within 30 days of the meeting. Recordings shall not otherwise be copied, reproduced or distributed in any manner. Recordings shall be returned to ICC or destroyed upon the request of ICC.

2.0 Code Development Cycle

2.1 Intent: The code development cycle shall consist of the complete consideration of code change proposals in accordance with the procedures herein specified, commencing with the deadline for submission of code change proposals (see Section 3.5) and ending with publication of the Final Action on the code change proposals (see Section 10.4).

2.2 New Editions: The ICC Board shall determine the schedule for publishing new editions of the Codes. Each new edition shall incorporate the results of the code development activity since the previous edition.

2.3 Supplements: The results of code development activity between editions may be published.

2.4 Emergency Action Procedures:

2.4.1 Scope: Emergency actions are limited to those issues representing an immediate threat to health and safety that warrant a more timely response than allowed by the Code Development Process schedule.

2.4.2 Initial Request: A request for an emergency action shall be based upon perceived threats to health and safety and shall be reviewed by the Codes and Standards Council for referral to the ICC Board for action with their analysis and recommendation.

2.4.3 Board and Member Action: In the event that the ICC Board determines that an emergency amendment to any Code or supplement thereto is warranted, the same may be adopted by the ICC Board. Such action shall require an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the ICC Board.

The ICC membership shall be notified within ten days after the ICC Boards' official action of any emergency amendment. At the next Annual Business Meeting, any emergency amendment shall be presented to the members for ratification by a majority of the Governmental Member Voting Representatives and Honorary Members present and voting.

All code revisions pursuant to these emergency procedures and the reasons for such corrective action shall be published as soon as practicable after ICC Board action. Such revisions shall be identified as an emergency amendment.

Emergency amendments to any Code shall not be considered as a retro-active requirement to the Code. Incorporation of the emergency amendment into the adopted Code shall be subjected to the process established by the adopting authority.

2.5 Code Development Record. The code development record shall include the official documents and records developed in support of the given code development cycle. This includes the following:

1. Code Change Agenda (Section 4.8)
2. Audio and video recording of the Committee Action Hearing (Section 5.1)
3. The Online Assembly Floor Motion Ballot (Section 5.7.3)
4. Report of the Committee Action Hearing (Section 5.8)
5. Public Comment Agenda (Section 6.6)
6. Public Comment Hearing results (Section 7.5.8.10)
7. Audio and video recording of the Public Comment Hearing (Section 7.1)
8. The Online Governmental Consensus Ballot (Section 8.2)
9. Final Action results (Section 10.4)
10. Errata to the documents noted above

The information resulting from online collaboration between interested parties shall not be part of the code development record.

3.0 Submittal of Code Change Proposals

- 3.1 Intent:** Any interested person, persons or group may submit a code change proposal which will be duly considered when in conformance to these Rules of Procedure.
- 3.2 Withdrawal of Proposal:** A code change proposal may be withdrawn by the proponent (WP) at any time prior to public comment consideration of that proposal. All actions on the code change proposal shall cease immediately upon the withdrawal of the code change proposal.
- 3.3 Form and Content of Code Change Submittals:** Each code change proposal shall be submitted separately and shall be complete in itself. Each submittal shall contain the following information:
- 3.3.1 Proponent:** Each code change proposal shall include the name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address of the proponent. Email addresses shall be published with the code change proposals unless the proponent otherwise requests on the submittal form.
- 3.3.1.1** If a group, organization or committee submits a code change proposal, an individual with prime responsibility shall be indicated.
- 3.3.1.2** If a proponent submits a code change proposal on behalf of a client, group, organization or committee, the name and mailing address of the client, group, organization or committee shall be indicated.
- 3.3.2 Code Reference:** Each code change proposal shall relate to the applicable code sections(s) in the latest edition of the Code.
- 3.3.2.1** If more than one section in the Code is affected by a code change proposal, appropriate proposals shall be included for all such affected sections.
- 3.3.2.2** If more than one Code is affected by a code change proposal, appropriate proposals shall be included for all such affected Codes and appropriate cross referencing shall be included in the supporting information.
- 3.3.3 Multiple Code Change Proposals to a Code Section.** A proponent shall not submit multiple code change proposals to the same code section. When a proponent submits multiple code change proposals to the same section, the proposals shall be considered as incomplete proposals and processed in accordance with Section 4.3. This restriction shall not apply to code change proposals that attempt to address differing subject matter within a code section.
- 3.3.4 Text Presentation:** The text of the code change proposal shall be presented in the specific wording desired with deletions shown struck out with a single line and additions shown underlined with a single line.
- 3.3.4.1** A charging statement shall indicate the referenced code section(s) and whether the code change proposal is intended to be an addition, a deletion or a revision to existing Code text.
- 3.3.4.2** Whenever practical, the existing wording of the text shall be preserved with only such deletions and additions as necessary to accomplish the desired change.
- 3.3.4.3** Each code change proposal shall be in proper code format and terminology.
- 3.3.4.4** Each code change proposal shall be complete and specific in the text to eliminate unnecessary confusion or misinterpretation.
- 3.3.4.5** The proposed text shall be in mandatory terms.
- 3.3.5 Supporting Information:** Each code change proposal shall include sufficient supporting information to indicate how the code change proposal is intended to affect the intent and application of the Code.

- 3.3.5.1 Purpose:** The proponent shall clearly state the purpose of the code change proposal (e.g. clarify the Code; revise outdated material; substitute new or revised material for current provisions of the Code; add new requirements to the Code; delete current requirements, etc.)
- 3.3.5.2 Reasons:** The proponent shall justify changing the current Code provisions, stating why the code change proposal is superior to the current provisions of the Code. Code change proposals which add or delete requirements shall be supported by a logical explanation which clearly shows why the current Code provisions are inadequate or overly restrictive, specifies the shortcomings of the current Code provisions and explains how such code change proposals will improve the Code.
- 3.3.5.3 Substantiation:** The proponent shall substantiate the code change proposal based on technical information and substantiation. Substantiation provided which is reviewed in accordance with Section 4.2 and determined as not germane to the technical issues addressed in the code change proposal may be identified as such. The proponent shall be notified that the code change proposal is considered an incomplete proposal in accordance with Section 4.3 and the proposal shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected. The proponent shall have the right to appeal this action in accordance with the policy of the ICC Board. The burden of providing substantiating material lies with the proponent of the code change proposal. All substantiating material published by ICC is material that has been provided by the proponent and in so publishing ICC makes no representations or warranties about its quality or accuracy.
- 3.3.5.4 Bibliography:** The proponent shall submit a bibliography of any substantiating material submitted with the code change proposal. The bibliography shall be published with the code change proposal and the proponent shall make the substantiating materials available for review at the appropriate ICC office and during the public hearing.
- 3.3.5.5 Copyright Release:** The proponent of code change proposals, floor modifications and public comments shall sign a copyright release reading: "I hereby grant and assign to ICC all rights in copyright I may have in any authorship contributions I make to ICC in connection with any proposal and public comment, in its original form submitted or revised form, including written and verbal modifications submitted in accordance Section 5.5.2. I understand that I will have no rights in any ICC publications that use such contributions in the form submitted by me or another similar form and certify that such contributions are not protected by the copyright of any other person or entity."
- 3.3.5.6 Cost Impact:** The proponent shall indicate one of the following regarding the cost impact of the code change proposal: 1) the code change proposal will increase the cost of construction; or 2) the code change proposal will not increase the cost of construction. The proponent shall submit information which substantiates either assertion. This information will be considered by the code development committee and will be included in the bibliography of the published code change proposal. Any proposal submitted which does not include the requisite cost information shall be considered incomplete and shall not be processed.

- 3.4 Online Submittal:** Each code change proposal and all substantiating information shall be submitted online at the website designated by ICC. Two copies of each proposed new referenced standard in hard copy or one copy in electronic form shall be submitted. Additional copies may be requested when determined necessary by the Secretariat to allow such information to be distributed to the code development committee. Where such additional copies are requested, it shall be the responsibility of the proponent to send such copies to the respective code development committee.

3.5 Submittal Deadline: ICC shall establish and post the submittal deadline for each cycle. The posting of the deadline shall occur no later than 120 days prior to the code change deadline. Each code change proposal shall be submitted online at the website designated by ICC by the posted deadline. The submitter of a code change proposal is responsible for the proper and timely receipt of all pertinent materials by the Secretariat.

3.6 Referenced Standards: In order for a standard to be considered for reference or to continue to be referenced by the Codes, a standard shall meet the following criteria:

3.6.1 Code References:

3.6.1.1 The standard, including title and date, and the manner in which it is to be utilized shall be specifically referenced in the Code text.

3.6.1.2 The need for the standard to be referenced shall be established.

3.6.2 Standard Content:

3.6.2.1 A standard or portions of a standard intended to be enforced shall be written in mandatory language.

3.6.2.2 The standard shall be appropriate for the subject covered.

3.6.2.3 All terms shall be defined when they deviate from an ordinarily accepted meaning or a dictionary definition.

3.6.2.4 The scope or application of a standard shall be clearly described.

3.6.2.5 The standard shall not have the effect of requiring proprietary materials.

3.6.2.6 The standard shall not prescribe a proprietary agency for quality control or testing.

3.6.2.7 The test standard shall describe, in detail, preparation of the test sample, sample selection or both.

3.6.2.8 The test standard shall prescribe the reporting format for the test results. The format shall identify the key performance criteria for the element(s) tested.

3.6.2.9 The measure of performance for which the test is conducted shall be clearly defined in either the test standard or in Code text.

3.6.2.10 The standard shall not state that its provisions shall govern whenever the referenced standard is in conflict with the requirements of the referencing Code.

3.6.2.11 The preface to the standard shall announce that the standard is promulgated according to a consensus procedure.

3.6.3 Standard Promulgation:

3.6.3.1 Code change proposals with corresponding changes to the code text which include a reference to a proposed new standard or a proposed update of an existing referenced standard shall comply with this section. The standard shall be completed and readily available prior to the Public Comment Hearing based on the cycle of code development which includes the code change proposal. In order for a new standard to be considered for reference by the Code, such standard shall be submitted in at least a consensus draft form in accordance with Section 3.4. If a new standard is not submitted in at least draft form, the code change proposal shall be considered incomplete and shall not be processed. Updating of standards without corresponding code text changes shall be accomplished administratively in accordance with Section 4.6.

3.6.3.2 The standard shall be developed and maintained through a consensus process such as ASTM or ANSI.

4.0 Processing of Code Change Proposals

4.1 Intent: The processing of code change proposals is intended to ensure that each proposal complies with these Rules of Procedure and that the resulting published code change proposal accurately reflects that proponent's intent.

- 4.2 Review:** Upon receipt in the Secretariat's office, the code change proposals will be checked for compliance with these Rules of Procedure as to division, separation, number of copies, form, language, terminology, supporting statements and substantiating data. Where a code change proposal consists of multiple parts which fall under the maintenance responsibilities of different code committees, the Secretariat shall determine the code committee responsible for determining the committee action in accordance with Section 5.6 and the Code Scoping Coordination Matrix (see Section 1.3.1).
- 4.3 Incomplete Code Change Proposals:** When a code change proposal is submitted with incorrect format, without the required information or judged as not in compliance with these Rules of Procedure, the Secretariat shall notify the proponent of the specific deficiencies and the proposal shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected, with a final date set for receipt of a corrected submittal. If the Secretariat receives the corrected code change proposal after the final date, the proposal shall be held over until the next code development cycle. Where there are otherwise no deficiencies addressed by this section, a code change proposal that incorporates a new referenced standard shall be processed with an analysis of the referenced standard's compliance with the criteria set forth in Section 3.6.
- 4.4 Editorial Code Change Proposals.** When a code change proposal is submitted that proposes an editorial or format change that, in the opinion of the Secretariat, does not affect the scope or application of the code, the proposal shall be submitted to the Code Correlation Committee who shall deem the code change proposal as editorial or send the proposal back to the Secretariat to be considered by the appropriate code development committee. To be deemed editorial, such proposal shall require a majority vote of the Code Correlation Committee. Editorial proposals shall be published in the Code Change Agenda. Such proposals shall be added to the hearing agenda for consideration by the appropriate code development committee upon written request to ICC by any individual. The deadline to submit such requests shall be 14 days prior to the first day of the Committee Action Hearing. Code Correlation Committee proposals that are not added to a code development committee hearing agenda shall be published in the next edition of the code with no further consideration.
- 4.5 Copy Editing Code Text:** The Chief Executive Officer shall have the authority at all times to make editorial style and format changes to the Code text, or any approved changes, consistent with the intent, provisions and style of the Code. Such editorial style or format changes shall not affect the scope or application of the Code requirements.
- 4.6 Updating Standards Referenced in the Codes:** The updating of standards referenced by the Codes shall be accomplished administratively by the Administrative Code Development Committee in accordance with these full procedures except that the deadline for availability of the updated standard and receipt by the Secretariat shall be December 1 of the third year of each code cycle. The published version of the new edition of the Code which references the standard will refer to the updated edition of the standard. If the standard is not available by the deadline, the edition of the standard as referenced by the newly published Code shall revert back to the reference contained in the previous edition and an errata to the Code issued. Multiple standards to be updated may be included in a single proposal.
- 4.7 Preparation:** All code change proposals in compliance with these procedures shall be prepared in a standard manner by the Secretariat and be assigned separate, distinct and consecutive numbers. The Secretariat shall coordinate related proposals submitted in accordance with Section 3.3.2 to facilitate the hearing process.
- 4.8 Code Change Agenda:** All code change proposals shall be posted on the ICC website at least 30 days prior to the Committee Action Hearing on those proposals and shall constitute the agenda for the Committee Action Hearing. Any errata to the Code Change Agenda shall be posted on the ICC website as soon as possible. Code change proposals which have not been published in the original posting or subsequent errata shall not be considered.

5.0 Committee Action Hearing

- 5.1 Intent:** The intent of the Committee Action Hearing is to permit interested parties to present their views including the cost and benefits on the code change proposals on the published agenda.

The code development committee will consider such comments as may be presented in the development of their action on the disposition of such code change proposals. At the conclusion of the code development committee deliberations, the committee action on each code change proposal shall be placed before the hearing assembly for consideration in accordance with Section 5.7.

5.2 Committee: The Codes and Standards Council shall review all applications and make committee appointment recommendations to the ICC Board. The Code Development Committees shall be appointed by the ICC Board.

5.2.1 Chairman/Moderator: The Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall be appointed by the Codes and Standards Council from the appointed members of the committee. The ICC President shall appoint one or more Moderators who shall act as presiding officer for the Committee Action_Hearing.

5.2.2 Conflict of Interest: A committee member shall withdraw from and take no part in those matters with which the committee member has an undisclosed financial, business or property interest. The committee member shall not participate in any committee discussion or any committee vote on the matter in which they have an undisclosed interest. A committee member who is a proponent of a code change proposal shall not participate in any committee discussion on the matter or any committee vote. Such committee member shall be permitted to participate in the floor discussion in accordance with Section 5.5 by stepping down from the dais.

5.2.3 Representation of Interest: Committee members shall not represent themselves as official or unofficial representatives of the ICC except at regularly convened meetings of the committee.

5.2.4 Committee Composition: The committee may consist of representation from multiple interests. A minimum of thirty-three and one-third percent (33.3%) of the committee members shall be regulators.

5.3 Date and Location: The date and location of the Committee Action Hearing shall be announced not less than 60 days prior to the date of the hearing.

5.4 General Procedures: *The Robert's Rules of Order* shall be the formal procedure for the conduct of the Committee Action Hearing except as a specific provision of these Rules of Procedure may otherwise dictate. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting members of the committee.

5.4.1 Chair Voting: The Chairman of the committee shall vote only when the vote cast will break a tie vote of the committee.

5.4.2 Open Hearing: The Committee Action Hearing is an open hearing. Any interested person may attend and participate in the floor discussion and assembly consideration portions of the hearing. Only code development committee members may participate in the committee action portion of the hearings (see Section 5.6). Participants shall not advocate a position on specific code change proposals with committee members other than through the methods provided in this policy.

5.4.3 Presentation of Material at the Public Hearing: Information to be provided at the hearing shall be limited to verbal presentations and modifications submitted in accordance with Section 5.5.2. Each individual presenting information at the hearing shall state their name and affiliation, and shall identify any entities or individuals they are representing in connection with their testimony. Audio-visual presentations are not permitted. Substantiating material submitted in accordance with Section 3.3.5.3 and other material submitted in response to a code change proposal shall be located in a designated area in the hearing room and shall not be distributed to the code development committee at the public hearing.

5.4.4 Agenda Order: The Secretariat shall publish a Code Change Agenda for the Committee Action Hearing, placing individual code change proposals in a logical order to facilitate the hearing. Any public hearing attendee may move to revise the agenda order as the

first order of business at the public hearing, or at any time during the hearing except while another code change proposal is being discussed. Preference shall be given to grouping like subjects together, and for moving items back to a later position on the agenda as opposed to moving items forward to an earlier position. A motion to revise the agenda order is subject to a 2/3 vote of those present and voting.

- 5.4.5 Reconsideration:** There shall be no reconsideration of a code change proposal after it has been voted on by the committee in accordance with Section 5.6.
- 5.4.6 Time Limits:** Time limits shall be established as part of the agenda for testimony on all code change proposals at the beginning of each hearing session. Each person requesting to testify on a code change proposal shall be given equal time. In the interest of time and fairness to all hearing participants, the Moderator shall have limited authority to modify time limitations on debate. The Moderator shall have the authority to adjust time limits as necessary in order to complete the hearing agenda.
- 5.4.6.1 Time Keeping:** Keeping of time for testimony by an individual shall be by an automatic timing device. Remaining time shall be evident to the person testifying. Interruptions during testimony shall not be tolerated. The Moderator shall maintain appropriate decorum during all testimony.
- 5.4.6.2 Proponent Testimony:** The Proponent is permitted to waive an initial statement. The Proponent shall be permitted to have the amount of time that would have been allocated during the initial testimony period plus the amount of time that would be allocated for rebuttal. Where the code change proposal is submitted by multiple proponents, this provision shall permit only one proponent of the joint submittal to be allotted additional time for rebuttal.
- 5.4.7 Points of Order:** Any person participating in the public hearing may challenge a procedural ruling of the Moderator or the Chairman. A majority vote of ICC Members in attendance shall determine the decision.
- 5.5 Floor Discussion:** The Moderator shall place each code change proposal before the hearing for discussion by identifying the proposal and by regulating discussion as follows:
- 5.5.1 Discussion Order:**
1. Proponents. The Moderator shall begin by asking the proponent and then others in support of the code change proposal for their comments.
 2. Opponents. After discussion by those in support of a code change proposal, those opposed hereto, if any, shall have the opportunity to present their views.
 3. Rebuttal in support. Proponents shall then have the opportunity to rebut points raised by the opponents.
 4. Re-rebuttal in opposition. Opponents shall then have the opportunity to respond to the proponent's rebuttal.
- 5.5.2 Modifications:** Modifications to code change proposals may be suggested from the floor by any person participating in the public hearing. The person proposing the modification is deemed to be the proponent of the modification.
- 5.5.2.1 Submission.** All modifications shall be submitted electronically to the ICC Secretariat in a format determined by ICC unless determined by the Chairman to be either editorial or minor in nature. The modification will be forwarded electronically to the members of the code development committee during the hearing and will be projected on the screen in the hearing room.
- 5.5.2.2 Criteria.** The Chairman shall rule proposed modifications in or out of order before they are discussed on the floor. A proposed modification shall be ruled out of order if it:
1. is not legible, unless not required to be written in accordance with

- Section 5.5.2.1; or
- 2. changes the scope of the original code change proposal; or
- 3. is not readily understood to allow a proper assessment of its impact on the original code change proposal or the Code.

The ruling of the Chairman on whether or not the modification is in or out of order shall be final and is not subject to a point of order in accordance with Section 5.4.7.

5.5.2.3 Testimony. When a modification is offered from the floor and ruled in order by the Chairman, a specific floor discussion on that modification is to commence in accordance with the procedures listed in Section 5.5.1.

5.6 Committee Action: Following the floor discussion of each code change proposal, one of the following motions shall be made and seconded by members of the committee:

- 1. Approve the code change proposal As Submitted (AS) or
- 2. Approve the code change proposal As Modified with specific modifications (AM), or
- 3. Disapprove the code change proposal (D)

Discussion on this motion shall be limited to code development committee members. If a committee member proposes a modification which had not been proposed during floor discussion, the Chairman shall rule on the modification in accordance with Section 5.5.2.2. If a committee member raises a matter of issue, including a proposed modification, which has not been proposed or discussed during the floor discussion, the Moderator shall suspend the committee discussion and shall reopen the floor discussion for comments on the specific matter or issue. Upon receipt of all comments from the floor, the Moderator shall resume committee discussion.

The code development committee shall vote on each motion with the majority dictating the committee's action. Committee action on each code change proposal shall be completed when one of the motions noted above has been approved. Each committee vote shall be supported by a reason.

The code development committee shall maintain a record of its proceedings including the action on each code change proposal.

5.7 Assembly Consideration: At the conclusion of the committee's action on a code change proposal and before the next code change proposal is called to the floor, the Moderator shall ask for a motion from the public hearing attendees who may object to the committee's action. If a motion in accordance with Section 5.7.1 is not brought forward on the committee's action, the results of the Committee Action_Hearing shall be established by the committee's action.

5.7.1 Assembly Floor Motion: Any attendee may raise an objection to the committee's action in which case the attendee will be able to make a motion to:

- 1. Approve the code change proposal As Submitted from the Floor (ASF), or
- 2. Approve the code change proposal As Modified from the Floor (AMF) with a specific modification that has been previously offered from the floor and ruled in order by the Chairman during floor discussion (see Section 5.5.2) or has been offered by a member of the Committee and ruled in order by the Chairman during committee discussion (see Section 5.6), or
- 3. Disapprove the code change proposal from the floor (DF).

5.7.2 Assembly Floor Motion Consideration: On receipt of a second to the floor motion, the Moderator shall accept the motion and the second and notify the attendees that the motion will be considered in an online ballot following the hearing in accordance with Section 5.7.3. No additional testimony shall be permitted.

5.7.3 Online Assembly Floor Motion Ballot: Following the Committee Action Hearing, all assembly floor motions which received a second shall be compiled into an online ballot. The ballot will include:

1. The code change proposal as published.
2. The committee action and reason from the Committee Action Hearing.
3. The floor motion, including modifications which are part of the floor motion.
4. Access to the audio and video of the Committee Action Hearing proceedings.
5. Identification of the ballot period for which the online balloting will be open.

5.7.4 Eligible Online Assembly Motion Voters: All members of ICC shall be eligible to vote on online assembly floor motions. Each member is entitled to one vote, except that each Governmental Member Voting Representative may vote on behalf of its Governmental Member. Individuals who represent more than one Governmental Member shall be limited to a single vote. Application, whether new or updated, for ICC membership must be received by the Code Council 30 days prior to the first day of the Committee Action Hearing. The ballot period will not be extended beyond the published period except as approved by the ICC Board.

5.7.5 Assembly Action: A successful assembly action shall be a majority vote of the votes cast by eligible voters (see Section 5.7.4). A successful assembly action results in an automatic public comment to be considered at the Public Comment Hearing (see Section 7.4).

5.8 Report of the Committee Action Hearing: The results of the Committee Action Hearing, including committee action and reason, online assembly floor motion vote results and the total vote count for each assembly floor motion shall be posted on the ICC website not less than 60 days prior to the Public Comment Hearing, except as approved by the ICC Board.

6.0 Public Comments

6.1 Intent: The public comment process gives attendees at the Public Comment Hearing an opportunity to consider specific objections to the results of the Committee Action Hearing and more thoughtfully prepare for the discussion for public comment consideration. The public comment process expedites the Public Comment Hearing by limiting the items discussed to the following:

1. Consideration of items for which a public comment has been submitted; and
2. Consideration of items which received a successful assembly action.

6.2 Deadline: The deadline for receipt of a public comment to the results of the Committee Action Hearing shall be announced at the Committee Action Hearing but shall not be less than 30 days subsequent to the availability of the Report of the Committee Action Hearing (see Section 5.8).

6.3 Withdrawal of Public Comment: A public comment may be withdrawn by the public commenter at any time prior to public comment consideration of that comment. A withdrawn public comment shall not be subject to public comment consideration. If the only public comment to a code change proposal is withdrawn by the public commenter prior to the vote on the consent agenda in accordance with Section 7.5.4, the proposal shall be considered as part of the consent agenda. If the only public comment to a code change proposal is withdrawn by the public commenter after the vote on the consent agenda in accordance with Section 7.5.4, the proposal shall continue as part of the individual consideration agenda in accordance with Section 7.5.5, however the public comment shall not be subject to public comment consideration.

6.4 Form and Content of Public Comments: Any interested person, persons, or group may submit a public comment to the results of the Committee Action Hearing which will be considered when in conformance to these requirements. Each public comment to a code change proposal shall be submitted separately and shall be complete in itself. Each public comment shall contain the following information:

6.4.1 Public comment: Each public comment shall include the name, title, mailing address, telephone number and email address of the public commenter. Email addresses shall be published with the public comments unless the commenter otherwise requests on the submittal form.

If a group, organization, or committee submits a public comment, an individual with prime responsibility shall be indicated. If a public comment is submitted on behalf a client, group, organization or committee, the name and mailing address of the client, group, organization or committee shall be indicated. The scope of the public comment shall be consistent with the scope of the original code change proposal, committee action or successful assembly action. Public comments which are determined as not within the scope of the code change proposal, committee action or successful assembly action shall be identified as such. The public commenter shall be notified that the public comment is considered an incomplete public comment in accordance with Section 6.5.1 and the public comment shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected. A copyright release in accordance with Section 3.3.5.5 shall be provided with the public comment.

- 6.4.2 Code Reference:** Each public comment shall include the code change proposal number.
- 6.4.3 Multiple public comments to a code change proposal.** A proponent shall not submit multiple public comments to the same code change proposal. When a proponent submits multiple public comments to the same code change proposal, the public comments shall be considered as incomplete public comments and processed in accordance with Section 6.5.1. This restriction shall not apply to public comments that attempt to address differing subject matter within a code section.
- 6.4.4 Desired Final Action:** In order for a public comment to be considered, the public comment shall indicate the desired Final Action as one of the following:
1. Approve the code change proposal As Submitted (AS), or
 2. Approve the code change proposal As Modified by the committee modification published in the Report of the Committee Action Hearing (AM) or published in a public comment in the Public Comment Agenda (AMPC), or
 3. Disapprove the code change proposal (D)
- 6.4.5 Supporting Information:** The public comment shall include a statement containing a reason and justification for the desired Final Action on the code change proposal. Reasons and justification which are reviewed in accordance with Section 6.5 and determined as not germane to the technical issues addressed in the code change proposal or committee action may be identified as such. The public commenter shall be notified that the public comment is considered an incomplete public comment in accordance with Section 6.5.1 and the public comment shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected. The public commenter shall have the right to appeal this action in accordance with the policy of the ICC Board. A bibliography of any substantiating material submitted with a public comment shall be published with the public comment and the substantiating material shall be made available at the Public Comment_Hearing. All substantiating material published by ICC is material that has been provided by the proponent and in so publishing ICC makes no representations or warranties about its quality or accuracy.
- 6.4.6 Online submittal:** Each public comment and substantiating information shall be submitted online at the website designated by ICC. Additional copies may be requested when determined necessary by the Secretariat.
- 6.4.7 Submittal Deadline:** ICC shall establish and post the submittal deadline for each cycle. The posting of the deadline shall occur no later than 120 days prior to the public comment deadline. Each public comment shall be submitted online at the website designated by ICC by the posted deadline. The submitter of a public comment is responsible for the proper and timely receipt of all pertinent materials by the Secretariat.
- 6.5 Review:** The Secretariat shall be responsible for reviewing all submitted public comments from an editorial and technical viewpoint similar to the review of code change proposals (see Section 4.2).
- 6.5.1 Incomplete Public Comment:** When a public comment is submitted with incorrect format, without the required information or judged as not in compliance with these Rules of Procedure, the public comment shall not be processed. The Secretariat shall notify the public commenter of the specific deficiencies and the public comment shall be held until

the deficiencies are corrected, or the public comment shall be returned to the public commenter with instructions to correct the deficiencies with a final date set for receipt of the corrected public comment.

6.5.2 Duplications: On receipt of duplicate or parallel public comments, the Secretariat may consolidate such public comments for public comment consideration. Each public commenter shall be notified of this action when it occurs.

6.5.3 Deadline: Public comments received by the Secretariat after the deadline set for receipt shall not be published and shall not be considered as part of the public comment consideration. This deadline shall not apply to public comments submitted by the Code Correlation Committee. In order to correlate submitted public comments with action taken at the Committee Action Hearing on code change proposals that did receive a public comment, the Code Correlation Committee, in conjunction with staff processing of public comments, shall review the submitted public comments and submit the necessary public comments in order to facilitate the coordination of code change proposals. Such review and submittal shall not delay the posting of the Public Comment Agenda as required in Section 6.6.

6.6 Public Comment Agenda: The Committee Action Hearing results on code change proposals that have not received a public comment and code change proposals which received public comments or successful assembly actions shall constitute the Public Comment Agenda. The Public Comment Agenda shall be posted on the ICC website at least 30 days prior the Public Comment Hearing. Any errata to the Public Comment Agenda shall be posted on the ICC website as soon as possible. Code change proposals and public comments which have not been published in the original posting or subsequent errata shall not be considered.

7.0 Public Comment Hearing

7.1 Intent: The Public Comment Hearing is the first of two steps to make a final determination on all code change proposals which have been considered in a code development cycle by a vote cast by eligible voters (see Section 9.0). The second step, which follows the Public Comment Hearing, is the Online Governmental Consensus Vote that is conducted in accordance with Section 8.0.

7.2 Date and Location: The date and location of the Public Comment Hearing shall be announced not less than 60 days prior to the date of the hearing.

7.3 Moderator: The ICC President shall appoint one or more Moderators who shall act as presiding officer for the Public Comment Hearing.

7.4 Public Comment Agenda: The Public Comment Consent Agenda shall be comprised of code change proposals which have neither a successful assembly action nor public comment. The agenda for public testimony and individual consideration shall be comprised of proposals which have a successful assembly action or public comment (see Section 6.1).

7.5 Procedure: *The Robert's Rules of Order* shall be the formal procedure for the conduct of the Public Comment Hearing except as these Rules of Procedure may otherwise dictate.

7.5.1 Open Hearing: The Public Comment Hearing is an open hearing. Any interested person may attend and participate in the floor discussion.

7.5.2 Agenda Order: The Secretariat shall publish a Public Comment Agenda for the Public Comment Hearing, placing individual code change proposals and public comments in a logical order to facilitate the hearing. The proponents or opponents of any code change proposal or public comment may move to revise the agenda order as the first order of business at the public hearing, or at any time during the hearing except while another proposal is being discussed. Preference shall be given to grouping like subjects together and for moving items back to a later position on the agenda as opposed to moving items forward to an earlier position. A motion to revise the agenda order is subject to a 2/3 vote of those present and voting.

7.5.3 Presentation of Material at the Public Comment Hearing: Information to be provided at the hearing shall be limited to verbal presentations. Each individual presenting

information at the hearing shall state their name and affiliation, and shall identify any entities or individuals they are representing in connection with their testimony. Audio-visual presentations are not permitted. Substantiating material submitted in accordance with Section 6.4.5 and other material submitted in response to a code change proposal or public comment shall be located in a designated area in the hearing room.

- 7.5.4 Public Comment Consent Agenda:** The Public Comment Consent Agenda (see Section 7.4) shall be placed before the assembly with a single motion for Final Action in accordance with the results of the Committee Action Hearing. When the motion has been seconded, the vote shall be taken with no testimony being allowed. A simple majority (50% plus one) based on the number of votes cast by eligible voters shall decide the motion. This action shall not be subject to the Online Governmental Consensus Vote following the Public Comment Hearing (see Section 8.0).
- 7.5.5 Public Comment Individual Consideration Agenda:** Upon completion of the Public Comment Consent Agenda vote, all code change proposals not on the Public Comment Consent Agenda shall be placed before the assembly for individual consideration of each item (see Section 7.4).
- 7.5.6 Reconsideration:** There shall be no reconsideration of a code change proposal after it has been voted on in accordance with Section 7.5.8.
- 7.5.7 Time Limits:** Time limits shall be established as part of the agenda for testimony on all code change proposals at the beginning of each hearing session. Each person requesting to testify on a code change proposal shall be given equal time. In the interest of time and fairness to all hearing participants, the Moderator shall have limited authority to modify time limitations on debate. The Moderator shall have the authority to adjust time limits as necessary in order to complete the hearing agenda.
 - 7.5.7.1 Time Keeping:** Keeping of time for testimony by an individual shall be by an automatic timing device. Remaining time shall be evident to the person testifying. Interruptions during testimony shall not be tolerated. The Moderator shall maintain appropriate decorum during all testimony.
- 7.5.8 Discussion and Voting:** Discussion and voting on code change proposals being individually considered shall be in accordance with the following procedures and the voting majorities in Section 7.6:
 - 7.5.8.1 Proponent testimony:** The Proponent of a public comment is permitted to waive an initial statement. The Proponent of the public comment shall be permitted to have the amount of time that would have been allocated during the initial testimony period plus the amount of time that would be allocated for rebuttal. Where a public comment is submitted by multiple proponents, this provision shall permit only one proponent of the joint submittal to waive an initial statement.
 - 7.5.8.2 Points of Order:** Any person participating in the public hearing may challenge a procedural ruling of the Moderator. A majority vote of ICC Members in attendance shall determine the decision.
 - 7.5.8.3 Eligible voters:** Voting shall be limited to eligible voters in accordance with Section 9.0.
 - 7.5.8.4 Allowable Final Action Motions:** The only allowable motions for Final Action are Approval as Submitted (AS), Approval as Modified by the committee (AM) or by one or more modifications published in the Public Comment Agenda (AMPC), and Disapproval (D).
 - 7.5.8.5 Initial Motion:** The code development committee action shall be the initial motion considered.
 - 7.5.8.6 Motions for Modifications:** Whenever a motion under consideration is for Approval as Submitted or Approval as Modified, a subsequent motion and

second for a modification published in the Public Comment Agenda may be made (see Section 6.4.4). Each subsequent motion for modification, if any, shall be individually discussed and voted before returning to the main motion. A two-thirds majority based on the number of votes cast by eligible voters shall be required for a successful motion on all modifications.

7.5.8.7 Voting: After dispensing with all motions for modifications, if any, and upon completion of discussion on the main motion, the Moderator shall then ask for the vote on the main motion. The vote on the main motion shall be taken electronically with the vote recorded and each vote assigned to the eligible voting member. If the motion fails to receive the majority required in Section 7.6, the Moderator shall ask for a new motion.

7.5.8.8 Subsequent Motion: If the initial motion is unsuccessful, a motion for either Approval as Submitted or Approval as Modified by one or more published modifications is in order. A motion for Disapproval is not in order. The vote on the main motion shall be taken electronically with the vote recorded and each vote assigned to the eligible voting member. If a successful vote is not achieved, Section 7.5.8.9 shall apply.

7.5.8.9 Failure to Achieve Majority Vote at the Public Comment Hearing. In the event that a code change proposal does not receive any of the required majorities in Section 7.6, the results of the Public Comment Hearing for the code change proposal in question shall be Disapproval. The vote count that will be reported as the Public Comment Hearing result will be the vote count on the main motion in accordance with Section 7.5.8.7.

7.5.8.10 Public Comment Hearing Results: The result and vote count on each code change proposal considered at the Public Comment Hearing shall be announced at the hearing. The results shall be posted and included in the Online Governmental Consensus Ballot (see Section 8.2).

7.6 Majorities for Final Action: The required voting majority for code change proposals individually considered shall be based on the number of votes cast of eligible voters at the Public Comment Hearing shall be in accordance with the following table:

| Committee Action | Desired Final Action | | |
|------------------|----------------------|---|-----------------|
| | AS | AM/AMPC | D |
| AS | Simple Majority | 2/3 Majority | Simple Majority |
| AM | 2/3 Majority | Simple Majority to sustain the Committee Action or; 2/3 Majority on each additional modification and 2/3 Majority on entire code change proposal for AMPC | Simple Majority |
| D | 2/3 Majority | 2/3 Majority | Simple Majority |

8.0 Online Governmental Consensus Vote

8.1 Public Comment Hearing Results: The results from the Individual Consideration Agenda at the Public Comment Hearing (see Sections 7.5.5 and 7.5.8.10) shall be the basis for the Online Governmental Consensus Vote. The ballot shall include the voting options in accordance with the following table:

| Committee Action | Public Comment Hearing result and Voting Majority | Online Governmental Consensus Ballot and Voting Majority | |
|------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| AS | AS: Simple Majority | AS: Simple Majority | D: Simple Majority |
| | AMPC: 2/3 Majority | AMPC: 2/3 Majority | D: Simple Majority |
| | D: Simple Majority | AS: Simple Majority | D: Simple Majority |
| AM | AS: 2/3 Majority | AS: 2/3 Majority | D: Simple Majority |
| | AM: Simple Majority | AM: Simple Majority | D: Simple Majority |

| | | | |
|----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| D | AMPC: 2/3 Majority | AMPC: 2/3 Majority | D: Simple Majority |
| | D: Simple Majority | AM: Simple Majority | D: Simple Majority |
| | AS: 2/3 Majority | AS: 2/3 Majority | D: Simple Majority |
| | AMPC: 2/3 Majority | AMPC: 2/3 Majority | D: Simple Majority |
| | D: Simple Majority | AS: 2/3 Majority | D: Simple Majority |

8.2 Online Governmental Consensus Ballot: The ballot for each code change proposal considered at the Public Comment Hearing will include:

1. The Public Comment Hearing result and vote count.
2. The allowable Online Governmental Consensus Vote actions in accordance with Section 8.1.
3. Where the Public Comment Hearing result is As Submitted (AS) or Disapprove (D), the original code change proposal will be presented.
4. Where the Public Comment Hearing result is As Modified by the committee (AM) or As Modified by one or more Public Comments (AMPC), the original code change and approved modification(s) will be presented.
5. The committee action taken at the Committee Action Hearing.
6. ICC staff identification of correlation issues.
7. For those who voted at the Public Comment Hearing, the ballot will indicate how they voted.
8. An optional comment box to provide comments.
9. Access to the Public Comment Agenda which includes: the original code change, the report of the committee action and the submitted public comments.
10. Access to the audio and video of the Committee Action and Public Comment Hearing proceedings.
11. Identification of the ballot period for which the online balloting will be open.

8.3 Voting process: Voting shall be limited to eligible voters in accordance with Section 9.0. Eligible voters are authorized to vote during the Public Comment Hearing and during the Online Governmental Consensus Vote; however, only the last vote cast will be included in the final vote tabulation. The ballot period will not be extended beyond the published period except as approved by the ICC Board.

9.0 Eligible Final Action Voters

9.1 Eligible Final Action Voters: Eligible Final Action voters include ICC Governmental Member Voting Representatives and Honorary Members in good standing who have been confirmed by ICC in accordance with the Electronic Voter Validation System. Such confirmations are required to be revalidated annually. Eligible Final Action voters in attendance at the Public Comment Hearing and those participating in the Online Governmental Consensus Vote shall have one vote per eligible voter on all Codes. Individuals who represent more than one Governmental Member shall be limited to a single vote.

9.2 Applications: Applications for Governmental Membership must be received by the ICC at least 30 days prior to the Committee Action Hearing in order for its designated representatives to be eligible to vote at the Public Comment Hearing or Online Governmental Consensus Vote. Applications, whether new or updated, for Governmental Member Voting Representative status must be received by the Code Council 30 days prior to the commencement of the first day of the Public Comment Hearing in order for any designated representative to be eligible to vote. An individual designated as a Governmental Member Voting Representative shall provide sufficient information to establish eligibility as defined in the ICC Bylaws. The Executive Committee of the ICC Board, in its discretion, shall have the authority to address questions related to eligibility.

10.0 Tabulation, certification and posting of results

10.1 Tabulation and Validation: Following the closing of the online ballot period, the votes received will be combined with the vote tally at the Public Comment Hearing to determine the final vote on the code change proposal. ICC shall retain a record of the votes cast and the results shall be certified by a validation committee appointed by the ICC Board. The validation committee shall report the results to the ICC Board, either confirming a valid voting process and result or citing irregularities in accordance with Section 10.2.

10.2 Voting Irregularities: Where voting irregularities or other concerns with the Online Governmental

Consensus Voting process which are material to the outcome or the disposition of a code change proposal(s) are identified by the validation committee, such irregularities or concerns shall be immediately brought to the attention of the ICC Board. The ICC Board shall take whatever action necessary to ensure a fair and impartial Final Action vote on all code change proposals, including but not limited to:

1. Set aside the results of the Online Governmental Consensus Vote and have the vote taken again.
2. Set aside the results of the Online Governmental Consensus Vote and declare the Final Action on all code change proposals to be in accordance with the results of the Public Comment Hearing.
3. Other actions as determined by the ICC Board.

10.3 Failure to Achieve Majority Vote: In the event a code change proposal does not receive any of the required majorities for Final Action in Section 8.0, Final Action on the code change proposal in question shall be Disapprove.

10.4 Final Action Results: The Final Action on all code change proposals shall be published as soon as practicable after certification of the results. The results shall include the Final Action taken, including the vote tallies from both the Public Comment Hearing and Online Governmental Consensus Vote, as well the required majority in accordance with Section 8.0. ICC shall maintain a record of individual votes for auditing purposes, however, the record shall not be made public. The exact wording of any resulting text modifications shall be made available to any interested party.

11.0 Code Publication

11.1 Next Edition of the Codes: The Final Action results on code change proposals shall be the basis for the subsequent edition of the respective Code.

11.2 Code Correlation: The Code Correlation Committee is authorized to resolve technical or editorial inconsistencies resulting from actions taken during the code development process by making appropriate changes to the text of the affected code. Any such changes to a Code shall require a 2/3 vote of the Code Correlation Committee. Technical or editorial inconsistencies not resolved by the Code Correlation Committee shall be forwarded to the ICC Board for resolution.

12.0 Appeals

12.1 Right to Appeal: Any person may appeal an action or inaction in accordance with Council Policy 1 Appeals. Any appeal made regarding voter eligibility, voter fraud, voter misrepresentation or breach of ethical conduct must be supported by credible evidence and must be material to the outcome of the final disposition of a code change proposal(s).

The following actions are not appealable:

1. Variations of the results of the Public Comment Hearing compared to the Final Action result in accordance with Section 10.4.
2. Denied requests to extend the voter balloting period in accordance with Sections 5.7.4 or 8.3.
3. Lack of access to the internet based online collaboration and voting platform to submit a code change proposal, to submit a public comment or to vote.
4. Code Correlation Committee changes made in accordance with Section 11.2.

13.0 Violations

13.1 ICC Board Action on Violations: Violations of the policies and procedures contained in this Council Policy shall be brought to the immediate attention of the ICC Board for response and resolution. Additionally, the ICC Board may take any actions it deems necessary to maintain the integrity of the code development process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CODE | PAGE |
|--|-------------|
| IBC – Egress | 1 |
| IBC – Fire Safety | 36 |
| IBC – General | 69 |
| IBC – Structural (heard by either IBC – FS or IBC – G) | 108 |
| IEBC (non structural) | 111 |
| IFGC | 130 |
| IMC | 140 |
| IPC | 171 |
| IPSDC | 217 |
| IPMC | 218 |
| IRC - Mechanical | 221 |
| IRC - Plumbing | 232 |
| ISPSC | 236 |

2015 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE – MEANS OF EGRESS

MEANS OF EGRESS CODE COMMITTEE

Carroll Lee Pruitt, FAIA, Chair
President/CEO
Pruitt Consulting Inc.
Fort Worth, TX

Gary Lampella, Vice Chair
Building Official
City of Redmond
Redmond, OR

Charles V. Barlow
Sales Manager
EverGlow NA, Inc.
Matthews, NC

Gene Boecker, AIA
Rep: National Association of Theatre Owners
Senior Project Consultant
Code Consultants, Inc.
St. Louis, MO

Ronald A. Brendel, PE
Senior Plan Reviewer/Code Development
Specialist
City of Saint Louis
St. Louis, MO

William (Bill) Dupler
Deputy County Administrator- Community
Development
Chesterfield County, VA

Jeffrey S. Grove, P.E.
Director-Las Vegas
Jensen Hughes.
Las Vegas, NV

Jeffrey Heiss
Construction Official
Township of Warren
Warren, NJ

Paul D. Martin
Rep: National Association of State Fire
Marshals
Deputy State Fire Administration
New York State Office of Fire Prevention and
Control
Albany, NY

Lorin Neyer
Rep: California Fire Prevention Officer's
Association (Cal Chiefs)
Regional Compliance Officer
California Office of Statewide Health Planning
and Development
Manteca, CA

John Stovall, AIA
Rep: National Association of Home Builders
SBK Partnership, LLC
Bethesda, MD

Andrew Stuffer, CBO
Building Official
City of Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA

Jerry R. Tepe, FAIA
Rep: American Institute of Architects
Architect
JRT-AIA Architect
Hopkinton, NH

Jeffrey Tubbs, PE, FSFPE
Principal
Arup
Cambridge, MA

Armin Wolski, PE
Principal Owner and Partner
AWC LLP
El Cerrito, CA

Staff Secretariat
Kimberly Paarlberg, RA
Senior Staff Architect
Codes and Standards Development
ICC Indiana Field Office

INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE - MEANS OF EGRESS

2015 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

E 1-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1003.3.2 Post-mounted objects. A free-standing object mounted on a post or pylon shall not overhang that post or pylon more than 4 inches (102 mm) where the lowest point of the leading edge is more than 27 inches (686 mm) and less than 80 inches (2032 mm) above the finished floor. Where a sign or other obstruction is mounted between posts or pylons and the clear distance between the posts or pylons is greater than 12 inches (305 mm), the lowest edge of such sign or obstruction shall be 27 inches (686 mm) maximum or 80 inches (2032 mm) minimum above the finished floor or ground.

Exception: These requirements shall not apply to sloping portions of *handrails* between the top and bottom riser of *stairs* and above the *ramp* run.

Committee Reason: Section 1003.3.3.2 was modified to keep the phrase "or ground" so that this section can be used for exterior signs that are on circulation paths.

The proposal will improve consistency in language throughout the code. The changes will improve coordination with the referenced accessibility standard, ICC A117.1.

Assembly Action :

None

E 2-15

The edition of the ANSI/NFSI B101.1 referenced in the change was 2005, however, the 2009 edition was submitted for committee and staff review.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The fact that this proposal was not limited to one type of flooring material is good. However, the definition of high traction does not contain any numerical value and has subjective language such as "reasonably sufficient". There would be confusion as to which floors are subject to wet conditions. There was testimony that some common flooring materials might not be able to meet the proposed standard. There will be an increase in construction cost because floor materials will need to be tested to this new standard.

There is question for maintenance of high traction materials in existing buildings over time – especially when floor products are used for cleaning or waxing.

The proposals could conflict with the intent of provisions for slip resistant in the accessibility provisions in the ICC A117.1 and the American's with Disabilities Act. Too much high traction might make some surfaces difficult to negotiate by persons with mobility issues.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ANSI/NFSI B101.1 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>.

The edition of the ANSI/NFSI B101.1 referenced in the change was 2005, however, the 2009 edition was submitted for committee and staff review.

E 3-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The referenced standard, ANSI A137.1 does not meet the criteria of CP28 for a referenced standard. The standard does has sections written in non-enforceable language. The scope of the standard is limited to ceramic tile;

however, this proposal is for multiple materials. The only place the standard is currently referenced in the 2015 IBC code is the definition of ceramic tile.

There would be confusion as to which floors are subject to wet conditions. The proposal does not deal with all hard surface materials, and there seems to be confusion on which hard surfaces in the list would be able to comply.

There is question for maintenance of high traction materials in existing buildings over time – especially when floor products are used for cleaning or waxing.

Assembly Action : None

E 4-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: While this proposal is limited to tile, this proposal has the same concerns as E3-15.

Assembly Action : None

E 5-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-GENERAL COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: What would be the 'typical usage' could not be uniformly enforced. This could be read to conflict with spaces used for multiple purposes being designed for those purposes as required in Section 302.1. The issue is already addressed in Section 1004.1.2. This is commentary language, not code requirements.

Assembly Action : None

Part II

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

301.1 General. The provisions of this chapter shall control the classification of all buildings and structures as to occupancy and use. Different classifications of occupancy and use represent varying levels of hazard and risk to building occupants and adjacent properties.

CHAPTER 4

SPECIAL DETAILED REQUIREMENTS BASED ON ~~USE~~OCCUPANCY AND ~~OCCUPANCY~~USE

401.1 Detailed ~~use~~occupancy and ~~occupancy~~use requirements. In addition to the occupancy and construction requirements in this code, the provisions of this chapter apply to the ~~special uses-occupancies~~ and ~~occupancies~~uses described herein.

Committee Reason: The committee approved 2 modifications. First the proposal was modified to make sure that the property surrounding each subject building is considered in conjunction with the activity in the building. The second amendment was to extend the clarification of the changes proposed for Chapter 3 into Chapter 4 where special provisions based on use and occupancy are located. Overall the committee found this proposal to be a good clarification between the terms of 'use' and 'occupancy'. Too often they are treated to be the same when they are really distinct terms. The proposal clarifies the difference.

Assembly Action : None

E 6-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

1004.1.1.1 Intervening spaces or accessory areas. Where occupants egress from one or more rooms, areas or spaces through others, the design *occupant load* shall be the combined *occupant load* of interconnected accessory intervening spaces. Design of egress path capacity shall be based on the cumulative portion of *occupant loads* of all rooms, areas or spaces to that point along the path of egress travel. ~~The anticipated occupant load from adjacent rooms, areas or spaces shall be based on either the capacity of the means of egress components providing access to the space under consideration, or the design occupant load of the adjacent space, whichever is less.~~

Committee Reason: The modification basically disapproves added sentence to Section 1004.1.1.1. The proposed language would force the total occupant load to one exit rather than divided between the exits. A safety factor is already in the capacity calculations. There is no need to effectively double the occupant load for the floor.

The approval is for the added language to Section 1026.4. This needs to be coordinated with the approved language in Section E123-15. The proposed language clarifies requirement for when the actual occupant load is less than the capacity of the exit. This reflects actual conditions.

Assembly Action :

None

E 7-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1004.3 Multiple Function Occupant Load. Where an area under consideration contains multiple functions having both gross and net or different occupant load factors, of gross or net are on the same floor they shall be included in the calculation of the design occupant load using the for such area shall be based on the floor area of each function calculated independently.

Committee Reason: The modification to Section 1004.3 simplifies the suggested language for the new section 1004.3, and supports and clarifies the main issue for the change.

The main change clarifies application of the occupant load when facilities include both gross and net areas.

Assembly Action :

None

E 8-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The testimony was about simultaneous occupancy, however, there is no requirement in the text that this space could not be a conference room used by the public and not just the occupants on the floor. This could result in inadequate design for exit access doors from the assembly space; or with multiple conference rooms on a floor, cause a problem for adequate sizing of the exits for the floor. An option might be a limit on the room size to allow for a lower capacity rather than to calculate an occupant load first, and then reduce the occupant load.

Assembly Action :

None

E 9-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1004.6 Concentrated business use areas. The occupant load factor for concentrated business use shall be applied to telephone call centers, trading floors, electronic data processing centers and similar business use areas with a higher density of occupants than would normally be expected in a typical business occupancy environment. The Where approved by the code official, the occupant load for concentrated business use areas shall be the actual occupant load, where approved by the code official, but not less than one occupant per ~~100~~ 50 square foot gross of occupiable floor space.

Committee Reason: The modification from 100 sq.ft. per occupant to 50 sq.ft. per occupant as a maximum for concentrated business areas is appropriate. The documentation shows that a worst case scenario of 50 sq.ft. per person occurred in these high density spaces.

The supporting data substantiates an increase for the typical office spaces. There were concerns raised about areas where high costs of space would result in a higher density in an office as well as maintain the occupant load during the life of a building as different tenants change.

Assembly Action :

None

E 10-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There are no qualifiers for size limits for the conference rooms. The testimony was about simultaneous

occupancy, however, there is no requirement in the text that this space could not be a conference room used by the public and not just the occupants on the floor. This could result in inadequate design for exit access doors from the assembly space; or with multiple conference rooms on a floor, cause a problem for adequate sizing of the exits for the floor.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 11-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Substantiation for the increase in square footage per occupant in all industrial areas was not provided. Some types of industrial occupancies do still rely on a large number of personnel. Allowing for a lower occupant load within a facility such as an airplane manufacture or or high pile automated storage is already permitted by the exception in Section 1004.1.2.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**
Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 39.29% (156) Oppose: 60.71% (241)
Assembly Action : **None**

E 12-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is a concern with this allowance applying to all Group R-2 and R-3 pool decks. Not all residential occupancies have large pool decks; there for the current occupant load could be appropriate. In addition, this occupant load may not be appropriate for large complexes with only one pool, especially time share vacation facilities that operate similarly to hotel/transient type occupancies.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**
Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 49.87% (189) Oppose: 50.13% (190)
Assembly Action : **None**

E 13-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This language is needed for signs in spaces with multiple configurations. This help fire officials determine the maximum occupant load for the space.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 14-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Including roofs in outdoor areas would be consistent with Section 1006.3 when determining number of exits. Occupied roofs should be handled the same as other outdoor areas for determining occupant load.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 15-15

Part I

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : **None**

Part II

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

E 16-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1006.2.1 Egress based on occupant load and common path of egress travel distance. Two exits or exit access doorways from any space shall be provided where the design occupant load or the common path of egress travel distance exceeds the values listed in Table 1006.2.1. ~~The portion of the cumulative occupant load from adjacent rooms, areas or spaces shall be based on the capacity of the means of egress components providing access to the space under consideration determined in accordance with Section 1004.1.1.1.~~

Exceptions:

1. The number of exits from foyers, lobbies, vestibules or similar spaces need not be based on cumulative occupant loads for areas discharging through such spaces, but the capacity of the exits from such spaces shall be based on applicable cumulative occupant loads.
2. In Group R-2 and R-3 occupancies, one means of egress is permitted within and from individual dwelling units with a maximum occupant load of 20 where the dwelling unit is equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2 and the common path of egress travel does not exceed 125 feet (38 100 mm).
3. Care suites in Group I-2 occupancies complying with Section 407.4.

1006.3 Egress from stories or occupied roofs. The means of egress system serving any story or occupied roof shall be provided with the number of exits or access to exits based on the aggregate occupant load served in accordance with this section. The path of egress travel to an exit shall not pass through more than one adjacent story. Where stairways serve more than one story, only the occupant load of each story considered individually shall be used in calculating the required number of exits or access to exits serving that story.

~~**Exception:** Where the only access to required exits from a mezzanine is through an adjacent story, the entire occupant load of such mezzanine shall be added to the load of the adjacent story.~~

Committee Reason: The modification to reference the cumulative occupant load requirements in Section 1004.1.1.1 instead of copying the language here will reduce the chance of conflicts over time. The calculated occupant load versus the capacity of the element is consistent with the actual use of the element. The modification also deletes the proposed exception to Section 1006.3 because this is already addressed in Section 1004.1.1.1.

The new exception for Section 1006.2.1 clarifies that small passage spaces are not the same as rooms adding together. The added language in Section 1006.3 is consistent with the occupant load calculations for stories in Section 1004.1.1.3.

Assembly Action :

None

E 17-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal moves the exception for Group R-2, R-3 and R-4 into the table, where it is easier to find. In addition, this improves flexibility for Group R-2, R-3 and R-4 units in a mixed use building.

Assembly Action :

None

E 18-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This table needs to be coordinated with the IEBC. Does IEBC send you back to the IBC for travel distance for alterations in existing buildings without sprinklers or additions to existing buildings where only the addition is sprinklered? If you take out the NP in the table for new construction, then the table could be read to allow non-sprinklered Group R occupancies.

Assembly Action :

None

E 19-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Deletion of the footnote would take away an option for travel distance in Group S-2 garages with no technical justification.

Assembly Action :

None

E 20-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text does not include the limit of equipment in NFPA 70 Section 1110.26 and 1110.33. The proposal does not include transformers. NEC is egress from equipment spaces, which is not always a room. The proposal would literally require panic hardware and door swing in the direction of egress for electrical rooms no matter what sized. There was no justification provided for panic hardware in boiler, incinerator, furnace or refrigerator. The proposal is not totally coordinated with the requirements in NFPA 70. The proposed text does not include the limit of equipment size in NFPA 70 Sections 110.26 and 110.33. The proposal does not include transformers. NEC is egress from equipment spaces, which is not always a room. The proposal would literally require panic hardware and door swing in the direction of egress for electrical rooms no matter what size.

There was no justification provided for panic hardware in boiler, incinerator, furnace or refrigerator machinery rooms.

There were multiple modifications to this proposal. Proposals E20, E21 and E80 should be coordinated in the public comment phase.

achinery rooms. This proposal should be coordinated with E21 and E80.

Assembly Action :

None

E 21-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Not everyone has a copy of NFPA 70. The technical criteria needs to be included in the code. Proposals E20, E21 and E80 should be coordinated in the public comment phase.

Assembly Action :

None

E 22-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The added text clarifies that only exit access and exit doors, not auxiliary doors, have to swing in the direction of travel.

Assembly Action :

None

E 23-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed language correlates provisions for Group I-4 throughout the code.

Assembly Action :

None

E 24-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text in E25 as modified provides better language and clarity. 'Separate and distinct' provides more direction than 'independent'.

E 25-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1006.3 Egress from stories or occupied roofs. The means of egress system serving any story or occupied roof shall be provided with the number of separate and distinct exits or access to exits based on the aggregate occupant load served in accordance with this section. ~~Where an exit access stairway provides access to an exit at another story, a single interior or exterior exit stairway having entrances at each story shall not serve as both required exits for a sing story.~~ The path of egress travel to an exit shall not pass through more than one adjacent story.

Committee Reason: The modification is to delete the new sentence. This new sentence is commentary language and is not needed in code text.

The term 'separate and distinct' will clarify that one exit stairway cannot serve as both exits from a floor. Moving down a floor via an exit access stairway does not alleviate the requirement for two exits.

Assembly Action :

None

E 26-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed language is confusing. The proposed language could be read to require additional exits from the floor.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 26.6% (104) Oppose: 73.4% (287)

Assembly Action :

None

E 27-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal provides needed correlation with Section 1019.3 for single exit buildings that allow for open stairways to serve as the means of egress for more than one story.

Assembly Action :

None

E 28-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The change to exit access travel distance would be a much more restrictive requirement than measuring to the common path of egress travel. There should have been a correlative change to the title heading in Section 1006.2.1 to remove common path of egress travel distance.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 63.05% (215) Oppose: 36.95% (126)

Assembly Action :

Approved as Submitted

E 29-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal corrects a conflict between the provisions in Section 1006.3.2 Item 4 and Table 1006.3.2(2).

Assembly Action :

None

E 30-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal to allow for no illumination for the means of egress in Group F and S does not address the situation where someone might be in these building during cloudy days or evening hours.

Assembly Action :

None

E 31-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal removes the artificial lighting option currently permitted in the code. It is not know at this time if there are devices available that will meet the provisions proposed for daylight responsive and occupant sensor controls. The code already allows for lights to be turned off, so you don't need provisions for these controls.

Assembly Action :

None

E 32-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The individual lighting mode of failure is what is important. Terminology that is across all types of fixtures is needed. Perhaps the language in NEC for lighting units would be appropriate.

Assembly Action :

None

E 33-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1008.2.3 Exit Discharge. Illumination shall be provided along the path of travel for the exit discharge from each exit to the public way.

Exceptions~~Exception:~~ Illumination for the exit discharge is not be required to the public way when the Path of the exit discharge meets all of the following requirements:

1. The path of exit discharge is illuminated from the exit ~~for to~~ a travel distance of 50 feet (15 240 mm) minimum or a distance of 1.5 times the total building height, whichever is greater. safe dispersal area complying with Section 1028.5
2. A dispersal area shall be ~~provided with all the following:~~
 - 2.1. ~~The dispersal area is illuminated.~~
 - 2.2. ~~The area is sized to accommodate a level not less than 5 square feet than 1 foot candle (0.46 m² 11lux) for each person using the exit discharge and wheelchair spaces in accordance with Section 1009.6.3.~~
 - 2.3. ~~The dispersal area shall be located on the same lot and located at the end of the illuminated path of exit discharge.~~
 - 2.4. ~~The area is permanently maintained and identified as an illuminated dispersal area.~~
 - 2.5. ~~The area shall be provided with a safe and unobstructed path of travel from the building walking surface.~~

Committee Reason: The modification references the requirements for a safe dispersal area in Section 1028.5 rather than repeat the requirements. In addition, the modification sets the lighting limit for that dispersal area. The language for 1.5 times the building height did not have any technical justification.

The proposal as modified would provide an appropriate allowance for large campuses that do not have the typical streets around buildings, but may have large open areas. Examples would be office complexes, or college campuses.

Assembly Action :

None

E 34-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1009.1 Accessible means of egress required. Accessible means of egress shall comply with this section. Accessible spaces shall be provided with not less than one accessible means of egress. Where more than one means of egress are required by Section 1006.2 or 1006.3 from any accessible space, each accessible portion of the space shall be served by not less than two accessible means of egress.

Exceptions:

1. ~~Accessible means of egress~~ in existing buildings shall be provided in compliance with the ~~International Existing Building Code~~.
2. One accessible means of egress is required from an accessible mezzanine level in accordance with Section 1009.3, 1009.4 or 1009.5.
3. In assembly areas with ramped aisles or stepped aisles, one accessible means of egress is permitted where the common path of egress travel is accessible and meets the requirements in Section 1029.8.

Committee Reason: The modification is to delete the first exception. Accessible means of egress is addressed in the IEBC, therefore a pointer is not needed.

The revised proposal will meet the intent of the original proposal.

Assembly Action :

None

E 35-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Two accessible means of egress is a burden for small mezzanines. The current requirement for one accessible means of egress provides a sufficient level of safety.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 38.57% (140) Oppose: 61.43% (223)

Assembly Action :

None

E 36-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

E 37-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This was intended to be a cleanup but it seems to be unnecessarily long. The provisions for exit access ramps should include a reference to Section 1019 as well as Section 1012.

Assembly Action :

None

E 38-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The provisions for accessible means of egress do not directly address open spaces such as occupied roofs. For example, how could someone do a horizontal exit? What would be the point of an area of refuge on an open roof. A roof is not a story, so would a 4 story building with an occupied roof need standby power?

Assembly Action :

None

E 39-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Dividing up the sections and correlation with exceptions to specific items improves clarity and understanding of requirements and allowances.

Assembly Action :

None

E 40-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: There is no requirement for areas of refuge in a sprinklered building on upper floors. Therefore, for consistency, in a sprinklered building on the level of exit discharge there should not be a requirement for a separation from the interior of the building for an exterior area for assisted rescue. The sprinkler system provides adequate protection for a trade off. By being outside and protected a person would be protected from smoke and fumes. Therefore the passive protection of the exterior wall is not needed.

Assembly Action :

None

E 41-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: A minimum distance is consistent with the intent. It is not logical, nor was it the original intent to set an absolute value.

Assembly Action :

None

E 42-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: A two way communication system is needed for persons with mobility impairments to be able to communicate with emergency responders on all levels that are accessed by an elevator. Loosing this two-way communication in two, three and four story buildings is a reduction in life safety for persons with mobility impairments who have difficulty or cannot use stairways for evacuation. The location at the elevator lobby is the best location for persons to see the two-way communication system when they enter the building. While the proponents talked about high cost, no cost information was provided.

This is consistent with the committee action on E43-15.

Assembly Action :

None

E 43-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: A two way communication system is needed for persons with mobility impairments to be able to communicate with emergency responders on all levels that are accessed by an elevator. Loosing this two-way communication in two, three and four story buildings is a reduction in life safety for persons with mobility impairments who have difficulty or cannot use stairways for evacuation. The location at the elevator lobby is the best location for persons to see the two-way communication system when they enter the building. While the proponents talked about high cost, no cost information was provided.

The proposed text would result in a two-way communication system in a five story or taller building to have two-way communication on all levels, including the level of exit discharge. A two-way communication system is not required in on the level of exit discharge in the current text.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 42.93% (164) Oppose: 57.07% (218)

Assembly Action :

None

E 44-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as hospitals are already addressed in the E45.

Assembly Action :

None

E 45-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: In hospitals and nursing homes all staff is trained to first defend in place rather than evacuate. Staff will address patients and visitors in an emergency situation; therefore, a two-way communication system for communication is not needed.

Assembly Action :

None

E 46-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: In jails all staff is trained to first defend in place rather than evacuate. Staff will address patients and visitors in an emergency situation; therefore, a two-way communication system for communication is not needed.

Assembly Action :

None

E 47-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1010.1.1 Size of doors. The required capacity of each door opening shall be sufficient for the occupant load thereof and shall provide a minimum clear opening width of 32 inches (813 mm). The clear opening width of doorways with swinging doors shall be measured between the face of the door and the stop, with the door open 90 degrees (1.57 rad). Where this section requires a minimum clear opening width of 32 inches (813 mm) and a door opening includes two door leaves without a mullion, one leaf shall provide a minimum clear opening width of 32 inches (813 mm). In Group I-2, doors serving as means of egress doors where used for the movement of beds shall provide a minimum clear opening width of 41 1/2 inches (1054 mm). The maximum width of a swinging door leaf shall be 48 inches (1219 mm) nominal. The minimum clear opening height of ~~door openings~~ doors shall be 80 inches (2032 mm).

Exceptions:

1. In Group R-2 and R-3 dwelling and sleeping units that are not required to be an Accessible unit, Type A unit or Type B unit, the minimum and maximum width shall not apply to door openings that are not part of the required means of egress.
2. In Group I-3, door openings to resident sleeping units that are not required to be an Accessible unit shall have a minimum clear opening width of 28 inches (711 mm).
3. Door openings to storage closets less than 10 square feet (0.93 m²) in area shall not be limited by the minimum clear opening width.
4. The width of door leaves in revolving doors that comply with Section 1010.1.4.1 shall not be limited.
5. Door openings within a dwelling unit or sleeping unit shall have a minimum clear opening height than 78 inches (1981 mm) in height.
6. In dwelling and sleeping units that are not required to be Accessible, Type A or Type B units, exterior door openings, other than the required exit door, shall have a minimum clear opening height of 76 inches (1930 mm) in height.
7. Groups I-1, R-2, R-3 and R-4 occupancies, in dwelling and sleeping units that are not required to be Accessible, Type A or Type B units, the minimum clear opening widths shall not apply to interior egress doors.
8. Door openings within Type B units intended for user passage shall have a minimum clear opening width of 31.75 inches (806 mm).
9. Doors to walk-in freezers and coolers less than 1,000 square feet (93 m²) in area shall have a maximum width of 60 inches (1524 mm) nominal.
10. The minimum clear opening width shall not apply to doors for non-accessible shower or sauna compartments.
11. The minimum clear opening width shall not apply to the doors for non-accessible toilet ~~seats~~ stalls.

Committee Reason: The modification to the last sentence of Section 1010.1.1 and Excpetions 10 and 11 is for consistency with terminology used in Exception 5. The modification for Exception 11 is to clarify that the door provisions are for stalls.

The proposal is a good clean up and provides consistency in terminology.

Assembly Action :

None

E 48-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The deletion of the sentence on maximum door width would result in no limit on the size of doors. This would also cause a conflict with Exception 8 which also deals with a maximum door width

Assembly Action :

None

E 49-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1010.1.1 Size of doors. The required capacity of each door opening shall be sufficient for the *occupant load* thereof and shall provide a minimum clear width of 32 inches (813 mm). Clear openings of doorways with swinging doors shall be measured between the face of the door and the stop, with the door open 90 degrees (1.57 rad). Where this section requires a minimum clear width of 32 inches (813 mm) and a door opening includes two door leaves without a mullion, one leaf shall provide a clear opening width of 32 inches (813 mm). The maximum width of a swinging door leaf shall be 48 inches (1219 mm) nominal. *Means of egress* doors in a Group I-2 occupancy used for the movement of beds shall provide a clear width not less than 41¹/₂ inches (1054 mm). The height of door openings shall be not less than 80 inches (2032 mm).

Exceptions:

1. The minimum and maximum width shall not apply to door openings that are not part of the required *means of egress* in Group R-2 and R-3 occupancies.
2. Door openings to resident *sleeping units* in Group I-3 occupancies shall have a clear width of not less than 28 inches (711 mm).
3. Door openings to storage closets less than 10 square feet (0.93 m²) in area shall not be limited by the minimum width.
4. The width of door leaves in revolving doors that comply with Section 1010.1.4.1 shall not be limited.
5. The maximum width of door leaves in ~~bi-parting~~ power-operated doors that comply with Section 1010.1.4.2 shall not be limited
6. Door openings within a *dwelling unit* or *sleeping unit* shall be not less than 78 inches (1981 mm) in height.
7. Exterior door openings in *dwelling units* and *sleeping units*, other than the required *exit* door, shall be not less than 76 inches (1930 mm) in height.
8. In other than Group R-1 occupancies, the minimum widths shall not apply to interior egress doors within a *dwelling unit* or *sleeping unit* that is not required to be an *Accessible unit*, *Type A unit* or *Type B unit*.
9. Door openings required to be *accessible* within *Type B units* shall have a minimum clear width of 31.75 inches (806 mm).
10. Doors to walk-in freezers and coolers less than 1,000 square feet (93 m²) in area shall have a maximum width of 60 inches (1524 mm).
11. In Group R-1 *dwelling units* or *sleeping units* not required to be *Accessible units*, the minimum width shall not apply to doors for showers or saunas.

Committee Reason: The modification to Item 5 is to allow for this proposed language to apply to all types of power doors, not just bi-parting doors. The addition of 'maximum' would clarify that power doors still have to provide the 32" clear opening width at a minimum for the means of egress.

Power doors provide a higher level of accessibility and access. The maximum width on power doors is not an issue for means of egress.

Assembly Action :

None

E 50-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The testimony said that these provisions would not apply to café or saloon doors that do not extend to the floor, but the text does not specify that limit. This could be an issue for accessibility where you had to hold both doors open at the same time.

Assembly Action :

None

E 51-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Requiring doors from all bathrooms to swing out could be an issue for corridor widths and maximum protrusion of doors. There could be additional concerns if the bathroom has an entry vestibule, or in large bathrooms where doors are swinging to move people through the bathroom rather than going back out the same door. This is not a life safety issue, this is a health issue so it is outside the scope of the IBC. There are many other options to address this health issue, such as foot openers or double swinging doors.

Assembly Action :

None

E 52-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There needs to be specific technical justification for this increase for revolving doors other than NFPA 101 allows for this. The proposal could potentially allow for everyone to be egressing through a collapsed revolving doors – that is a safety issue that should not be accepted.

Assembly Action :**None**

E 53-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal would provide consistency in the language related to breakout force for revolving doors.

Assembly Action :**None**

E 54-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: A specific standard for lower energy power operated and sliding doors and folding doors is a necessary safety requirement.

Assembly Action :**None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of BMHA A156.38 relative to CP#28, Section 3.6, please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>.

E 55-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal coordinates with changes to Section 1010.1.4.3 last cycle. The additional words clarifies the special applications for these types of doors.

Assembly Action :**None**

E 56-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Requirements for control vestibules are needed because these types of systems are being provided. Sallyports are already addressed in Group I-3. Where these types of systems are provided should be limited. Perhaps the door system needs to have an over ride connected to the fire alarm system. The proposed text is currently too open ended and should be further defined so that enforcement is consistent.

Assembly Action :**None**

E 57-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IEBC COMMITTEE.

Part I**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Criteria for Group E classrooms to lock down safely is needed. Types of devices that are blocking devices that do not allow for unlocking from the outside are currently being used and are a safety hazard. However, the committee strongly felt that this should be an option, not a requirement. There should be correlation with the signage requirement in Section 1010.1.9.3. The definitions in the IBC and IEBC should match – change 'and' to 'or' in the last sentence.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Though there were some concerns with the mandatory verbiage used, provisions dealing with the ability to safely lockdown within a classroom are needed. The committee suggested that this proposal should not be limited to Group E occupancies as these safety concerns exist in other occupancies. Note that proposal EB23-15 deals with a similar topic.

Assembly Motion:

Disapprove

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 67.72% (235) Oppose: 32.28% (112)

Assembly Action :

Disapproved

E 58-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There are several terms that are undefined and unclear: such as 'openable by simple method', 'electrically supervised system', 'operating device'. These types of overhead doors are not appropriate as a means of egress door for a potentially large occupant loads in any occupancy. Regarding the 30 pounds force for opening, it is not clear on which direction this force would be applied.

Assembly Action :

None

E 59-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Installation and removal of devices over emergency escape windows is an operational issue and does not belong in the IBC. There are products on the market that will comply with Section 1030.4 and protect from storm damage. Provisions should not be permitted that override Section 1030.4. There could be an enforcement issue since installation of shutters would not require a building permit.

Assembly Action :

None

E 60-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

E 61-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The new language clarifies that monitoring egress systems are permitted as long as egress in emergencies is addressed.

Assembly Action :

None

E 62-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1010.1.9.3 Locks and latches. Locks and latches shall be permitted to prevent operation of doors where any of the following exist:

1. Places of detention or restraint.

2. In buildings in occupancy Group A having an occupant load of 300 or less, Groups B, F, M and S, and in *places of religious worship*, the main door or doors are permitted to be equipped with key-operated locking devices from the egress side provided:

2.1. The locking device is readily distinguishable as locked.

2.2. A readily visible durable sign is posted on the egress side on or adjacent to the door stating:

THIS DOOR TO REMAIN UNLOCKED WHEN THIS SPACE IS OCCUPIED. The sign shall be in letters 1 inch (25 mm) high on a contrasting background.

2.3. The use of the key-operated locking device is revokable by the *building official* for due cause.

3. Where egress doors are used in pairs, *approved* automatic flush bolts shall be permitted to be used, provided that the door leaf having the automatic flush bolts does not have a doorknob or surface-mounted hardware.

4. Doors from individual *dwelling* or *sleeping units* of Group R occupancies having an occupant load of 10 or less are permitted to be equipped with a night latch, dead bolt or security chain, provided such devices are openable from the inside without the use of a key or tool.

5. Fire doors after the minimum elevated temperature has disabled the unlatching mechanism in accordance with listed fire door test procedures.

6. Doors serving roofs not intended to be occupied shall be permitted to be locked preventing entry to the building from the roof ~~provided that when accessing the roof from the building the locks do not automatically lock preventing re-entry into the building from the roof.~~

Committee Reason: The modification is to delete the last portion of Item 6 to address security concerns in urban areas where access to a roof may be via the roof of an adjacent building.

This new language in Item 6 addresses a concern that was not specifically addressed in the code before. Getting back into the building should not be an issue because access to the roof is limited to maintenance personnel who should have keys.

Assembly Action :

None

E 63-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The scope of this seems to be all occupancies, but then Item 6.1 exempts Group R. Is this meant to imply that Group R cannot use this allowance? The new provisions in Item 6 seem to be the same as Item 2. Why the differences. This could be used to address outside pools or decks. Could Item 6.4 allowance for a thumb turn allow for someone to inadvertently locked outside? Perhaps that option needs to be limited to Group R private areas only? The mix of vision panel and door opening is confusing.

Assembly Action :

None

E 64-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: While this might be a valid concern in some facilities for safety, the current provisions should not be applicable to just Group R-4. Free egress from occupied spaces is already required by the code. The current language could be read to apply to all closets, including reach-in closets.

Assembly Action :

None

E 65-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The modification to item 1 deletes the requirement for a sprinkler system. The current exceptions are needed for psychiatric facilities. The term "control system" is not defined. There is a lot of duplicative text. The revisions do not improve the understanding of the requirements. The additional language does not appear to address the failure concerns brought up in the proponents reason.

Assembly Action :

None

E 66-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Since courtrooms are assembly spaces, the provisions should be revised to allow for the delayed egress locking systems only on the 2nd way out of the room, not the main exit. This would allow for the security issues for the private judge's areas without an increased risk for the public in the gallery.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 67-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved because it was felt that E68 as modified would address the issue better.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 68-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

1010.1.9.7 Delayed egress. Delayed egress locking systems shall be permitted to be installed on doors serving Group B, E, F, I, M, R, S and U occupancies in buildings that are equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or an approved automatic smoke or heat detection system installed in accordance with Section 907.

Committee Reason: There were two modification to this proposal. One modification was to delete the limit of 10 occupants. The proposed text was not clear as to if this was an entire facility or just one classroom. The requirements for sprinklers or smoke or heat detection is an improvement in the level of safety that should allow for a classroom with a higher occupant load to use this option for delayed egress locking systems.

The second modification was to delete the new proposed exception and include Group E in the allowances for where delayed egress locking systems can be used. The exception no longer has any additional limits for where delayed egress locking systems can be used. This could be considered editorial based on the approval of the first modification.

Splitting the section into two parts improves clarity. Changing the text to say where these types of locks are permitted is clearer than listing where it is not permitted. Allowing Group E facilities to use delayed egress locking systems helps address the security concerns associated with wandering or 'trigger events' for preschool classes or classrooms for students with special needs.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 69-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The addition of Group I-1 and I-4 to the Exceptions in Item 5 provides for consistency in all Group I occupancies where there are concerns for wandering. With the total time limit staying at 30 seconds maximum, security concerns can be addressed without an increase in the level of risk for residents.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 70-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: There was not technical justification for not allowing groups that were not currently listed to use the sensor release locking systems when this system is permitted for occupancies with higher occupant loads.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 71-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal improves consistency of the terms used for this type of locking system.

E 72-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1010.1.9.9 Door hardware release of electrically locked egress doors. Door hardware release of electric locking systems shall be permitted on doors in the means of egress with any occupancy except in Group H where installed and operated in accordance with all of the following:

1. The door hardware that is affixed to the door leaf has an obvious method of operation that is readily operated under all lighting conditions.
2. The door hardware is capable of being operated with one hand and shall comply with Section 1010.1.9.5.
3. Operation of the door hardware directly interrupts the power to the ~~electromagnetic~~ electric lock and unlocks the door immediately.
4. Loss of power to the electric locking system automatically unlocks the door.
5. Where panic or fire exit hardware is required by Section 1010.1.10, operation of the panic or fire exit hardware also releases the electric lock.
6. The locking system units shall be listed in accordance with UL 294.

Committee Reason: The modification to Item 3 is for the terminology to be consistent throughout the section and is consistent with the main proposal.

There was no technical justification for not allowing these types of locking systems in occupancies that have a lower risk than those listed. The other changes correlate and clarifies terminology.

Assembly Action :

None

E 73-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: There are multiple uses within correctional and detention facilities. The current list is not all inclusive. Elimination of the lists would allow for the detention and correctional facilities to address security needs appropriately.

Assembly Action :

None

E 74-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Deletion of the four story limit would address the current hole between the lowrise and highrise provisions for locking stairway doors (i.e., between 4 stories and 75 feet)..

Assembly Action :

None

E 75-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved because it was felt the E74 as submitted addressed the issue in a more succinct manner.

Assembly Action :

None

E 76-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This special requirement for elevator lobbies is already addressed in other sections of the code, therefore, this new language is not needed. Section 3006.4 requires direct access to one stairway from the lobby, so this proposal is not needed for occupants in the lobby. If the lobby is a space that is part of the route to the exits, locking of doors is already addressed in Section 1010.1.9.9. There are some language inconsistencies in the proposed text. Item 7 allows for too much judgement on the part of the code official.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 77-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: To limit the panic hardware to swinging doors is consistent with the referenced standards and application for panic hardware.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 78-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The revision will allow for doors with panic hardware to use the sensor release of electrically locked doors. This increases design options.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 79-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: A need to eliminate panic hardware on the conference room was not demonstrated. The issue seems to be more that panic hardware would be required on all doors between the room and the exit door to the outside. Conference rooms may be public access spaces, so the argument that this is only people familiar with the space is not valid. The proposed language is not clear as to if this is individual conference rooms or aggregate occupant load for all conference rooms on the floor.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 80-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is not totally coordinated with the requirements in NFPA 70. Proposals E20, E21 and E80 should be coordinated in the public comment phase.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 81-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Security is not required in many places where it was never thought of before. A new type of gate limiter is commonly used. This new proposed language would address egress concerns at those locations. This is a good update for the codes.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 82-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The change is not needed. The current language already sets a minimum size.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 83-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The diagram in the reason statement is the only way to understand the proposed language. The winder treads in diagram would be permitted with the current text.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 30.79% (101) Oppose: 69.21% (227)

Assembly Action :

None

E 84-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1011.10 Spiral stairways. *Spiral stairways* are permitted to be used as a component in the *means of egress* only within *dwelling units* or from a space not more than 250 square feet (23 m²) in area and serving not more than five occupants, or from *technical production areas* in accordance with Section 410.6.

A *spiral stairway* shall have a 6 ³/₄ inch (171 mm) minimum clear tread depth at a point 12 inches (305 mm) from the ~~walk line~~ **narrow edge**. The risers shall be sufficient to provide a headroom of 78 inches (1981 mm) minimum, but riser height shall not be more than 9 1/2 inches (241 mm). The minimum *stairway* clear width at and below the *handrail* shall be 26 inches (660 mm).

Committee Reason: The modification is a correction for the language on what to measure too. The distance is from the narrow edge to the walk line.

The change coordinates with how spiral stairways are measured in the IRC. Since the tread depth is measured on the walk line, while the dimension is less, the overall size of the tread will not change from when the measurement was taken perpendicular to the riser.

Assembly Action :

None

E 85-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Using the defined term, flights of stairways, clarifies the handrail required locations. Handrails should not be required along landings.

Assembly Action :

None

E 86-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The construction requirements are moved to the main text. The 6 items now only list the where ladders are permitted. This improves clarity in the code.

Assembly Action :

None

E 87-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The additional height permitted for the bottom of the floor level exit signs improves flexibility. The height is consistent with the listing of the signs. This will reduce conflicts with accessibility requirements for bottom rails on doors. This is coordinated with the requirements for low level exit signs in NFPA 101.

Assembly Action :

None

E 88-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The reference to Section 1013.1 in Item 2 could be read to require tactile exit signage at all exit access doors with an exit sign. Requiring a tactile exit sign at exterior exit stairways could result in signage being required outside at the top of the steps. Where would you put the tactile sign if there are no walls?

Assembly Action :

None

E 89-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal will coordinate with the ICC A117.1 revision to tactile exit signage that will be in the next edition. Tactile 'exit' signage is an important part of way finding for persons with vision impairments. Therefore, providing a tactile 'exit' signage at an area of refuge in front of an elevator that does not have direct access to an exit stairway is not good direction.

Assembly Action :

None

E 90-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The power source requirements for hospital exit signs is a requirement for hospitals, therefore it is appropriate to move it to the main text. Exceptions are options, so a hospital could choose not to do this as currently written.

Assembly Action :

None

E 91-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: While effective width for a stairway with a central handrail is an issue that needs to be addressed, there was a concern that this exception would be in conflict with the stairway safety provisions that have handrails within 30" of the required stairway width. Consideration of the provisions for stepped aisles that do not have handrails within 30" might be something to consider for a public comment.

Assembly Action :

None

E 92-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Deletion of 'or adjacent fixed seating' in Exception 1 is a coordination with revisions that occurred in the IRC last cycle.

Assembly Action :

None

E 93-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Exterior of common stairways within a Group R-2 facility should not use the lower guard height allowances that are permitted within the unit. If the concern is for the front steps to Group R-2 townhouses, the limits should specify that.

Assembly Action :

None

E 94-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The new exception 6 will address a specific need regarding guard heights along stairways in factories.

Assembly Action :

None

E 95-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This code change was disapproved because of the 'laundry list' of rooftop components. The term "scope of the code" is too broad. The limit for access should include rooftop components that "require service" so you don't pick up everything.

The split of the sections in the IMC to match the IBC and IFC split between equipment and roof hatches is appropriate and should be pursued in a public comment.

Assembly Action :

None

E 96-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1015.6 Mechanical equipment, systems and devices. Guards shall be provided where various components that require service are located within 10 feet (3048 mm) of a roof edge or open side of a walking surface and such edge or open side is located more than 30 inches (762 mm) above the floor, roof or grade below. The guard shall extend not less than 30 inches (762 mm) beyond each end of such components. The guard shall be constructed so as to prevent the passage of a sphere 21 inches (533 mm) in diameter.

Exception: Guards are not required where permanent fall arrest/restraint anchorage connector devices that comply with ANSI/ASSE Z 359.1 are installed.

1015.7 Roof access. Guards shall be provided where the roof hatch opening is located within 10 feet (3048 mm) of a roof edge or open side of a walking surface and such edge or open side is located more than 30 inches (762 mm) above the floor, roof or grade below. The guard shall be constructed so as to prevent the passage of a sphere 21 inches (533 mm) in diameter.

Exception: Guards are not required where permanent fall arrest/restraint anchorage connector devices that comply with ANSI/ASSE Z 359.1 are installed.

[BE] 304.11 Guards. Guards shall be provided where various components that require service and roof hatch openings are located within 10 feet (3048 mm) of a roof edge or open side of a walking surface and such edge or open side is located more than 30 inches (762 mm) above the floor, roof, or grade below. The guard shall extend not less than 30 inches (762 mm) beyond each end of components that require service. The top of the guard shall be located not less than 42 inches (1067 mm) above the elevated surface adjacent to the guard. The guard shall be constructed so as to prevent the passage of a 21-inch-diameter (533 mm) sphere and shall comply with the loading requirements for guards specified in the International Building Code.

Exception: Guards are not required where permanent fall arrest/restraint anchorage connector devices that comply with ANSI/ASSE Z 359.1 are installed.

Committee Reason: The modification was to delete the requirement for 'permanent' for the anchors. The ANSI/ASSE Z 359.1 standard does allow for non-permanent anchors.

The proposal as a whole, with the deletion, will allow for anchor systems to be designed based on what would best serve the particular project.

Assembly Action :

None

E 97-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was no technical justification for why Categories C and D were included or why E and F were excluded. There was no technical justification for why construction types 2B, 3B and 5B were more of a hazard to safety than other types. There is no link between travel distance limitations and resistance for hurricanes or tornadoes. Safety after a natural disaster should include shutting off utilities to damaged buildings – there is no such requirement here. This proposal, and a similar proposal, E105, were both disapproved for consistent action.

E 98-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: IFC Table 3206.3 footnote g already covers this so it is not needed here. The term "additional" needs clarifications.

Assembly Action :

None

E 99-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There are several questions for this new allowance. How would the term "final portion" be uniformly enforced? How would you transition from a non-rated corridor to a rated corridor? Is a door required when you enter the rated corridor? What would happen with a corridor that extended to exits at both ends? This should already be achievable with an exit passageway provisions in the current text, which is much more defined.

Assembly Motion:

As Modified

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 24.14% (91) Oppose: 75.86% (286)

Assembly Action :

None

Online Floor Modification:

1017.2.3 Corridor increases. In buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 exit access travel distances specified in Table 1017.2 shall be increased an additional 100 feet (30 480 mm) where the final portion of the exit access is within a corridor ~~with having a~~ minimum fire-resistance rating of 1 hour. The length of such corridor shall not be less than the amount of increase taken.

E 100-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change to the definition clarifies that the common path of egress travel can be measured both out of a room to a common corridor or down an exit access stairway to another floor at which point an occupant would have two options for continuing along the means of egress.

The change to Section 1017.3 clarifies that exit access travel distance can also be measured to an exit enclosure on the same level, or down an exit access stairway to an exit enclosure on another floor.

Assembly Action :

None

E 101-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is a conflict with Section 1018.4. The proposed text need to address how aisles should be measured.

Assembly Action :

None

E 102-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Typical travel along an exit access stairway should not be for more than two stories for all uses. If this comes back with a public comment it needs to coordinate with E27.

This revision would allow for an atrium to have unlimited number of stories included in travel down the exit access stairway (Section 1023.2), which could be a concern. There is a conflict with the number of stories for escalators and stairways that have protection offered by draft curtains.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 103-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was no justification for a 4 story limit stairways in an atrium to 4 stories. If there is a limit, it should not be in the definition. The language literally could be read to apply to an open parking garage.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 104-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal fixes a glitch that ended up in the code last cycle. The change will fix the misinterpretation that the exit access stairway serving the main floor are exit access stairways.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 105-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: A fire resistance rating will not always stay in place after a natural disaster. There was no technical justification for why Categories C and D were included or why E and F were excluded. There was no technical justification for why construction types 2B, 3B and 5B were more of a hazard to safety than other types. There is no link between corridor fire resistance and resistance for hurricanes or tornadoes. Safety after a natural disaster should include shutting off utilities to damages buildings – there is no such requirement here. This proposal, and a similar proposal, E97, were both disapproved for consistent action.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 106-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The revision coordinates with the language for ambulatory care facilities used elsewhere in the code.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 107-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Group R-4 should be removed from the list for dead ends. Group R-4 facilities are permitted to be single exit buildings, so the dead end provisions would never be practical.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 108-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was no technical justification for the 6.26 number in the proposal. Such a ratio would most likely called a room. This situation could be covered by exception 2 or by intervening rooms.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 109-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The reference to Section 705.8 may be in conflict with the open exit balcony provisions. No technical data was submitted for the justification or need. A suggestion for a public comment was to perhaps have an exception for private balconies.

Assembly Action :

None

E 110-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This exception is appropriate. In the situation where a stairway and exit passageway system is pressurized, the door is not needed, any may even be a problem for the system.

Assembly Action :

None

E 111-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is an editorial clean up. It replaces non-mandatory language with mandatory language.

Assembly Action :

None

E 112-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This allowance for security systems to penetrate a stairway enclosure is appropriate. Security systems are needed for occupant safety. These systems can also be used for remote assessment of a stairway during an emergency. This is coordinated with NFPA 101.

Assembly Action :

None

E 113-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1023.5 Penetrations. Penetrations into or through interior exit stairways and ramps are prohibited except for equipment and ductwork necessary for independent ventilation or pressurization, fire protection systems, two-way communication systems, electrical raceway for fire department communication systems and electrical raceway serving the interior exit stairway and ramp and terminating at a steel box not exceeding 16 square inches (0.010 m²). Such penetrations shall be protected in accordance with Section 714. There shall not be penetrations or communication openings, whether protected or not, between adjacent interior exit stairways and ramps.

Exception: Membrane penetrations shall be permitted on the outside of the interior exit stairway and ramp. Such penetrations shall be protected in accordance with Section 714.3.2.

1024.6 Penetrations. Penetrations into or through an exit passageway are prohibited except for equipment and ductwork necessary for independent pressurization, fire protection systems, two-way communication systems, electrical raceway for fire department communication and electrical raceway serving the exit passageway and terminating at a steel box not exceeding 16 square inches (0.010 m²). Such penetrations shall be protected in accordance with Section 714. There shall not be penetrations or communicating openings, whether protected or not, between adjacent exit passageways.

Exception: Membrane penetrations shall be permitted on the outside of the exit passageway. Such penetrations shall be protected in accordance with Section 714.3.2.

Committee Reason: The modification is to maintain the exceptions and is coordination with F49-15. The exceptions are needed to allow for outlets, light switches, fire alarm pull stations and exit signs.

In the main text, the change from 'sprinkler piping and standpipes' to 'fire protection systems' would allow for all systems used for fire fighting. The addition of the 'two-way communication system' allows for requirements associated with the fire fighters

communication, the requirements in high rises for systems in the stairway every five floors, and areas of refuge.

Assembly Action :

None

E 114-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Adding Section 412.3.2 to smoke proof enclosures is a correlation with air traffic control towers. This is a needed pointer since these facilities do not occur very often.

Assembly Action :

None

E 115-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: These references could be read as a requirement for standpipes rather than just a pointer. This would be a problem for shorter buildings. This cross reference from Chapter 10 to Chapter 9 are unnecessary.

Assembly Action :

None

E 116-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Luminous egress path markings are an egress stairway issues, so they should remain in Chapter 10. This section is referenced from the highrise requirements, so it will not be missed.

Assembly Action :

None

E 117-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Luminous egress path markings are not needed in Group I-2 facilities. A hospital and nursing home already has multiple redundancies to address emergency egress such as trained staff, defend-in-place protection for first response and emergency generators. Since these buildings are continuously occupied, the current requirements for luminous egress paths require the lights in the stairways to be on 24-7. Not having the luminous egress path markings would not reduce safety in these buildings and would be a savings both in initial installation as well as energy costs during the life of the building.

Assembly Action :

None

E 118-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Group I-4 should be deleted from the occupancies that would result in luminous egress path markings being required. Day care facilities would not be a highrise building on their own. The fact that a day care was within a high rise building should not be a trigger for luminous egress path markings in the stairways.

Assembly Action :

None

E 119-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Luminous egress path markings are not needed in Group I-3 facilities. A jail already has multiple redundancies to address emergency egress such as trained staff, defend-in-place protection for first response and

emergency generators. Since these buildings are continuously occupied, the current requirements for luminous egress paths require the lights in the stairways to be on 24-7. Not having the luminous egress path markings would not reduce safety in these buildings and would be a savings both in initial installation as well as energy costs during the life of the building.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 120-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change acknowledges the allowance for the narrow stripes permitted in UL1994.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 121-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no inherent life safety or fire safety advantage to have a third layer of electrical lighting as emergency lighting. While this option is energy efficient, there are questions about reliability and durability. This is a significant code change so additional information on the technical merits needs to be provided.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 122-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: ASTM does not list products, so the term 'listed' is not appropriate for the ASTM standard. UL does list products.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 123-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language clarifies requirement for when the actual occupant load is less than the capacity of the exit. This reflects actual conditions. This proposal needs to be coordinated with the language approved in E6-15 as modified.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 124-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: A references instead of repeating requirements for capacity of an area of refuge would maintain consistency over time.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 125-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No data was provided to substantiate the distance and height of the wall as part of the exit system. While this might work for a shorter building, there were concerns for multi-story stairways. There is no limit on the openings in the wall or a minimum thickness requirement. How would this wall be maintained as part of the egress system? The term 'property line' is not used in the code; only lot line.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 126-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal for exterior exit stairways serving Group R-3 occupancies is a coordination with allowances in the IRC.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 127-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: While there were concerns raised over the travel distance to the exterior exit door with this change, the current text does not have a travel distance limit. The more important aspect is that the path to that exterior exit door must be obvious. Seeing the physical door itself is not the important component.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 128-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language is confusing. The proposal could be read require separation of the exit doors at the ground level as well as the paths for exit discharge. This would be an issue for buildings blocked in on three sides that need to use exit passageways to bring occupants to the front of the building. Separation of the exit discharge will be an issue with buildings that use side courts or alleys to get around to the front of the building to exit the site.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 129-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved because the solution in E130 deals with the issue of narrowing in the egress courts better.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 130-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is an unused and outdated requirement. There is no need to funnel occupants to the exit door/opening.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 131-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no technical justification for the new requirement for 1.5 times the building height. If there is an additional requirement for spaces for persons using wheelchairs, there should be an accessible route required to the area; or this should be coordinated with accessible means of egress requirements in Section 1009.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 132-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change is a clean up that addresses open air seating and provides consistent terminology throughout.

Assembly Action :

None

E 133-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The evaluation for smoke protected seating addresses threats other than fire; hurricanes, storms, bomb threats. It is a detailed analysis that considers crowd movements. It separates owner and designer requirements. While a final evaluation cannot be completed until the owner hires his building managers, this is an important safety consideration that is not matched in the code requirements, therefore the reference should remain.

Assembly Action :

None

E 134-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is a coordination clean up for minimum aisle width.

Assembly Action :

None

E 135-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is a coordination clean up for the transition provisions added to the stepped aisle last cycle.

Assembly Action :

None

E 136-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There were concerns about the confusing language in this proposal. Aisle and aisle accessways must be clearly identified. The cross slope for aisle accessway is too steep.

Assembly Action :

None

E 137-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal fills the gap when dealing with stepped aisles as they move around a vomitory.

Assembly Action :

None

E 138-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Uniform tread depth is an important safety issue. There is no limit on the tread depth variation, so the

tread could vary a great deal for every other step. Allowing this would be a tripping hazard and a serious safety issue.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 139-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is more typically in suites rather than along the front edge of major seating areas. There is no data on the drink rails being a climbing issue in these types of facilities. Requiring this would be a problem for line of site to the event. This is similar to the issue regarding fixed seating along an edge in Section 1015.3 and E92-15; a fixed table or seat is not more hazardous than a moveable one in the same space.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 140-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There are three changes dealing with emergency escape windows: E140, E141 and E142. The proposal to E141 is preferred.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 141-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: There are three changes dealing with emergency escape windows: E140, E141 and E142. The proposal to E141 is preferred. The language specifying 'only one exit' is an important clarification when referring back to Tables 1006.3.2(1) and 1006.3.2(2).

Assembly Action : **None**

E 142-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There are three changes dealing with emergency escape windows: E140, E141 and E142. The proposal to E141 is preferred.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 143-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The intent of the emergency escape windows is to get clear of the building. The added language could result in the occupants being trapped within four walls. The term 'edge or guard' is unclear as a termination point.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 144-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was not technical justification provided to require emergency escape windows in all Group R-1 and R-2 facilities. The past text referenced in the reason included an exception for sprinklered buildings. All Group R-1 and R-2 building are now required to be sprinklered, so the current code matches past codes. There was no technical reason for the limits of the construction types.

E 145-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This allowance would encourage people to voluntarily put in a residential sprinkler system. This proposal provides flexibility for the location of the bedrooms in the basement to not be directly attached to the emergency escape and rescue opening. Having a sprinkler system in a single family home does seem a reasonable trade off for the orientation/location of the emergency escape and rescue openings. There still needs to be two ways out of the basement.

Assembly Action :

None

E 146-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This provides added clarity to the code for operation of emergency and escape openings. This is a coordination with the IRC. This proposal recognizes the window control devices in ASTM F2090.

Assembly Action :

None

E 147-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IEBC COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal for the IBC and IEBC provides correlation between the two documents for emergency escape openings. The added language to Section 1030.4 clarifies that any security systems cannot block emergency and escape rescue operation.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This provision was seen as necessary to correlate with the IBC. The IBC references existing buildings with regard to installation of security bars on emergency escape and rescue openings but the language was not found in the IEBC. The proposal provides that consistency by placing the language in both the prescriptive and work area methods with the other window related requirements.

Assembly Action :

None

E 148-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This section should not require a retrofit for existing buildings when exit signage requirements are revised. This would allow for consistency in signage throughout an existing building.

Assembly Action :

None

E 149-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There were questions about if this exception should be permitted for Type A dwelling units. While the committee agreed that Group U private garages was appropriate, the committee felt that a public comment would allow for interested parties to look at this further.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 150-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

1003.2.14 Walk-in coolers and freezers. Walk-in cooler and freezer equipment accessed only from employee work areas are not required to comply with this chapter.

Committee Reason: The modification to add 'only' would reinforce the intent of the main proposal.

This proposal will avoid the mis-interpretation that this is an exception for large cooler/freezer buildings. The term 'work areas' is a defined term, so this should clarify that the coolers exempted are those that are back of house, not a cooler open to the public for shopping.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 151-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Access to occupied roofs is an important element to providing equal access for persons with disabilities. Adding roofs to the vertical access requirements is appropriate.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 152-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Areas that are in the general exceptions for areas such as limited access spaces, mechanical spaces accessed only by service personnel, guard towers, etc. should not be included in the aggregate area for determining Section 1104.4 Exception 1. That should already be permitted by current provisions. However, the general reference to Section 1103.2 picks up the employee work areas in Section 1103.2.2. That type of area should be included in the aggregate area in Section 1104.4 Exception 1

Assembly Action : **None**

E 153-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The testimony was that power doors are already typically provided in these types of facilities, so why is there a need to require them? This is a best practice item, not a minimum code requirement. There was no technical justification for the occupant load numbers suggested.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 154-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The addition of 'Group U' clarifies that this exception is only applicable to small private garages, not garage levels that are limited to resident parking.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 155-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Technical justification for the need for the New York B+ units was not provided. This would over ride the ICC A117.1 technical provisions for Type A and Type B units. This would eliminated Type A units which do provide a higher level of accessibility. This would potentially cause a conflict with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) viewing the IBC and ICC A117.1 as safe harbor documents.

Assembly Action :

None

E 156-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal is dealing with Type B units in Group I-1. Swing-up grab bars are already permitted in the ICC A117.1 for Type B units. This addition is a technical item that should remain in ICC A117.1 and is not needed in the code.

Assembly Action :

None

E 157-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal is dealing with Type B units in Group I-2.nursing homes. Swing up grab bars are already permitted in the ICC A117.1 for Type B units. This addition is a technical item that should remain in ICC A117.1 and is not needed in the code.

Assembly Action :

None

E 158-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal is dealing with Type B units in Group I-2.hospitals. Swing up grab bars are already permitted in the ICC A117.1 for Type B units. This addition is a technical item that should remain in ICC A117.1 and is not needed in the code.

Assembly Action :

None

E 159-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change for counting hotel rooms on a multi- building site for accessibility is a coordination with DOJ requirements.

Assembly Action :

None

E 160-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1107.6.3 Group R-3. In Group R-3 occupancies where there are four or more dwelling units or sleeping units intended to be occupied as a residence in a single structure, every dwelling unit and sleeping unit intended to be occupied as a residence shall be a Type B unit.

Bedrooms within congregate living facilities, dormitories, sororities, fraternities, and boarding houses shall be counted as sleeping units for the purpose of determining the number of units.

Exception: The number of Type B units is permitted to be reduced in accordance with Section 1107.7.

1107.6.4 Group R-4. Accessible units and Type B units shall be provided in Group R-4 occupancies in accordance with Sections 1107.6.4.1 and 1107.6.4.2. Bedrooms in Group R-4 facilities shall be counted as sleeping units for the purpose of

determining the number of units.

Committee Reason: The modification to add 'sleeping' in two locations was made by the committee assuming a search and replace error in the proposal.

The change would bring the code into alignment with the DOJ interpretation for counting units within dormitories that have bedrooms in suite configurations rather than separate bedrooms down a common hallway.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 161-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Eliminating the Accessible unit requirements would be in conflict with the ADA requirements for group homes, which DOJ refers to social service center establishments.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 162-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is dealing with Type B units in Group R-4 facilities. Swing up grab bars are already permitted in the ICC A117.1 for Type B units. This addition is a technical item that should remain in ICC A117.1 and is not needed in the code.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 163-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal is dealing with Type B units in Group R-4 facilities. Swing up grab bars are already permitted in the ICC A117.1 for Type B units. This addition is not needed.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 164-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The ADA requires accessibility where ever toilet rooms are provided. Putting in this allowance would be a step away from harmonization. The language 'serving only' would be difficult to interpret and uniformly enforce.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 165-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Allowing for an option for a fixtures designed for children within a family/assisted use bathroom is a common design configuration that is a benefit for families. Since the family/assisted use bathroom exceeds ADA, this would not be a conflict with harmonization.

Assembly Action : **None**

E 166-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This revision for electrical outlets would break harmonization with both ADA and FHA.

Assembly Action :

None

E 167-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is an improvement for accessibility in casinos and other gaming areas. The numbers specifies minimums rather than specific numbers. The provisions allow for side and front approach to tables and machines to provide design flexibility. The provision clarifies what is meant by 'type' of machine. As gaming becomes more prevalent across this country this information is needed. This has been used in Los Vegas successfully.

Assembly Action :

None

E 168-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Including an accessible route to play areas will be a step forward towards harmonization with the ADA and their more inclusive provisions for playgrounds.

Assembly Action :

None

E 169-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There were several questions about requiring signage on accessible lavatories. What would the sign say? Where would it be located? How would it be maintained?

Assembly Action :

None

2015 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE – FIRE SAFETY

FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE

Kenneth E. Bush, Chair

Rep: National Association of State Fire Marshals
Senior Fire Protection Engineer
Maryland State Fire Marshal's Office
Easton, MD

Paul Armstrong, Vice Chair, PE, CBO
Regional Manager/Building Official
CSG Consultants, Inc.
Lakewood, CA

Andrew Blum, PE, MS, CFEI
Managing Engineer
Exponent, Inc.
Marietta, GA

Matthew Dobson

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Director, Code and Regulatory
Vinyl Siding Institute
Burlington, NC

George Hollingsworth

Captain II, Fire Marshal
Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department
Fairfax, VA

Stephan Kiefer

Community & Economic Development Director
City of Livermore, CA
Livermore, CA

Bradley J. Larson, CFPS

Fire Marshal/Battalion Chief
Unified Fire Authority of Greater Salt Lake
Salt Lake City, UT

Joseph McElvaney, Jr., PE

Lead Fire Protection Engineer
City of Phoenix Fire Department
Phoenix, AZ

Bill McHugh

Rep: Firestop Contractors International
Association
Executive Director
The McHugh Company
Hillside, IL

Bob D. Morgan, PE, CPCU

Senior Fire Protection Engineer
Fort Worth Fire Department
Fort Worth, TX

Steven Andrew Norwood, AIA

President
Norwood Architecture, Inc.
Louisville, CO

Timothy Pate, CBO

Chief Building Official
City and County of Broomfield
Broomfield, CO

Michael Shannon, PE, CBO

Assistant Development Services Director
-Deputy Building Official
City of San Antonio, Development Services
Department
San Antonio, TX

Richard N. Walke

Senior Regulatory Engineer
Codes and Advisory Services
UL LLC
Northbrook, IL

Michael E. Whalen

Construction Official
New Jersey Department of Community Affairs
Trenton, NJ

Staff Secretariat

Ed Wirtschoreck, LA

Manager, Standards
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hills, IL

INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE - FIRE SAFETY

2015 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

FS 1-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this should not be approved at this point as there were still many issues between the parties involved in the testimony. Further, the committee felt that the existing language was better as it was more positive than prohibitive and that the two referenced standards in the existing language should stay and were appropriate.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 2-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Although alternative methods and materials are covered in Sections 104.10 and 104.11, the committee felt that the existing language should remain in the code as it clarified that, in general, automatic sprinklers cannot be used as part of an assembly that is tested to establish a fire resistance rating in accordance with the requirements of ASTM E119 or UL 263.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 25.91% (107) Oppose: 74.09% (306)

Assembly Action :

None

FS 3-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that reference to ASTM E136 was appropriate as it internally refers to ASTM E2652. Further, it is not clear in ASTM E2652 that all thermocouples were required, whereas in ASTM E136 they are. Lastly, it is not clear which acceptance criteria in ASTM E136 needs to be applied when testing in accordance ASTM E2652.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 4-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that there were several conflicts in the proposed language, in that item #2 seems more stringent than item #1, the term "or other wording" is subjective and it appeared to require an accessible ceiling in all cases.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 5-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this change was unnecessary because identification on the construction documents would be sufficient to allow code officials, special inspectors, building managers, contractors, and others to understand what penetration firestop system was used. Further, allowing electronic marking systems, such as a bar code, may not result in a long term or permanent marking based on changes in technology.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 6-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. BOTH PARTS WERE HEARD BY THE IBC-FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed language was confusing in that it was not clear as to whether the fire resistance rating required for the primary structural frame member or the assembly on the unexposed side was used to determine the extent of protection to be provided. Further, concerns were raised on how the intersection between the primary structural frame assembly and the assembly on the unexposed side would be treated.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed language was confusing in that it was not clear as to whether the fire resistance rating required for the primary structural frame member or the assembly on the unexposed side was used to determine the extent of protection to be provided. Providing clarity for application of these provisions is critical as it pertains to the primary structural frame. Further, concerns were raised on how the intersection between the primary structural frame assembly and the assembly on the unexposed side would be treated.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 7-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

704.2 Column protection. Where columns are required to have protection to achieve a fire-resistance rating, the entire column shall be provided individual encasement protection by protecting it on all sides for the full column height, including connections to other structural members, with materials having the required fire-resistance rating. Where the column extends through a ceiling, the encasement protection shall be continuous from the top of the foundation or floor/ceiling assembly below through the ceiling space to the top of the column.

Exception: Columns located in a wall that meet the limitations of light-frame construction and located entirely between the top and bottom plates shall be permitted to have the fire resistance ratings provided by the membrane protection provided by the fire-resistance-rated wall Section 704.4.1.

704.4.1 Light-frame construction. Studs, columns, and boundary elements that are integral elements in walls of light-frame construction, and are located entirely between the top and bottom plates or tracks shall be permitted to have required fire-resistance ratings provided by the membrane protection provided for the wall.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that built-up solid structural elements, such as 2 or more vertical framing members, within fire-resistance rated walls of light-frame construction that meet the limitations of Section 704.4.1 can be a part of a fire-resistance rated wall assembly without requiring the individual encasement protection of Section 704.2. The modification eliminates redundant language by referencing Section 704.4.1 for limitations. Further, the modification appropriately recognizes steel framing members for the same allowable use.

Assembly Motion:

Disapprove

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 34.86% (114) Oppose: 65.14% (213)

Assembly Action :

None

FS 8-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the concerns within this proposal were taken into account with the approval as modified of FS7-15.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 9-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. BOTH PARTS WILL BE HEARD BY THE IBC-FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE. SEE THE TENTATIVE HEARING ORDERS FOR THIS COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that allowing the elimination of protection for columns in unusable spaces was inappropriate as unusable space is not defined and that storage in this space is not addressed. It would be difficult for a code official to verify that the space was not used for storage after the certificate of occupancy was issued.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that allowing the elimination of protection for primary structural framing, other than columns, in unusable spaces was inappropriate as unusable space is not defined and that storage in this space is not addressed. It would be difficult for a code official to verify that the space was not used for storage after the certificate of occupancy was issued.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 10-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that arranging the requirements of this section into a table was unnecessary as the existing language was clear. Further, the table appears to leave out requirements for the condition supporting 2 floors and a roof.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 11-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Defining "projection" may not be appropriate as the term is used in the code for many instances that do not always apply to what this definition is trying to address. Further, inclusion of decks in the proposed definition is inconsistent with the existing provisions in Section 705.2. Lastly, the proponent should consider allowing flexibility in the definition by indicating "such as but not limited to" prior to the list of projection examples within the definition.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 12-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposed provisions were confusing for the following reasons: seems to require a wall and parapet beyond the actual exterior wall; seems to contradict the base requirement that states that projections are prohibited; if an exterior wall is provided as this language suggests, then it appears there would no longer be a projection, so it is unclear what these provisions are trying to address.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 13-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposed revisions correctly bring the requirements in line with what was intended when this table was revised a couple of cycles ago, in that it allows the projection to be a minimum distance of 40 inches from the line to determine fire separation distance (FSD) once you are at a FSD of 5 feet or greater.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 14-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the existing language over the proposed formula based understandability and enforceability.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 15-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

603.1 Allowable materials. Combustible materials shall be permitted in buildings of Type I or II construction in the following applications and in accordance with Sections 603.1.1 through 603.1.3:

(no changed to items 1 through 12)

13. Combustible exterior wallcoverings, balconies and similar projections and bay or oriel windows in accordance with Chapter 14 and

Section 705.2.3.1.

(no changes to items 14 through 18)

19. Heavy timber as permitted by Note c to Table 601 and Sections 602.4.7 and ~~406.3~~ 705.2.3.1.

(no changes to remaining items)

705.2.4 Bay and oriel windows. Bay and oriel windows constructed of combustible materials shall conform to the type of construction required for the building to which they are attached.

Exception: Fire-retardant-treated wood shall be permitted on buildings three stories or less above grade plane of Type I, II, III or IV construction.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that relocating these provisions to Chapter 7 from Chapter 14 was more effective from the code user's standpoint. The modifications appropriately correct section references to coordinate with the relocation and correctly clarify that the requirements for bay and oriel windows applied to those constructed of combustible materials.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 16-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that these requirements were confusing in that it was not clear when an exterior wall was required. Further, the committee felt that the requirements would be better located with the fire separation distance requirements in Chapter 6.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**
Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 32.51% (132) Oppose: 67.49% (274)
Assembly Action : **None**

FS 17-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies that the limitation of openings in exterior walls is based on the fire separation distance of each individual story, rather than only based on the FSD of the first story.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 18-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that requiring a space to be enclosed by exterior walls simply because it is usable was unreasonable and could cause a more hazardous condition by not allowing the products of combustion to dissipate as effectively as leaving the space unenclosed. Further, the committee felt that this was a misapplication of the fire separation distance requirements and that previously approved FS17 was a better fix.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**
Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 36.52% (126) Oppose: 63.48% (219)
Assembly Action : **None**

FS 19-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language would be redundant as other portions of chapter 7 already establish that glazing tested as part of a wall assembly in accordance with ASTM E119 is considered part of the wall assembly not as a wall opening protective.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 20-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that allowing temperature rise limitations to not apply to vertical separations as this is a different fire exposure condition than the flame barriers that project beyond the exterior wall. The concern is that the fire will be directly against the exterior wall, which would make temperature rise on the unexposed surface more critical. Although a test standard is under development to address the fire exposure of this condition, the committee believes that this change should be made now to address the temperature rise concern.

FS 21-15

Committee Action:**Approved as Modified**

705.8.6 Vertical exposure. For buildings on the same lot, opening protectives having a fire protection rating of not less than 3/4 hour shall be provided in every opening that is less than 15 feet (4572 mm) vertically above the roof of an adjacent building or structure based on assuming an imaginary line between them. The opening protectives are required where the fire separation distances ~~between from~~ the imaginary line and the adjacent to each building or structure is less than 15 feet (4572 mm).

Exceptions:

1. Opening protectives are not required where the roof assembly of the adjacent building or structure has a fire-resistance rating of not less than 1 hour for a minimum distance of 10 feet (3048 mm) from the exterior wall facing the imaginary line and the entire length and span of the supporting elements for the fire-resistance-rated roof assembly has a fire-resistance rating of not less than 1 hour.
2. Buildings on the same lot and considered as portions of one building in accordance with Section 705.3 are not required to comply with Section 705.8.6.

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed revisions gave the designer options while maintaining safety. The fire separation distance (FSD) should be measured to each building not only the adjacent building, which implies one. Further, plan review becomes clearer in terms of how the FSD is measured. The modification provides correct grammar for clearer provisions.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 22-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that removing these provisions would create less stringent requirements. Further, to address the differences in requirements between buildings on the same lot and buildings on adjacent lots it appears that FS23-15 does a better job. Lastly, this section should remain in the code as it directly tells the code user that fire exposure between buildings on the same lot needs to be considered.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 23-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that a new building should be designed in relation to the known lot lines without taking into account a building or structure on an adjacent lot, the conditions of which could change over time. Also, openings in the existing building may already be protected; this should be addressed in item #2. Further, enforceability could be difficult when dealing with a property, structure or property owner on a lot that is adjacent to the lot on which the new structure is permitted. Lastly, Section 705.8 should be referenced as some situations may require openings to be protected for more than ¾ hours.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 24-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this proposal was incomplete in that it was not coordinated with the allowable opening provisions in 705.8.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 25-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on a lack of data to substantiate the reduced roof covering classification for other occupancies to allow the parapet to be eliminated.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 26-15

Committee Action:**Approved as Modified**

705.11.1 Parapet construction. Parapets shall have the same fire-resistance rating as that required for the supporting wall, and on any side adjacent to a roof surface, shall have noncombustible faces for the uppermost 18 inches (457 mm), including counterflashing and coping materials. The height of the parapet shall be not less than 30 inches (762 mm) and not more than 48 inches (1219 mm) above the point where the roof surface and the wall intersect. Where the roof slopes toward a parapet at a slope greater than two units vertical in 12 units horizontal (16.7-percent slope), the parapet shall extend to the same height as any portion of the roof within a fire separation distance where protection of wall openings is required, but in no case shall the height of the parapet be less than 30 inches (762 mm).

Exception: Parapets shall not be limited to 48 inches (1219 mm) in height where approved by the fire code official.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that a limitation on parapet heights was appropriate to facilitate firefighting operations. The modification clarifies that the code official can approve a higher parapet as this is purely a building issue.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 27-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

706.1.1 Party walls. Any wall located on a lot line between adjacent buildings, which is used or adapted for joint service between the two buildings, shall be constructed as a fire wall in accordance with Section 706. Party walls shall be constructed without openings and shall create separate buildings.

Exceptions:

1. Openings in a party wall separating an anchor building and a mall shall be in accordance with Section 402.4.2.2.1.

2. Fire walls are not required on lot lines dividing a building for ownership purposes where the aggregate height and area of the portions of the building located on both sides of the lot line do not exceed the maximum height and area requirements of this code. The code official shall be provided with copies of dedicated access easements and contractual agreements that permit the owner of the portion of the building located on either side of the lot line access to the other side for purposes of maintaining fire and life safety systems necessary for the operation of the building for review and approval.

~~**706.1.1.1 Fire walls not required.** Fire walls are not required on lot lines dividing a building for ownership purposes where the aggregate height and area of the portions of the building located on both sides of the lot line do not exceed the maximum height and area requirements of this code. The code official shall be provided with copies of dedicated access easements and contractual agreements that permit the owner of the portion of the building located on either side of the lot line access to the other side for purposes of maintaining fire and life safety systems necessary for the operation of the building.~~

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that with the modifications this proposal would give the code official and designer the necessary minimum requirements to deal with the issue of having property subdivided with a lot line dividing a building for ownership purposes. Contractual agreements between building owners are appropriate documentation to be submitted to the code official for review, approval and building department records. The modification appropriately places these requirements in the exceptions and requires the code official to review and approve the documentation.

Assembly Motion:

Disapprove

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 54.04% (214) Oppose: 45.96% (182)

Assembly Action :

Disapproved

FS 28-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed changes to the NFPA standard should be processed through the NFPA standards process. Further, it appears there will be a cost impact contrary to what the proponent indicated.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 29-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on a lack of data to substantiate the floor or roof sheathing being continuous through the fire wall. Also, it is not understood how structural stability will be achieved under loading and fire conditions.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 30-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on a lack of data to substantiate cross-laminated timber protected with gypsum wallboard was equivalent to noncombustible material. Further, it is not clear that the gypsumboard needs to completely encapsulate the cross-laminated timber members.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 31-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt the proposal was confusing in that it did not coordinate with the requirements of NFPA 221 for fire walls; it is unclear as to how the fire walls are to be constructed without this coordination.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 32-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt the proposed revisions were confusing and unnecessary. Further it is unclear if the 15 percent allowance is in addition to the maximum allowable openings in Table 705.8. The committee felt this should not be additive.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 33-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on a lack of data to substantiate not limiting the aggregate width of openings in a 24 foot length of firewall.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 34-15

THIS IS A 3 PART CODE CHANGE. ALL PARTS WERE HEARD BY THE IBC-FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on a lack of data to substantiate the need for such a system. Further, it seems that these requirements would better fit in Section 705. Lastly, the committee felt that the installation of these systems would increase the cost of construction contrary to what the proponent indicated.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on a lack of data to substantiate the need for such a system. Further, the committee felt that the installation of these systems would increase the cost of construction contrary to what the proponent indicated.

Assembly Action :

None

Part III

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on a lack of data to substantiate the need for such a system. Further, the committee felt that the installation of these systems would increase the cost of construction contrary to what the proponent indicated.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 35-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt this proposal added redundant language to the code as the user will obtain these same requirements in Chapter 9.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 36-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal because without the 25 percent aggregate width limitation there is no maximum on the number of these types of doors in a single length of fire barrier. Further, fire testing to substantiate this type of opening has not been submitted.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 37-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal appropriately coordinates section 707.9 and 707.5.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 38-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal was a proper and necessary correlation between the I-Codes and NFPA 13R's scope recognizing that the intent of the exceptions is to cover buildings protected by NFPA 13R systems and limit the exceptions to buildings not exceeding 60-feet in height above grade plane.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 39-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on a lack of data to substantiate the substitution of fire-retardant-treated-wood construction for draftstopping, as draftstopping provides resistance to wind (air) moving through the attic space.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 40-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the exception eliminating the requirement for draftstopping in buildings throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 was appropriate taking into account similar provisions in other sections of the code.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 41-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that these provisions should be further limited to two dwelling units because at the proposed 5000 square foot threshold a fire can affect 3 or 4 dwelling units depending on their design and size.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 42-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

718.4 Draftstopping in attics. Draftstopping shall be installed to subdivide attic spaces where required by Section 708.4.2. In other than Group ~~R-1 and R-2~~ R occupancies, draftstopping shall also be installed to subdivide combustible attic spaces and combustible concealed roof spaces such that any horizontal area does not exceed 3,000 square feet (279 m²). Ventilation of concealed roof spaces shall be maintained in accordance with Section 1203.2.

Exceptions. Buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal was an editorial clarification that resulted in better application and enforcement of the provisions. The modification correctly makes Section 718.4 applicable to all Group R occupancies.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 43-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. BOTH PARTS WERE HEARD BY THE IBC-FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed language was redundant and already covered in Section 716.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the protection provisions provided in Section 716 adequately covered the concerns brought up by the proponent.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 44-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that since these doors were not required to be fire resistance rated there was no need for requiring labeling of the protective plates.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 45-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with requirements in Section 709.5.1, however they felt the revisions to exception 1 of Section 709.5 were not needed as these are not defend in place locations.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 46-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the current language in the code is redundant and confusing and that the new language allows openings that may be used for other purposes including occupant mobility.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 47-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

FS 48-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

FS 49-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee felt this was a good change based on the fact that these membrane penetrations were already allowed in exit passageways and shafts.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 50-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that Chapter 6 of NFPA 82 was the correct reference for Waste and linen chutes.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 51-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that reference to Section 712 at these locations is necessary to permit the use of the exceptions contained in Section 712 for shaft construction.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 52-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that a recycling chute should be permitted to be located in the same shaft with a waste chute based on the similar hazards associated with each.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 53-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the chute access room compartment and door provide a minimum level of protection to the shaft enclosing the chute and the chute access doors. They also agreed that room should be designed to allow the room access door to close upon failure of the self-closing requirement of the chute access door.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 54-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this change for the following reasons: The special inspection requirements currently in the code adequately cover this; the provisions should also address membrane penetrations; and these licensing provisions should be determined at the state or local level, rather than in the I-codes.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 55-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

714.2 Installation. A listed ~~through~~ penetration firestop system shall be securely installed in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions and the listing criteria.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that these listed systems needed to be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions. The modification ensures this requirement is applicable to all types of listed penetration systems.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 56-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

714.3.1.1 Fire-resistance-rated assemblies. Through penetrations shall be protected using ~~materials~~ systems installed as tested in the approved fire-resistance-rated assembly.

714.4.1.1 Fire-resistance-rated assemblies. Through penetrations shall be protected using ~~materials~~ systems installed as tested in the approved fire-resistance-rated assembly.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies that it is the method of protecting the penetration, not the penetration itself, which is the subject of these sections. The modification clarifies that the provisions relate to systems rather than to materials.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 57-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal was too confusing by sending the user back and forth between exceptions and sections. The proponent was urged to combine the exceptions and submit a public comment.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 58-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the current term "noncommunicating" was clearer than non-staggered as there are configurations other than staggered studs that allow communication between stud cavities.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 59-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the current term "firestopping" was more appropriate than fireblocking because it is used consistently throughout the code.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 60-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that unexpected consequences such as how to deal with soffits could create confusion in applying these requirements. Further, the language in item #2 is confusing in that there typically is no concealed space in a concrete floor; this should only reference "within the cavity of the wall above".

Assembly Action :

None

FS 61-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that limiting exception 2 to floors inappropriately excludes roof penetrations.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 62-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The revised exception provides a reference back to the main section. This circular reference is confusing and unnecessary.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 63-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this item based on the following: No maximum diameter is given for the cable; and no justification has been provided for the metal conduit.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 64-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this item based on the following: There is no limitation on the number of floor penetrations there can be; This should apply only to open parking garages; and this should be rewritten as an exception to the testing rather than to the F and T rating, which is what the testing determines.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 65-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this item based on the following: Basing the proposal on an alternative to a code recognized method that has questionable temperature rise performance (steel pipe) is not appropriate; the language should more closely match exception number 2 of Section 714.4.1.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 66-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that a double top plate was appropriate for this exception as it is an exception for up to a 2-hour fire-resistance-rated horizontal assembly. It is not clear that a single top plate will perform as required.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 67-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that it was appropriate to allow these light fixture assemblies as they are required to be tested and listed and installed in accordance with the listing instructions. The committee also felt that these systems could reduce construction costs. Lastly, the committee suggested that this new exception be combined with exception #4 to reduce the laundry list of items.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 68-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that it was confusing and redundant to place a definition within a code section.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 69-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies that a fire-resistant joint system is not required for the joint between an exterior curtain wall and a rated, or unrated, roof slab or deck. Further, the committee suggested that the exceptions be combined to

reduce the laundry list of items.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 70-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that It is appropriate to install the fire-resistant joint system in accordance with the listing (including manufacturer's instructions) and in a manner to accommodate building movement. This also matches what the committee recommended approval for in FS55-15. Lastly, it appropriately deletes unenforceable language.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 71-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

FS 72-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposed change to the Exception of Section 715.3 results in consistency between the requirements for exterior walls and fire-resistant joint systems installed within exterior walls.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 73-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that these were not all editorial changes and that the revisions further confuse the distinction between joints and intersections.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 74-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the correlation of references provided for more effective application and enforcement of the provisions.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 75-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

716.6 Fire-protection-rated glazing. Glazing in fire window assemblies shall be fire protection rated in accordance with this section and Table 716.6. Glazing in fire door assemblies shall comply with Section 716.5.8. Fire-protectionrated glazing in fire window assemblies shall be tested in accordance with and shall meet the acceptance criteria of NFPA 257 or UL 9. ~~Fire-protection-rated glazing shall comply with NFPA 80.~~ Openings in nonfire-resistance-rated exterior wall assemblies that require protection in accordance with Section 705.3, 705.8, 705.8.5 or 705.8.6 shall have a fire protection rating of not less than 3 /4 hour. Fire-protection-rated glazing in 0.5-hour fire-resistance-rated partitions is permitted to have an 0.33-hour fire protection rating.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the testing requirements for opening protective should be located at the beginning of the section for clarity. The modification strikes reference to NFPA 80 in Section 716.6 to be consistent with these revisions.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 76-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal maintains consistency in the code when dealing with fire-rated glazing products, by adding the testing and marking requirements for glass installed as part of a floor/ceiling assembly.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 77-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that providing reference to UL 10B and 10C in Section 716.3.1 was consistent with other sections in 716 that recognize these test methods.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 78-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Consistent with their action on FS77, the committee agreed that providing reference to UL 10B and 10C in Section 716.3.1 was consistent with other sections in 716 that recognize these test methods.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 79-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that providing footnote f to Table 716.5 provided an appropriate reference to the additional permitted marking requirements for fire rated glazing door vision panels.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 80-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that Note c to Table 716.5 needs to be deleted as it currently creates misdirection to a user of the table by sending the user to Section 716.5.5 of the code, which does not provide for any modification of the 100 sq. in. limitation for fire protection rated glazing.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 81-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this item based on the following: No technical justification provided dealing with radiant heat transfer of fire-protection-rated glazing in these door assemblies; and the testing required has no thermocouple requirements for the unexposed surface.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 82-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal corrects an inconsistency in the way fire windows are treated in comparison to transoms and sidelights found in the same frame with a fire door. This provision will allow the same type of glazing that is currently allowed in fire windows to be used in transoms and sidelights in 2-hour exterior walls.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 83-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this item based on the following: No technical justification was provided dealing with radiant heat transfer of fire-protection-rated glazing in these applications.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 84-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee thought that this was a good concept, but would prefer that the table relate to a specific double wall allowance rather than calling it a fire wall.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 85-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposed change provides for consistency with the testing requirements within NFPA 252.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 86-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this item based on the following: Applying the smoke and draft control requirements to door assemblies in corridors and smoke barriers is too broad and not substantiated; and it is unclear how this application would affect the operation of these doors.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 87-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Consistent with FS85, the committee agreed that the proposed change provides for consistency with the testing requirements within NFPA 252.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 88-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that rolling steel fire doors should be included in the list since they have been tested and listed to meet either NFPA 252 or UL 10B.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 89-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this item based on the following: Consider limiting this to I occupancies as indicated in the reason statement; and consider making the exception the charging text and the charging text the exception.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 90-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this was an editorial clarification.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 91-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this was an editorial clarification that removes redundant language.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 92-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that deleting the 10 inch maximum dimension limit for horizontal exits will allow for a fire door vision panel that meets ADA 43 inch height limits and the goal of accessible design.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 93-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies that only side-hinged swinging fire doors are being addressed in these provisions.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 94-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

716.5.9.3 Delayed action closers. Doors required to be self-closing and not required to be automatic closing shall be permitted to be equipped with delayed action closers ~~with not more than 60 seconds delay before the door is closed.~~

Committee Reason: Including provisions for delayed action closers is appropriate as they are being widely used. The modification removes the 60 second door-closing time delay as it is an arbitrary number. The committee felt a public comment to address time delay should be considered.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 95-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal editorially clarifies Section 716.5.9.3 and deletes redundant language.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 96-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that inherent safety issues related to vertical operation of these doors is cause enough to leave the term "vertical" in this section.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 97-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

TABLE 716.6

FIRE WINDOW ASSEMBLY FIRE PROTECTION RATINGS

| TYPE OF WALL ASSEMBLY | REQUIRED WALL ASSEMBLY RATING (hours) | MINIMUM FIRE WINDOW ASSEMBLY RATING (hours) | FIRE-RATED GLAZING MARKING |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Atrium separations (Section 707.3.6), Incidental use areas (Section 707.3.7), Mixed occupancy separations (Section 707.3.9)., Atrium separations (Section 707.3.6) | 1 | 3/4 | OH-45 or W-60 |
| | | | |

(no change to balance of table or footnotes)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that it is appropriate to include 707.3.6 Atriums into Table 716.6 because it provides for the use of a 1 hour fire-resistance rated fire barrier for enclosing an atrium and provide for the use of fire windows. This will provide clarification and guidance will be provided to the code user. The modification puts the list in the proper order.

Assembly Action : None

FS 98-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposed change to the Section 716.6.2 brings consistency between the requirements for exterior walls and glazing systems installed within exterior walls.

Assembly Action : None

FS 99-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that fire door and fire window frames are commonly listed and labeled, and code authorities typically look for labels during installation. Further, this is consistent with NFPA 80, Section 17.1.3, which requires these frames to be labeled.

Assembly Action : None

FS 100-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that it is appropriate to remove the term "smoke barrier" from Section 716.6.7.3 because the charging section (716.6.7) for this sub section does not include smoke barriers and Table 716.6 states the minimum fire window assembly rating in a smoke barrier is 3/4-hour. This is greater than and in conflict with the 1/3 hour protection provided in 716.6.7.3.

Assembly Action : None

FS 101-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the reorganization was editorial and provided for more effective application and enforcement of the provisions.

Assembly Action : None

FS 102-15

THIS IS A 3 PART CODE CHANGE. ALL PARTS WERE HEARD BY THE IBC-FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: The scope of UL10 indicates that these systems are "supplemental" only; the proposed definition should not contain requirements by reference to UL10; the definition should reference the entire system that incorporates the fire curtain; the definition is not needed as it is contained in UL10; the defined term is fire curtain but requirements in Section 717 are for fire and smoke curtains, which is inconsistent; and equivalence to other fire resistance rated issues need to be addressed such as hose stream, temperature rise and smoke migration.

Assembly Action :**None****Part II****Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: The proposed definition should not contain requirements by reference to UL10; the definition should reference the entire system that incorporates the fire curtain; the definition is not needed as it is contained in UL10; the defined term is fire curtain but requirements in Section 717 are for fire and smoke curtains, which is inconsistent; equivalence to other fire resistance rated issues need to be addressed such as hose stream, temperature rise and smoke migration; and for horizontal applications in an atrium, sprinkler design needs to be addressed for above and below the curtain.

Assembly Action :**None****Part III****Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: The scope of UL10 indicates that these systems are "supplemental" only; the scope of UL10 indicates that these products are appropriate for 20 minute door assemblies, not for the use described in this proposal; the proposed definition should not contain requirements by reference to UL10; the definition should reference the entire system that incorporates the fire curtain; the definition is not needed as it is contained in UL10; the defined term is fire curtain but requirements in Section 717 are for fire and smoke curtains, which is inconsistent; and equivalence to other fire resistance rated issues need to be addressed such as hose stream, temperature rise and smoke migration.

Assembly Action :**None****FS 103-15****Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies that Section 714.3 is applicable to rated walls and 714.4 is on horizontal assemblies.

Assembly Action :**None****FS 104-15****Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies that only fire dampers are appropriate for the applications described in Section 717.1.2.

Assembly Action :**None****FS 105-15****Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: The referenced standard, ASTM E2816 does not contain fire side survivability criteria. If the duct is compromised, then pressurization would not occur and the system would fail to function as needed; transitions in direction need to be evaluated separately as transitions are not dealt with in the standard - the proposed text should reflect this so a plan reviewer knows to look for evidence of this; this does not appear to be an option, rather a restriction, which more than likely would have cost implications.

Assembly Action :**None****FS 106-15****Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: These requirements should not be in the code as they are part of the manufacturer's individual product listing; and how to measure the 24 inches in relation to the smoke barrier or partition penetration needs to be clarified. The committee suggested providing a public comment that addressed the 24 inch measurement

Assembly Action :

None

FS 107-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal appropriately relocates the reference to ceiling radiation dampers labeled for use in dynamic systems to item number 4 addressing ceiling radiation dampers.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 108-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

717.3.2.1 Fire damper ratings. Firedampers shall have the minimum rating specified in Table 717.3.2.1 ~~for the type of penetration.~~

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the correct terminology is reflected in the proposal for dampers ratings. Further the proposal removes unnecessary language. The modification removes the same unnecessary language from Section 717.3.2.1.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 109-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: The referenced standard, ASTM E2816 does not contain fire side survivability criteria. If the duct is compromised, then the duct system would fail to function as needed; transitions in direction need to be evaluated separately as transitions are not dealt with in the standard - the proposed text should reflect this so a plan reviewer knows to look for evidence of this; and the committee was not clear on how a duct wrap system could be an alternative to a fire damper – equivalency was not demonstrated.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 110-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that there were unanswered questions on why Group H was taken out of these exceptions. Since the proponent requested disapproval these issues were not discussed.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 111-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal creates consistency in terminology within Section 717, by requiring listed fire dampers and listed smoke dampers.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 112-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: testing labs are not comfortable with only ASTM E84 testing – perhaps additional listings based on other testing should be required; requirements seem to apply to all occupancies, which is contrary to what the proponent discusses in the reason statement; and the minimum distance from a wall penetration to the flexible connections should be specified and justified.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 113-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

FS 114-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: Allowing this in I occupancies is concerning and needs substantiation; and the committee is not clear on why in item 2.1 the size of the duct is limited.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 115-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: This proposal deletes portions of the text that are currently working well, without justification; the provisions for the continuously running fan at the upper terminus needs to stay as it is very effective; and if substantiation was provided this could be a good change as it would save construction costs.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 116-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that exception 4 should stay in as it would allow design of smoke control systems without dampers. Even if the system is designed without dampers this change would not directly exempt them. This design option should remain.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 117-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the revisions to exception 5 eliminate an inconsistency between the IBC & IMC, with respect to the prohibition of dampers in kitchen and clothes dryer exhaust.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 118-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: the provisions would be better placed in definitions of fully ducted system. Proponents should consider combining FS112 and FS118 with revised text and submitting a public comment.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 119-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal combines Section 717.6.2 and 717.6.2.1 in a way that the requirements could be understood better and more enforceable.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 120-15

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this was an equivalent system to an exhaust duct and this allowance could benefit current construction practices.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 121-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. BOTH PARTS WERE HEARD BY THE IBC-FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Part I**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred their action on FS42 and that these revisions were unnecessary.

Assembly Action :**None****Part II****Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred their action on FS42 and that these revisions were unnecessary.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 122-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that draftstopping in R-4 occupancies should not be required considering the protection afforded by Sections 903.2.8.3 through 903.2.8.3.2 of the IBC/IFC that were added in 2015 IBC/IFC.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 123-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified**

720.1 General. Insulating materials shall comply with the requirements of this section. Where a flame spread index or a smoke-developed index is specified in this section, such index shall be determined in accordance with ASTM E 84 or UL 723. Any material that is subject to an increase in flame spread index or smoke-developed index beyond the limits herein established through the effects of age, moisture or other atmospheric conditions shall not be permitted. Insulating materials, when tested in accordance with the requirements of this section, shall include but are not limited to facings, facings, when used, such as vapor retarders, vapor permeable membranes and similar coverings, and all layers of single and multilayer reflective foil insulations insulation, and similar materials.

(no changes to the exceptions)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that moving the list of materials to the end of the paragraph clarified that Section 720.1 is applicable to all insulating materials. The modification adds other appropriate insulating materials and includes facings on the insulating materials.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 124-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that removing "all layers" as it relates to single and multilayer reflective insulations was not appropriate as this is the general section, which is talking about all types of insulation.

Assembly Action :**None**

FS 125-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: The term fully laminated should be clarified with a definition; and testing needs to be provided to show how this might affect the fire-resistance-rating of a roof assembly.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 126-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Testing needs to be provided to show how radiant barriers might affect the fire-resistance-rating of a roof assembly.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 127-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Testing needs to be provided to show how interior radiation control coatings might affect the fire-resistance-rating of a roof assembly. Also, testing needs to be provided to substantiate that this material will have no effect on the roof classification. Lastly, installation requirements should not be part of the definition.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 128-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that these assemblies did not qualify for a 2 hour rating, rather a 1 hour rating.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 129-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal corrects the construction requirements by requiring the gypsum wallboard to be secured to the resilient channels rather than the I-joists.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 130-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal corrects the construction requirements by requiring the gypsum wallboard to be secured to the resilient channels rather than the I-joists.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 131-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the requirements in Section 722 should remain as many designers use this as a viable option to providing fire testing of an assembly.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 132-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that when heavy timber is used to form the interior surfaces of egress elements they should be subject to the interior finish requirements for that location.

Assembly Action : None

FS 133-15

Committee Action: Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : None

FS 134-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that corridor finish requirements for ambulatory care facilities should be increased as ambulatory care facilities contain occupants who are incapable of self-preservation. The goal for these facilities is complete evacuation. This upgrade is to ensure that the corridors are tenable until evacuation is complete.

Assembly Action : None

FS 135-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that ASTM E2579 would be more appropriate for these products as it would be completely representative of the product makeup. Further, enforcement of these provisions is less burdensome as the code official and plan reviewer do not need to look at what specific substrate has been tested.

Assembly Action : None

FS 136-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal provides consistency with the International Fire Code and that testing in accordance with ASTM E2404 was appropriate in that facings are required to be tested over a wood substrate, which will yield conservative results.

Assembly Action : None

FS 137-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

803.13.1.1 Furred construction. If the interior finish material is applied to furring strips, the intervening spaces between such furring strips shall comply with one of the following:

1. Be filled with material that is inorganic or noncombustible;
2. Be filled with material that meets the requirements of a Class A material in accordance with Section 803.1.1 or 803.1.2; or
3. Be fireblocked at a maximum of 8 feet (2438 mm) in every direction in accordance with Section 718.

Exception: ~~Concealed spaces created~~ Compliance with items 1, 2 or 3 is not required where the materials used to create the concealed space are noncombustible furring strips.

Committee Reason: The committee felt the change adding structural elements to Section 803.13.1 is consistent with the provisions of Section 803.13. The revisions to Section 803.13.1.1 are also appropriate and reflect common practice. The modification further clarifies the exception to Section 803.13.1.1 to require all materials in the concealed space to be noncombustible.

Assembly Action : None

FS 138-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

803.13.2 Set-out construction. Where walls and ceilings are required to be of fire-resistance-rated or noncombustible construction and walls are set out or ceilings are dropped distances greater than specified in Section 803.13.1, Class A finish materials, in accordance with Section 803.1.1 or 803.1.2, shall be used.

Exceptions:

1. Where interior finish materials are protected on both sides by an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2.
2. Where interior finish materials are attached to noncombustible backing or furring strips installed as specified in Section 803.13.1.1.
3. Where the combustible void is filled with ~~an approved~~ a noncombustible material.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal adds an additional option when addressing set-out construction, but does not change the current code requirements. The modification appropriately removes the term "approved" from item 3 as noncombustible materials are regulated in the code.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 139-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved this change based on the following: moving NFPA 286 to the beginning of the section is editorial, is appropriate for more product and removes redundant language; ASTM E84 remains an option for materials to meet; and the section as a whole becomes more enforceable as it is more easily understood.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 140-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that ASTM E648 is technically equivalent to NFPA 253. Further, the flooring industry routinely references ASTM E648 and this proposal will indicate that these products comply without needing to get a comparison to NFPA 253.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 141-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

| |
|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">TABLE 707.3.10 FIRE-RESISTANCE RATING REQUIREMENTS FOR FIRE BARRIER ASSEMBLIES, FIRE WALLS OR HORIZONTAL ASSEMBLIES BETWEEN FIRE AREAS</p> |
|--|

707.3.10 Fire areas. The fire barriers, fire walls or horizontal assemblies, or ~~both combination thereof~~, separating a single occupancy into different fire areas shall have a fire-resistance rating of not less than that indicated in Table 707.3.10. The fire barriers, fire walls or horizontal assemblies, or ~~both combination thereof~~, separating fire areas of mixed occupancies shall have a fire-resistance rating of not less than the highest value indicated in Table 707.3.10 for the occupancies under consideration.

901.7 Fire areas. Where buildings, or portions thereof, are divided into fire areas so as not to exceed the limits established for requiring a fire protection system in accordance with this chapter, such fire areas shall be separated by fire walls constructed in accordance with Section 706, fire barriers constructed in accordance with Section 707, ~~exterior walls constructed in accordance with Section 705~~, or horizontal assemblies constructed in accordance with Section 711, or a combination thereof having a fire-resistance-rating of not less than that determined in accordance with Section 707.3.10.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal correctly removes a conflict with the definition of fire area. The modification also provides a positive correlation with Section and Table 707.3.10 regarding fire areas.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 142-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this item based on the following: the proposal does not seem to fix anything; the measurement on the vestibule length is confusing and should possibly require measurement from the face of the doors rather than the centerline; this might be better handled in the commentary with figures.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 143-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as there was not technical justification for change in pressurization of stairways and ramps.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 144-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as there was not technical justification for change in pressurization of elevator hoistways.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 145-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: transitions in direction need to be evaluated separately as transitions are not dealt with in the standard - the proposed text should reflect this so a plan reviewer knows to look for evidence of this; and the committee was not clear on how a duct wrap system could be an alternative to all of the requirements of a shaft enclosure – equivalency was not demonstrated.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 146-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1403.5 Vertical and lateral flame propagation. Exterior walls on buildings of Type I, II, III or IV construction that are greater than 40 feet (12 192 mm) in height above grade plane and contain a combustible water-resistive barrier ~~in accordance with Section 1404.2~~ shall be tested in accordance with and comply with the acceptance criteria of NFPA 285. For the purposes of this section, fenestration products flashing of fenestration products and water resistive barrier flashing and accessories at other locations, including through-wall flashings, shall not be considered part of the water-resistive barrier.

Exceptions:

1. Walls in which the water-resistive barrier is the only combustible component and the exterior wall has a wall covering of brick, concrete, stone, terra cotta, stucco or steel with minimum thicknesses in accordance with Table 1405.2.
2. Walls in which the water-resistive barrier is the only combustible component and the water-resistive barrier has a peak heat release rate of less than 150 kW/m², a total heat release of less than 20 MJ/m² and an effective heat of combustion of less than 18 MJ/kg as determined in accordance with ASTM E 1354 and has a flame spread index of 25 or less and a smoke-developed index of 450 or less as determined in accordance with ASTM E 84 or UL 723. The ASTM E 1354 test shall be conducted on specimens at the thickness intended for use, in the horizontal orientation and at an incident radiant heat flux of 50 kW/m².

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies the intent of Section 1403.5 in that the trigger for requiring NFPA 285 testing is the water-resistive barrier material and not its accessories. It extends to the excepted accessories specifically mentioned to include flashings that are not associated with fenestration. The modification further clarifies that all water-resistive barriers need to be included in this requirement.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 147-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that additional justification was required to justify the proposed substrate material of Type X gypsum board.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 148-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that no pointer was needed as the location of the noncombustibility requirements are well known by code users.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 149-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. BOTH PARTS WERE HEARD BY THE IBC-FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: Section 104.11 allows this already; testing should be done to support suitability of the exterior wall system; and there are unqualified labs currently providing engineering analyses to determine equivalence – this change would support that.

Assembly Action : **None**

Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: Section 104.11 allows this already; testing should be done to support suitability of the exterior wall system; and there are unqualified labs currently providing engineering analyses to determine equivalence – this change would support that.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 150-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: the proposed testing does not address durability and effectiveness representing installed conditions; it appears the code official would need to approve the installation method; there should be a definition for the water-resistive barrier assembly.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 151-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: bringing these requirements in from the International Residential Code is not appropriate as they are prescriptive requirements that may exclude current products being used in this application; and the current language is clear and enforceable.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 152-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this item as it did not address the manufacturer's installation instructions or product listing information.

Assembly Action : **None**

FS 153-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee did not see the need to add reference to ASTM E2556 as section 104.11 allows the code official to approve alternatives. With the limitations of this standard the code official should review and specially approve based on a given application.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 154-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: Having air barrier requirements in the IBC is inappropriate and they should remain in the IECC; Providing only pointers to the IECC is redundant as the code already sends users to the IECC for energy provisions; and reference only to commercial provisions is inappropriate as residential provisions may apply to certain structures.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 155-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee liked the clarification that allows the proper application of fire separation distance, however without substantiating data the committee could not approve the reduction in distance from 10 to 5 feet.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 156-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee's main objection to this proposal is the lack of fire data submitted to qualify these products. Further, the definition seems limiting in that it only includes foam plastic insulating material.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 157-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that anchored masonry veneer should have an allowable minimum nominal dimension of 2 inches based on historical use and residential code recognition.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 158-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this was mostly a reorganization of the current requirements. The committee also agreed with the minimum thickness revisions based on current industry standards.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 159-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: verifying the moisture content of the building envelope framing is difficult and too time consuming for the local jurisdiction; this will also put a burden on contractors to allow the time for this to be verified; should be specific to wood framing; and the location in Chapter 14 is questionable – not sure this is a fire safety issue.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 160-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies the vapor retarder requirement for Zone Marine 4.

FS 161-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this change in favor of their action on FS162-15

Assembly Action :

None

FS 162-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the terminology change was necessary (insulating sheathing to continuous insulation). Further, the definition is consistent with what is currently in the IRC.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 163-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1405.3.4 Minimum clear airspaces and vented openings for vented cladding. For the purposes of this section, vented cladding shall include the following minimum clear airspaces:

1. Vinyl, polypropylene, ~~or insulated vinyl lap~~ or horizontal aluminum siding applied over a weather-resistive barrier as specified in this chapter.
2. Brick veneer with a clear airspace as specified in this code.
3. Other approved vented claddings.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that polypropylene siding should be recognized as a vented cladding based on its similar characteristics to vinyl siding as vented cladding. The modification removes insulated vinyl as it has not been established as a vented cladding.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 164-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1405.4 Flashing. Flashing shall be installed in such a manner so as to prevent moisture from entering the wall or to redirect that moisture to the exterior. Flashing shall be installed at the perimeters of exterior door and window assemblies, penetrations and terminations of exterior wall assemblies, exterior wall intersections with roofs, chimneys, porches, decks, balconies and similar projections and at built-in gutters and similar locations where moisture could enter the wall. Flashing with projecting flanges shall be installed on both sides and the ends of copings, under sills and continuously above projecting trim. When self-adhered membranes are used as flashings of fenestration in wall assemblies, those self-adhered flashings shall comply with AAMA 711.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that AAMA 711 was a proper standard to reference in the code as a specification for self-adhering flashing that is widely used in building construction. The modification properly limits the application to self-adhered membranes that are used as flashings of fenestration in wall assemblies.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 165-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1405.4 Flashing. Flashing shall be installed in such a manner so as to prevent moisture from entering the wall or to redirect that moisture to the exterior. Flashing shall be installed at the perimeters of exterior door and window assemblies, penetrations and terminations of exterior wall assemblies, exterior wall intersections with roofs, chimneys, porches, decks, balconies and similar projections and at built-in gutters and similar locations where moisture could enter the wall. Flashing with projecting flanges shall be installed on both sides and the ends of copings, under sills and continuously above projecting trim. When fluid applied membranes are used as flashing for exterior wall openings, those fluid applied membrane flashings shall comply with AAMA 714.

Committee Reason: Despite the lack of data to show that currently manufactured liquid applied flashing meet this new standard, the committee agreed that AAMA 714 was a proper standard to reference in the code as a specification for liquid applied flashing. The modification properly limits the application to liquid applied flashings that are used as flashings of fenestration in wall assemblies.

FS 166-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1405.4 Flashing. Flashing and weep holes in anchored veneer designed in accordance with Section 1405.6 shall be located not more than ~~16~~ 10 inches (~~407~~ 245 mm) above finished ground level above the foundation wall or slab. At other points of support, including structural floors, shelf angles and lintels, flashing and weep holes shall be located in the first course of masonry above the support.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the flashing and weep holes in anchored masonry need to be at a minimum height above finished grade to function properly. The modification reduces the original height from 16 to 10 inches, which is a more reasonable height to reduce the amount of waterproofing that would be required below the flashing.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 167-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that plastic composites that comply with ASTM D7032 have been shown to be equivalent to untreated wood, including flame spread characteristics, and therefore should be allowed in the applications set forth in Section 1406.3, exception 2.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 168-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal appropriately requires HPL used in the applications described in Section 1409.2 to comply with the requirements of Sections 1409.4 through 1409.14, rather than just the two sections.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 169-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal provides consistency with the IRC and clarifies that testing at a maximum thickness is appropriately applied to installations of thicknesses at or less than the tested specimen.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 170-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this change based on the following: Hazards can increase based on misuse of products on the jobsite and during storage and handling of the material to get it manufactured, stored and delivered to the jobsite; no fire test data has been submitted on the product used in this application – fire can get below ground and protection by the slab may not always be enough; the proponents raised a perceived toxicity problem with fire treated foam plastic but provided no data showing the health risk affects of fire treated products.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 171-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this change based on the following: no fire test data has been submitted on the product used in this application – fire can get below ground and protection by the masonry or concrete wall or foundation may not always be enough; this is a more susceptible location than that proposed in FS170; and the 6 inch dimension is arbitrary and may not always be there after occupancy causing an exposure issue, which could then increase flame spread to other portions of the exterior of the building.

FS 172-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved this change based on the following: the code already allows ½ inch wood panel to provide this protection – heavy timber can more than meet this protection; Table 602 allows heavy timber for a 1-hour fire resistance construction – this should more than qualify it as a thermal barrier.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 173-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed language was redundant and unnecessary.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 174-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal as sprinkler protection generally does not provide enough protection from exterior fire exposure, which will result in flame propagation. Further, alternate testing to NFPA 285 is available (FM 4880).

Assembly Action :

None

FS 175-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

2603.5 Exterior walls of buildings of any height. Exterior walls of buildings of Type I, II, III or IV construction of any height shall comply with Sections 2603.5.1 through 2603.5.7. Exterior walls of cold storage buildings required to be constructed of noncombustible materials, where the building is more than one story in height, shall comply with the provisions of Sections 2603.5.1 through 2603.5.7. Exterior walls of buildings of Type V construction shall comply with Sections 2603.2, 2603.3 and 2603.4. Fireblocking shall be in accordance with Section 718.2.

~~**2603.5.8 Concealed spaces.** Concealed spaces of exterior walls and exterior wall coverings shall comply with Section 718.~~

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that Section 2603.5 should also refer code users to Section 718 for concealed space protection. The modification clarifies that it is the fireblocking requirements that is needed and appropriately locates the requirement within the general section 2603.5 rather than creating a new section.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 176-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this change based on the following: fire hazards from the exterior of a structure are taken into account by other portions of the code, such as fire rating exposure based on fire separation distance, combustible cladding requirements and the exposure requirements of the International Wildland-Urban Interface Code; current fire testing of exterior wall assemblies shows that many other materials on the exterior of the wall can provide sufficient protection – so this proposal excludes complying materials; and item 1 should be changed to gypsum sheathing or other material approved for that use.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 177-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal for the following reasons: there is an existing definition of building element in the code currently – the relationship between the two needs to be addressed; the definition of building element includes primary structural frame - how secondary structural members are dealt with needs to be addressed; the committee suggests interested parties get together to

Assembly Action :

None

FS 178-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

2603.7.2 Approval. The foam plastic insulation shall exhibit a flame spread index of 25 or less and a smoke-developed index of 50 or less when tested in accordance with ASTM E 84 or UL 723 at the thickness and density intended for use and shall meet the acceptance criteria of Section 803.1.2 when tested in accordance with NFPA 286. Alternatively, the foam plastic insulation shall be approved based on tests conducted in accordance with Section 2603.9.

Committee Reason: The committee agrees that compliance with Section 2603.9 should not be mandated as there are other paths to compliance. The modification keeps reference to compliance with Section 2603.9 as an alternative.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 179-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this item based on a lack of a definition for building panel systems. Without a definition products may be inadvertently included or excluded from these requirements.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 180-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that "plain" glass is not defined and that the term should be removed as being ambiguous and unnecessary.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 181-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this was an editorial change that clarified what types of greenhouses should be included in this exception.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 182-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal because it adds flexibility on the separation and area of light-transmitting plastic interior signs by providing the additional requirements for Class CC1 plastic, fire suppression and separation.

Assembly Action :

None

FS 183-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the following: the reorganization provides for greater understanding, which will improve application and enforcement of the requirements; provides coordination with the IRC; and appropriately requires the product component or component packaging to be labeled to indicate compliance with ASTM D7032.

Assembly Action :

None

2015 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE – GENERAL

GENERAL CODE COMMITTEE

Christina (Jamison) Kiefer, FM, Chair
Fire Marshal
San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District
San Ramon, CA

Gregory N. Nicholls, AIA, Vice Chair
Rep: Fayette County Building Dept., OH
Architect
The Preview Group, Inc
Cincinnati, OH

Amy Carpenter, AIA LEED
Senior Designer/Project Manager/Associate
SFCS Inc.
Conshohocken, PA

John D. Catlett, MCP
Director
Alexandria Department of Code Administration
Alexandria, VA

Frank Golon
Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Division President
Davidson-Wayne Development
Newark, NJ

Raymond A. Grill, PE, LEED AP
Principal
Arup
Washington, DC

Ron E. Hampton, MCP, CBO
Rep: Code Administrators Association of
Kentucky
Field Inspector
KY Dept. of Housing, Building and Construction
Catlettsburg, KY

Dwight A. Jewell
Zoning and Building Official
Metro Hartsville/Trousdale County TN
Hartsville, TN

Homer Maiel, PE, CBO
Project Manager
City of Cupertino (WC3, Inc.)
Cupertino, CA

Kevin T. McOsker, PE, CBO
Manager of Plans Examination
Clark County Department of Building and Fire
Prevention
Las Vegas, NV

Eirene Oliphant, MCP
Code Specialist
BRR Architecture
Merriam, KS

Michael Pokorny, PE
Firefighter/Rescuer II
Montgomery County Fire & Rescue Service
Aspen Hill, MD

Mark Robbins
Senior Project Manager/Architect
Performa, Inc.
De Pere, WI

Keith Wen, RA
Technical Advisor to the Commissioner
New York City Department of Buildings
New York, NY

Steven R. Winkel, AIA, PE, CASp
Rep: The American Institute of Architects
Partner, West Coast Office Manager
The Preview Group, Inc.
Berkeley, CA

Staff Secretariat
Kermit Robinson
Senior Technical Staff
International Code Council
Western Regional Office
Brea, CA

INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE - GENERAL

2015 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

G 1-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Overall the committee felt that the proposed change would add confusion to the code and not ease administration or interpretation. They found the 5 foot dimension arbitrary and unjustified. This would insert a regulation into the definition instead of a more appropriate place in the code. There was concern that this change would confuse the application of the code to marquees and signs as well as eaves and sunshades used to address requirements of the *International Energy Conservation Code*. Finally there was concern that this change to one of the fundamental definitions of the code would have consequences for other provisions not even guessed at during the hearing.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 20.26% (79) Oppose: 79.74% (311)

Assembly Action :

None

G 2-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The concept of 'usable' by the building occupants was found to be vague. What is usable? How usable? The new text would not clarify the application of the code based on this definition. The committee agrees that there is a need to have the code better address areas under building projections and overhangs, but they didn't see G1-15 or this proposal providing clear guidance.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 25.78% (91) Oppose: 74.22% (262)

Assembly Action :

None

G 3-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would add technical requirement into the definition. The definition is in severe need for improvement and should have existing technical provisions moved to the atrium section of Chapter 4.

Assembly Action :

None

G 4-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

SECTION 202

DEFINITIONS

CHILDREN'S PLAY STRUCTURE. A structure composed of one or more components, where the user enters a play environment that utilizes combustible materials.

Committee Reason: This is a necessary and useful definition. The modification eliminating the last 4 words makes the proposal palatable.

Assembly Action :

None

G 5-15

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent, whom requested disapproval, in that the definitions were needed but were vague and it was unclear as to what criteria would actually determine what materials would be considered noncombustible. Further, the committee felt that the proponent should get together with the interested parties to address these issues and submit a public comment.

Assembly Action :

None

G 6-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The phrasing is essential because it identifies one of the characteristics of the persons being served and therefore the level of care being provided. During the 2015 edition development the CTC worked to provide clear distinction between the occupancy categories based on the type of care being provided. Taking the text out of the definition without replacing it elsewhere in the code, would leave a gap in methods to establish the distinct care occupancies.

Assembly Action :

None

G 7-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed wording would result in a requirement that to be a dormitory you would have to have cooking facilities. Without cooking, a building wouldn't be a dormitory. This issue and trying to limit dormitories to being student housing leaves all other dormitories as undefined.

Assembly Action :

None

G 8-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found the added language to not provide any clarity for determining what is a dwelling. The existing definition is adequate to help you determine what is a dwelling. The issue of transitional use is addressed elsewhere in the code.

Assembly Action :

None

G 9-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change provides clarity that sleeping units are just a single room but can be a collection of rooms. The revision increases design options for sleeping rooms. There was concern that the revision could be read to not ever require a sleeping area in a sleeping room. Such is not the intent of the proposal.

Assembly Action :

None

G 10-15

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The definition as proposed would cause confusion at rooms with multiple doors, within vestibules and doors that serve as part of a means of egress in both directions.

Assembly Action :

None

G 11-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

G 12-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee concluded that the revision doesn't improve the determination of grade plane. They found the proposed language resulted in a more complex calculation. Further the change in definition can result in grade plane being at a different level than under the current definition - and as such it could affect the determination of which are stories above grade plane and therefore the height of the building.

Assembly Action :

None

G 13-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

GREENHOUSE. A structure or thermally isolated area of a building that maintains a specialized sunlit environment ~~exclusively~~ used for, and essential to, the cultivation, protection or maintenance of plants.

Committee Reason: The modification removed the word 'exclusively' because it is clear from the actions already taken, that the greenhouse uses are not 'exclusive' to plant cultivation. It was acknowledged that this will differ from the IECC definition. The IBC needs a definition. This action, as modified gives a pointer to the Energy Committee to revise the IECC definition in the next cycle.

Assembly Action :

None

G 14-15

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this is an appropriated definition to be in the IBC as term is used extensively in the code, including the title of Section 716, but is not always understood by code users. Further, the committee indicated that a public comment should be submitted to exclude floor assembly opening protectives.

Assembly Action :

None

G 15-15

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

SECTION 202

DEFINITIONS

PLASTIC LUMBER. A manufactured product made primarily of plastic materials (filled or unfilled) which is generally rectangular in cross section.

WOOD/PLASTIC COMPOSITE. A composite material made primarily from wood or cellulose-based materials and plastic.

Committee Reason: Although this is lacking a description of what "similar materials" might be the committee agreed that this was a good idea to include plastic composite deck boards, stair treads, and guard systems made with such recycled material as carper fiber or material such as mineral-filled PVC. The modification puts back the definitions of plastic lumber and wood/plastic composite as these definitions provide clarification to code users.

Assembly Action :

None

G 16-15

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that having the mechanical fastening requirement in the definition was unnecessary and overly restrictive. This would allow for other fastening methods.

Assembly Action :

None

G 17-15

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the definition of approved plastic needed to remain general in order to include all types of uses.

Assembly Action :

None

G 18-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides an important clean up to the code. It may be appropriate to further revise to clarify that the tenants of the associated building can use the private garage whether they are the owners of the building or renters.

Assembly Action :

None

G 19-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

SECTION 202

DEFINITIONS

SOFT CONTAINED PLAY EQUIPMENT STRUCTURE. A children's play structure containing one or more components where the user enters ~~a an enclosed~~ play environment that utilizes pliable materials.

Committee Reason: This proposal adds a useful definition that clarifies the application of the code. The modification removed the word "enclosed" as it added confusion.

Assembly Action :

None

G 20-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The definition proposed is not consistent with that provided in the *International Swimming Pool and Spa Code*. In the ISPSC the connection to a circulation system appears to be key to what is regulated, where in this proposed definition it seems to only apply to the 'others' listed in the second sentence. The term recreation shouldn't be removed from the definition. The definition is unclear with respect to its application for site-built pools.

Assembly Action :

None

G 21-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal properly refers to the correct Procedure of the testing. This change also aligns the requirements of the IBC and the IRC.

Assembly Action :

None

G 22-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal reduces redundancy in the code and simplifies the search for information. With each defined term italicized, the code user will go directly to Chapter 2 where the full definitions are found. The listings in front of the chapter provided no information for the code user. The intent of the committee was to change to the lists to a simple reference to Chapter 2 with the exception of those locations where the lists also included scientific notations. The notations would remain in the Chapters.

Assembly Action :

None

G 23-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found the proposal confusing. The proponent hoped to remove his changes to Sections 508.2.4 and 508.3.3. This proposal has similar issues as the other proposals addressing the use of roofs. The text is somewhat circular in that if the roof deck is private and related to an R-2 dwelling unit would be unclassified. The committee later expressed encouragement to the proponents of all the occupied roof proposals to attempt to work together to create a solution for consideration at the public comment hearings.

Assembly Action :

None

G 24-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The testimony on this proposal and similar items clearly show that use of roofs needs to be clarified. The committee found the language of this proposal unclear and would still result in multiple interpretations. There was discomfort with the complete exemption allowed by the text of Section 503.1.4. Uses on roof must address issue of occupant safety as well as fire fighter access. Often planning/zoning regulations require open spaces and the solution is often the solution. The issue of whether an occupied roofs are considered a story or not. On a later proposal, the committee encouraged the proponents of the similar proposals try to get together to develop a solution for consideration at the public comment hearings.

Assembly Action :

None

G 25-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent addressed concerns regarding the impact of the existing language when a change of occupancy occurred. The appropriate place to address that issue would be in the IEBC. The proposed language would eliminate the certainty provided by the current code and would result in a debate of the occupancy category each time one of these smaller spaces was included in a plan.

Assembly Action :

None

G 26-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal is a solution looking for a problem. Contrary to providing clarity, the proposal was found to add confusion.

Assembly Action :

None

G 27-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is one of a group of changes which provides clarity of the use of greenhouses. For the A occupancy, these are much like a museum or exhibition hall with the focus on the growth and maintenance of plants. The committee felt that adding this to the listing of A-3 occupancies is a good addition.

Assembly Action :

None

G 28-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found adding a new term to the list providing no additional clarity. The use described by the proponent if it has no seats is simply an A-3 gym; with seats it is an A-4 arena.

Assembly Action :

None

G 29-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The B-occupancy classification application is unclear. Compared with G27-13 where the 'green' purpose is identified, this proposal simply says its attached to a B occupancy. There is no limit as to ratio compared to the balance of the building. What would be a greenhouse which is stand alone - and isn't attached to anything - be classified.

Assembly Action :

None

G 30-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Similar to G29-15, this proposal doesn't again specify a use but simply that it is attached to a building that is classified as Group E. This doesn't provide any clarity.

Assembly Action :

None

G 31-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on earlier action, the classification of F-2 is inappropriate because of the level of combustibles that would possibly be in such facilities.

Assembly Action :

None

G 32-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

G 33-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The provisions assure that if these occupancies are built under the auspices of the *International Residential Code* that they are protected with an automatic sprinkler system. If the text is removed, that assurance is lost. With many states and localities removing sprinkler requirements when the IRC is adopted, this language in the IBC assures sprinkler protection.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 23.27% (104) Oppose: 76.73% (343)

Assembly Action :

None

G 34-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal is conceptually identical to G33-15. Consistent with the disapproval G33, this one is also disapproved.

Assembly Action :

None

G 35-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found that the proposal, while a good attempt to address the issue, left too many unanswered concerns. There was concern that the requirements would be too onerous when applied to a smaller building, or perhaps for a temporary holding room located in a mall or a school. On the other hand a large court building might have a small lock up next to each of 12 court rooms. Such would be prohibited by the limitation of one such lockup per building. In addition, the change in Section 308.5 would leave unanswered what was an I-3 with 5 or fewer occupants which was not a lockup facility.

Assembly Action :

None

G 36-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Of the group of greenhouse occupancy proposals, the use for Mercantile was felt to be the most obvious and logical.

Assembly Action :

None

G 37-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

310.4 Residential Group R-2. Residential Group R-2 occupancies containing *sleeping units* or more than two *dwelling units* where the occupants are primarily permanent in nature, including:
Apartment houses ~~with three or more dwelling units~~
Congregate living facilities (nontransient) with more than 16 occupants
Boarding houses (nontransient)
Convents
Dormitories
Fraternities and sororities
Monasteries
Hotels (nontransient)
Live/work units
Motels (nontransient)
Vacation timeshare properties

Committee Reason: The proposal provides a needed clarification of the uses which can be either an R-2 or an R-3 based on size (number of occupants.). The modification removes text which is redundant with the charging language of Section 310.4. Since both R-2 and R-3 are required to be provided with an automatic sprinkler system, occupants in both occupancies are afforded that protection.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 38-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal inappropriately narrows the focus of dormitories. It would leave all dormitories which are not student housing as seemingly unclassified.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 39-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Condominium is a form of ownership not occupancy and as such should not come into consideration under the IBC.. Adding such only the the R-2 occupancy listing would result in confusion where office space is owned on a 'condominium' basis or where a 2 dwelling unit structure which should be classified as an R-3 has units owned individually as a condominium. Adding this term only adds to confusion.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 40-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee found the dual limit confusing. What is the occupancy if there are 4 guest rooms but 12 occupants? There was reluctance to add 'owner occupied' to the code, even though it is consistent with the IRC.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 41-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee concluded that the pointer to the IRC doesn't need to say sprinklers are required when the IRC requires the provisions of sprinklers. While testimony focused on the change of occupancy and what is needed when such change occurs. Discussion of change of occupancy is addressing the wrong code.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 42-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The following is a corrected Committee Reason Statement for G42 -15 and was posted May 15, 2015. It replaces the previously posted statement:

The committee approved this proposal to provide clarification regarding the requirements for R-4 occupancies. While in general R-4 occupancies are to comply with R-3 standards, there are specific provisions which apply specifically to R-4 occupancies. The proposal also clarifies that only R-4 Condition 1 occupancies have the option of comply with the provisions of the IRC. This assures that the higher needs residents of an R-4 Condition 2 occupancy are covered by the standard of the IBC. Within the family of I-Codes, the R-4 occupancy will be provided with sprinkler protection regardless of the code it is developed under. The committee acknowledged that some state adoptions have removed sprinkler requirements in the IRC.

Assembly Motion: **Disapprove**
Online Vote Results: **Successful** - Support: 68.52% (283) Oppose: 31.48% (130)
Assembly Action : **Disapproved**

G 43-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The square footage limitation is unneeded. The limit is unneeded. Many felt that the elimination of the whole provision would be appropriate since the accessory occupancy regulation is adequately addressed.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 44-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

311.2 Moderate-hazard storage, Group S-1. Storage Group S-1 occupancies are 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 406.8)

Photo engravings

Resilient flooring

Self-service storage facility (mini-storage)

Silks

Soaps

Sugar

Tires, bulk storage of

Tobacco, cigars, cigarettes and snuff

Upholstery and mattresses

Wax candles

Committee Reason: While most of the rest of the items listed under S-1 occupancy speaks to the items being stored, this is an actual use. This is a helpful addition. It provides clear understanding that such facilities are appropriate as S-1. Storage in these facilities are relatively unregulated, other than operational limits. The modification added 'facility' to the listed term for consistency with the defined term.

Assembly Action :

None

G 45-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Adding the definition is adding confusion. Livestock and agricultural things are often in the same building. There was discomfort with including the terms 'zoos' and 'laboratories' because such may be more appropriate in different occupancies than Group U.

Assembly Action :

None

G 46-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no size limit on these facilities. Often these facilities are large and have larger quantities of fuels and fertilizers. These are better classified as S occupancies. Often there are maintenance shops within such facilities where ground crew personnel could be working.

Assembly Action :

None

G 47-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides clarity for the classification of these facilities. They are typically small and rarely have any occupants other occasional maintenance personnel. Hazards are relatively low; usually of non-combustible materials.

Assembly Action :

None

G 48-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

312.1.1 Greenhouses. Greenhouses not classified as Group A-3, B, Group E, ~~F-2~~ F-1 or Group M shall be classified as Use Group U. ~~Greenhouses that are accessory buildings to Group B, E or M occupancies, and utility or accessory greenhouses that are not classified in any specific occupancy shall be classified as Group U.~~

Committee Reason: The industry has asked us to provide clarity for the code officials in addressing these buildings. With the collection of proposals, greenhouses used for other occupancies will take precedence and only those not otherwise classified would fall to the Group U. The overall package may need some further refinement, but the committee felt this should be the beginning of the solution. The modifications changed F-2 to F-1 recognizing that plant materials and the containers provide a level of combustible materials consistent with the F-1 occupancies. The second modification deletes language that is essentially redundant with the first sentence of the new section.

G 49-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This proposal addressing mall buildings. There was some support for completely distributing egress provisions to chapter 10, sprinklers to Chapter 9, etc. But the proposal series would put topic specific provisions in other parts of the code - for example by moving malls to chapter 5, you move egress and sprinkler requirements to Chapter 5.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 50-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a minority of the committee. This proposal addresses high-rise buildings. The committee felt that these buildings do provide unique needs and requirements and the regulations should remain as a package in Chapter 4.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 51-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or specialized set of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This proposal was addressing atriums, the proposed location is Chapter 7. Section 712 provides various options for addressing how openings in horizontal assemblies should be addressed. While there was support for relocating the atrium provisions, the committee expressed concern that improvements to text of the provisions needs to be done. There was a call to improve the definition of atrium. The committee raised the distinction of atriums that are an occupied space where the other methods for addressing openings in horizontal assemblies do not focus on the space as an occupied portion of the building.

Assembly Motion:**As Submitted****Online Vote Results:****Failed** - Support: 13.18% (46) Oppose: 86.82% (303)**Assembly Action :****None**

G 52-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This proposal addresses underground buildings.

Assembly Action :

None

G 53-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This proposal addresses private garages. There was support to move this to chapter 3 as it was occupancy specific.

Assembly Action :

None

G 54-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This proposal addresses a variety of vehicle related uses there was support for relocation to Chapter 3.

Assembly Action :

None

G 55-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This proposal addresses I-2 occupancies, there was support for relocation to Chapter 3 because it is only related to an occupancy.

Assembly Action :

None

G 56-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This proposal addresses I-3 occupancies, there was support for relocation to Chapter 3 because it is only related to an occupancy. Others find that moving to Chapter 3 provides no clear benefits.

Assembly Action :

None

G 57-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This proposal addresses motion picture projection booths. There committee did find the proposed additional #15 in Section 307.1.1 would be a useful pointer to these regulations whether kept in Chapter 4 or moved to a new location.

Assembly Action :

None

G 58-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This proposal addresses stages which is a specialized construction feature. There was limited support to moving this provision to a different location.

Assembly Action :

None

G 59-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This proposal addresses special amusement facilities. The additional reference in Section 304.3 would prove helpful regardless of the future disposition of this proposal. As this is occupancy driven, there was more support for its relocation.

Assembly Action :

None

G 60-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This section addresses aircraft control towers. This continues to be a very special type of occupancy/facility and it needs to remain in Chapter 4

Assembly Action :

None

G 61-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This section addresses aircraft hangers.

Assembly Action :

None

G 62-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This section is a leftover after all other provisions were moved to the fire code. High pile storage isn't limited to the S occupancy.

Assembly Action :

None

G 63-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This section addresses requirements which are only needed where hazardous materials are used in larger quantities.

Assembly Action :

None

G 64-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This section addresses hazardous material related occupancies. There was support moving this to Chapter 3 with other occupancy driven requirements.

Assembly Action :

None

G 65-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee.

Assembly Action :

None

G 66-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This is repeating provisions in Mechanical code and may not need to be in the IBC at all.

Assembly Action :

None

G 67-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee.

Assembly Action :

None

G 68-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or specialized set of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This proposal was addressing live/work units. The proponent made the case that live/work units are simply a specialized set of mixed occupancy requirements. Mixed occupancies are generally addressed in Section 508 with specialized designs contained in Section 510. Consistent with previous actions in the series, the committee chose to retain the Chapter 4 location.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 10.47% (36) Oppose: 89.53% (308)

Assembly Action :

None

G 69-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or specialized set of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee on this item. This proposal was addressing Section 420 which address specific requirements which are clearly based on the specific occupancies listed. The proponent made the case occupancy driven requirements should be found in Chapter 3 with the listing of the occupancy. Consistent with previous actions in the series, the committee choose to retain the Chapter 4 location.

Assembly Motion:**As Submitted****Online Vote Results:****Failed** - Support: 12.28% (42) Oppose: 87.72% (300)**Assembly Action :****None**

G 70-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 71-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This section addresses ambulatory care facilities and the requirements are occupancy driven.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 72-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This section addresses storm shelters. The support of FEMA to maintain the provisions in chapter 4 was important to committee members.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 73-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This section addresses children's play structures. Chapter 6 is structure classification, moving this and other things to Chapter 6 would just move the 'dumping' ground of unique provisions.

Assembly Action :

None

G 74-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee. This section seems to only be a pointer to another standard. It was questioned whether it was needed in the code at all.

Assembly Action :

None

G 75-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is one of a series of proposals (G49-15 through G75-15) which would systematically relocate all provisions of Chapter 4 of the IBC to another location in the code. The proponent of these changes would locate current Chapter 4 provisions with other code requirements that they are a logical extension. A primary argument by the proponent for the relocation Chapter 4 provisions is to make these various provisions more easily found during the design process. He believes that their location in Chapter 4 results in them being either overlooked or found late in the design process and requiring substantial modifications to a design. The committee in disapproving the series of changes concluded that Chapter 4 provides a convenient location for specialized use and design provisions. It allows designers to start in one location to find unique requirements of a use or building feature before proceeding through the rest of the code to determine allowed height, area, construction types, and fire protection requirements found in those specific topic chapters. Contrary to the reason provided by the proponent, the committee felt that Chapter 4 isn't an afterthought in the design process, but is a convenient first stop for specialized requirements. Moving all the provisions of Chapter 4 to other chapters would make other chapters more confusing by adding one or more specialized sets of requirements in the midst of chapters that are relatively straight forward in addressing their topics. There was concern that unique and key provisions found in Chapter 4 could be lost and overlooked if moved to other code locations.

Although none of the series of proposals was approved, some individual proposals found more support than others. While the committee did not support complete elimination of Chapter 4, a case for relocating some provisions was made by a larger minority of the committee.

Assembly Action :

None

G 76-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: While this would result in a consolidation of system controls in one location, full compliance with Section 911 would seem to be overkill. Despite the stated intent of the proponent, the language would only apply to covered malls; leaving application to open malls unclear. Requiring all fire control room systems isn't needed for a single story malls. This may be setting up a conflict between the Fire Code and Building Code.

Assembly Action :

None

G 77-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change points the code user to the correct provisions for the design and construction of exit passageways.

Assembly Action :

None

G 78-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was seen as watering down the Chapter 10 requirements addressing exit passageways. The list would perhaps be too specific. It doesn't tell the code user how to address similar systems. However, the committee felt the laundry list shouldn't be included. Some of the terms used are not consistent with related provisions.

Assembly Action :

None

G 79-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found the term 'primary occupancy' lacks definition and therefore would render the code unclear in its application if this proposal were to be approved. Earlier in the hearing the committee debated a variety of proposals trying to clarify the use of roofs. This proponent was encouraged to work with proponents of other occupied roof proposals to address that topic.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 21.7% (69) Oppose: 78.3% (249)

Assembly Action :

None

G 80-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: H occupancies are actually more hazardous than F-1 and S-1 and should be similarly restricted. If the specific H-occupancies should be specified, such could be revised via public comment.

Assembly Action :

None

G 81-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies that spaces that are supporting the R-2 uses, or are used exclusively by the residents, should not be used to trigger the extra stairway. The intent of exempting the R-2 occupancies shouldn't be undone by support and common use spaces. This adds clarity for spaces used by the building occupants.

Assembly Action :

None

G 82-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee supported the change in recognition of the similarity between R-1 and R-2 occupant loads. It was also noted that compared to typical office building highrise buildings where stairways are located in the core of the building, R-1 buildings have stairways which are more remotely located. The occupant load and the building configuration makes the 3rd stairway not needed.

Assembly Action :

None

G 83-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

G 84-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

403.5.2 Additional interior exit stairway. For buildings other than Group R-2 that are more than 420 feet (128 000 mm) in *building height*, one additional *interior exit stairway* meeting the requirements of Sections 1011 and 1023 shall be provided in addition to the minimum number of *exits* required by Section 1006.3. The total width of any combination of remaining *interior exit stairways* with one *interior exit stairway* removed shall be not less than the total width required by Section 1005.1. *Scissor stairways* shall not be considered the additional *interior exit stairway* required by this section.

Exceptions:

1. An additional *interior exit stairway* shall not be required to be installed in buildings having elevators used for occupant self-evacuation in accordance with Section 3008.
2. An additional *interior exit stairway* shall not be required for ~~redundancy to stairways serving only those other~~ portions of the building where the highest occupiable floor level in those areas is less than 420 feet (128 000 mm) in *building height*.

Committee Reason: The intent is to clarify that the application of the 3rd stairway requirement to those portions of a building which is over 420 feet. Therefore where a portion of a building is over 420, a third stairway is imposed, and continues through the total height, but if the same building had a second tower less than 420, the third stairway wouldn't be imposed. The modification provided clearer text meeting the intent of the changed.

Assembly Action :

None

G 85-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found the language of the proposal to be flawed. The proponent noted that improvement to his proposal is needed. The provisions of Item 2 and 3 in Section 403.4.3 do not coordinate well. It would imply that the fire department would not be able to override the system to open the doors.

Assembly Action :

None

G 86-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The suggestion that the broader use and availability of cell phones negates the need to these communications systems was questioned based on the frequent poor reception for such phones within a steel or steel reinforced stairway. Locked stairways need to have some method to allow folks who either intentionally or unintentionally end up in such stairways and need to have some way to communicate with someone outside the stairway to help them return to the building.

Assembly Action :

None

G 87-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal is unclear and doesn't seem to reflect the reason statement provided by this proponent. The reason implied each unit is served by a private elevator, but no such text is found in the proposal. Further the diagram implies that the fire service access elevator can't be used for regular, daily use by the occupants. Such is a false assumption.

Assembly Action :

None

G 88-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was not convinced that sprinklers are effective in taller atriums even where the use of the atrium for isn't limited.

Assembly Action :

None

G 89-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: While the committee did find merit in the reorganization of these provisions, the remained discomfort in two areas. 1. Is the change to 404.2 changing the intent of that section? Based on testimony that there is no science behind the 55 foot exemption, committee members expressed concern about the sprinkler waiver at any height. An example was provided where the fire isn't at the floor level of the atrium, but at an upper level where those floors might not be 55 below the roof. There needs to be clarification between the potential fire location and the location of any ceiling where sprinklers would be waived.

Assembly Motion:

As Modified

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 33.13% (109) Oppose: 66.87% (220)

Assembly Action :

None

Online Floor Modification:

[F] 404.3 Automatic sprinkler protection. An *approved automatic sprinkler system* shall be installed throughout the entire building. ~~The floor of the atrium shall not be used for any activities that exceed the designed capability of the automatic sprinkler system. Where a smoke control system is present the use and arrangement of the atrium floor shall be consistent with the design of the smoke control system.~~

Exceptions:

1. That area of a building adjacent to or above the *atrium* need not be sprinklered provided that portion of the building is separated from the *atrium* portion by not less than 2-hour *fire barriers* constructed in accordance with Section 707 or *horizontal assemblies* constructed in accordance with Section 711, or both.
 2. Sprinkler protection at the ceiling of the *atrium* is not required provided the following criteria are met:
 - 2.1. The ceiling of the *atrium* is more than 55 feet (16764 mm) above the floor, and
 - 2.2. The floor of the *atrium* shall not be used for other than low fire hazard uses.
-

G 90-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found that the proposal didn't add clarity to the code. The proposal appears to conflict with the smoke barrier. For this an all atrium proposals, the first priority should be to fix the definition to apply 3 more stories. Then it should be easier to craft a solution to the issue raised by this proponent.

Assembly Action :

None

G 91-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal appears to allow the rationale analysis for the capacity of the smoke control system. The committee was unclear that this is a valid alternative to the atrium smoke control requirement.

Assembly Action :

None

G 92-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Fire barrier and smoke barriers are distinctly different. This proposal would significantly lessen the protection of the walls, especially the opening protections between an atrium and the balance of the building.

Assembly Action :

None

G 93-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was supportive of the concept of allowing other solutions to the windows 'gasketing' but felt the proposed language was too open ended. If the proposal was revised along the lines of 'and other approved materials', it would allow for the building official to review and accept other methodologies. The committee wanted to make sure that the common practice of 'butt jointing' glazing, frequently used in such locations, was clearly addressed in revised text.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 54.55% (174) Oppose: 45.45% (145)

Assembly Action :

Approved as Submitted

G 94-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the code language by providing more information regarding when a smoke control system isn't required. The committee expressed the desire to have the definition of atrium improved which could then make this and other provisions unneeded, but as the definition stands today, this exception is needed.

Assembly Action :

None

G 95-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

406.1.7 Electric vehicle charging stations. ~~Electric~~ Where provided, electric vehicle charging stations shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 70. Electric vehicle charging system equipment shall be listed and labeled in accordance with UL 2202. Electric vehicle supply equipment shall be listed and labeled in accordance with UL 2594. Accessibility to electric vehicle charging stations shall be provided in accordance with Chapter 11.

Committee Reason: The proposal provides a needed reorganization of the provisions for the various motor vehicle based regulations. The committee modified the proposal to make it clear that the code isn't requiring the electric vehicle charging stations, but providing the a standard for installation. It was acknowledged that the standard doesn't fully meet CP28, but it is the best available. Section 406.1.3 is an incomplete reference and may not be needed. Section 406.7 should also be revised because it provides a circular reference.

Assembly Action :

None

G 96-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides a helpful definition to clarify the scope of the repair garage use.

Assembly Action :

None

G 97-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides clarity that larger garages can be built according to the public garage standards even where the use is limited to the private use of the building tenants. Approval may sent up a circular reference with Section 406.4.

Assembly Action :

None

G 98-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There isn't any justification for the 3000 square feet other than its what used to be in the code. If this is accessory to a single family house, the appropriate venue is the IRC where there is no limit on the size of the accessory structure. While the discussion was about car collectors, the exception addresses any R-3 occupancy - which includes many more uses than just one and two family dwellings.

Assembly Action :

None

G 99-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

G 100-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The two types of facilities have different occupant loads. The proponent didn't provide technical justification to increase the allowed size of ramp accessed garages.

Assembly Action :

None

G 101-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was support for some increase in area based on moving to higher levels of building construction, however the committee was not convinced that the areas proposed by the proponent are appropriate. The committee might be comfortable with a large increase where sprinklers systems are provided.

Assembly Action :

None

G 102-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt the proposal added words that are redundant because the comprehensive term 'ventilation' includes the more specific term of exhaust. As the IMC has distinct provisions which may change, the committee was uncomfortable with references to specific sections of another code.

Assembly Action :

None

G 103-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

406.6.2 Ventilation. A mechanical *ventilation* system shall be provided in accordance with the *International Mechanical Code*.

Exception: Mechanical ventilation shall not be required for enclosed parking garages that are accessory to one and two family dwellings ~~Group R-3 occupancies~~.

Committee Reason: The intent of the proposal to waive ventilation for typical garages accessory to a typical residence is better realized based on the modification to replace 'occupancies' with 'one and two family dwellings'. These smaller garages accessory to one and two family dwellings are usually small and with little chance of accumulation of fumes. This solves a problem often encountered in the field by designers.

Assembly Action :

None

G 104-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change improves the intent of this provisions by giving specific examples of other spaces allowed to be open to the corridors. The existing text 'and similar' has led to a wide range of interpretations and mis-interpretations.

Assembly Action :

None

G 105-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This was a new provision for the 2015 code. With experience, improvements to the text to allow more consistent interpretation and compliance are needed.

Assembly Action :

None

G 106-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

G 107-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides clarity to the requirement and divides the paragraph into the 3 topic areas that are covered by the existing provisions.

Assembly Action :

None

G 108-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

G 109-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recognized the good work put forth by the proponent, but found the text to be unclear. Modifications to address the issues were ruled out of order. Of concern is the single bed patient room and whether such can be readily enforced. The proponents are encouraged to submit a public comment for consideration in the fall.

Assembly Action :

None

G 110-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on the number of proposals submitted on this topic, there is a clear need for a comprehensive solution to the issue. Returing to the previous area limits are not justifiable.

Assembly Action :

None

G 111-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides a much safer configuration requirement to support the defend in place concept. It eliminates the dead end smoke compartment that only has access to one other compartment. The committee understood that the phrase 'two adjacent smoke compartments' is intended that both individually adjacent to the smoke compartment where egress is initiated and not that the two other smoke compartments are not simply adjacent to each other.

Assembly Action :

None

G 112-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides needed guidance to the hold-open devices where they in the smoke barrier of an I-2 occupancies. It connects the I-2 provisions in Section 407 with the specific provisions in Chapter 7 applicable to these doors.

Assembly Action :

None

G 113-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The intent of this code section is protecting the occupants from the effects of a fire. This proposal changes the focus to post fire clean up, which takes away the safety for the occupants of the I-3 facility. Even if it were even appropriate, the air changes method is not appropriate. Providing a teneable environment is exactly the intent of the existing code provision and shouldn't be reduced.

Assembly Action :

None

G 114-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the concept raised by the proposal is very much needed because many times theater stagers are part of a much larger and complex building. The proposed text or that contained in the modification presented didn't provide a full 'encapsulazation of the stage because the lateral directions of the proscenium wall are not addressed.

Assembly Motion:

As Modified

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 50.63% (161) Oppose: 49.37% (157)

Assembly Action :

Approved as Modified

Online Floor Modification:

410.3.4 Proscenium wall. Where the stage height is greater than 50 feet (15 240 mm), all portions of the stage shall be completely separated from the seating area by a proscenium wall with not less than a 2-hour fire-resistance rating extending continuously from the foundation to the roof.

Exception: Where the stage is located in a building of Type I construction, proscenium walls:

1. ~~Where Shall be permitted to terminate at the top of the foundation or floor/ceiling assembly where~~ located above a minimum 2-hour horizontal assembly ~~shall be permitted to extend from the top of this horizontal assembly in accordance with Section 711.~~
2. ~~Where located beneath a minimum 2-hour horizontal assembly are~~ Shall be permitted to terminate at the underside of ~~this a floor/ceiling assembly where located below a minimum 2-hour horizontal assembly in accordance with Section 711.~~
3. ~~Are~~ Shall not be permitted to terminate at a horizontal assembly where the provisions of Item 2 of Section 403.2.1.1 have been applied.

G 115-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides a comprehensive update to the airport control tower facilities. The proponent is a group purposely formed to address these facilities. This reflects current approach for safety in these facilities. The committee noted that the text of Section 412.3.3.2 doesn't clearly required the fire command center as the proponent stated was the intent. There was also concern that for smaller airfields where towers may be only a few stories, all of these requirements - which are clearly based on the high-rise building provisions may be a bit of an overkill.

Assembly Action :

None

G 116-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: These facilities are characterized by a small occupant load that is awake and alert. Further they are typically a small footprint or width of the tower portion. The proposal is reasonable exception for these facilities.

Assembly Action :

None

G 117-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides consistency for the protection of cables and electrical circuits. The five current locations addressing this issue have five unique sets of requirements. This proposal will provide consistency. It allows other methods that have been tested and proved effective. The concern raised is the term 'critical circuit'. The term is undefined and the terms used in the NEC are different.

Assembly Action :

None

G 118-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is aimed at clarifying what constitutes a sleeping unit and whether a sleeping unit can have multiple rooms. And where multiple rooms exist, where are the separations required. The exceptions are necessary to clarify the intention of Section 420.2.

Assembly Action :

None

G 119-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

420.2 Separation walls. Walls separating *dwelling units* in the same building, walls separating *sleeping units* in the same building and walls separating *dwelling* or *sleeping units* from other occupancies contiguous to them in the same building shall be constructed as *fire partitions* in accordance with Section 708.

Exception: In Group R-3 and Group R-4 facilities, walls within the dwelling unit or ~~between~~ sleeping units are not required to be constructed as fire partitions.

420.3 Horizontal separation. Floor assemblies separating *dwelling units* in the same buildings, floor assemblies separating *sleeping units* in the same building and floor assemblies separating *dwelling* or *sleeping units* from other occupancies contiguous to them in the same building shall be constructed as *horizontal assemblies* in accordance with Section 711.

Exception: In Group R-3 and R-4 facilities, floor assemblies within the dwelling or ~~between~~ sleeping units are not required to be constructed as horizontal assemblies.

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies that within a dwelling unit or within a sleeping unit, separations are unnecessary. These are the size of a dwelling unit and if the separations were imposed, it would impose rated doors within a dwelling unit. The hazards within such units is low. The modification was approved to reinforce that the separations are around the units and not within a unit.

Assembly Action :

None

G 120-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal is clearly borrowed from the I-2 provisions of the 2015 IBC and earlier editions. As the push is to more home-like living design in I-1 occupancies, these uses located open to a corridor will help foster that idea. The safety aspects provided for such features in I-2 are mirrored here.

Assembly Action :

None

G 121-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The issue of cooking facilities in dormitories needs to be addressed. It occurs and the code doesn't clearly address. The provision is modeled after the provisions allowed for the I-2 occupancy. A related changed is planned for the IFC during the cycle next year. The committee raised the concern that if these occupancies are used during the summer as an R-1 whether accessibility provisions may come into play.

Assembly Action :

None

G 122-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal attempts to address a security issue that is beyond the typical scope of the IBC. The laundry list of 'uses' is incomplete and uses terminology that is inconsistent. Security isn't just an issue for residential occupancies.

Assembly Action :

None

G 123-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: During the development of the 2015 IBC, such cooking facilities were allowed for I-2 facilities. I-1 with a concept of being more home-like should also be allowed the same options based on the same safeguards.

Assembly Action :

None

G 124-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal moves text essential to understanding the scope of this use from its current location and places it in the definition. The concern raised was whether this was putting a technical criteria in the definition. In this case it is an element of distinguish this use from other uses.

Assembly Action :

None

G 125-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides clarity for the electrical systems installed in ambulatory care facilities. It provides consistent regulations to those applying to Group I occupancies.

Assembly Action :

None

G 126-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This code change closes a loophole and thereby improves the code. However, the 150 square foot threshold is a concern. 200 square feet may be more appropriate, but it is not critical enough to disapprove the proposal.

Assembly Action :

None

G 127-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was reluctance to creating a whole new section to just provide a pointer to provisions in the Fire Code. There are construction related criteria in the IFC, but it was also pointed out that additional provisions are also in the IPC. The was support for moving the construction provisions found in the IFC into the IBC rather than simply a pointer.

Assembly Action :

None

G 128-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee acknowledged that the issue of building resilience should be addressed, but it needs a more comprehensive, global discussion by a broad range of our constituents. This proposal is not the result of any such discussion. The codes have improved over the years. Buildings built under current codes are already more resilient compared to historic codes. The structural provisions for resisting earthquake, flooding and high wind have been enhanced numerous times. The building code can't control infrastructure; such is a local decision. This proposal would eliminate the incentives to install sprinklers. The committee did not find the cost impact estimates to be realistic. Overall the committee concluded that this proposal doesn't pass muster as a reasonable approach to the issue.

Assembly Action :

None

G 129-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt this was not only inappropriate to be placed in the IBC, that adding such language would be contradictory to provisions in Chapter 32 which allows buildings to encroach into the public right of way - by crossing the street property line. The issue raised is one that is more akin to zoning and land subdivision than it is of building code. The proposal as written would force consolidations of properties. While some jurisdictions currently require such action. Many allow legal agreements and other documentation to clarify what is the 'lot' for a particular development. By stating that no lot line can be crossed, the code would discourage if not eliminate alternative solutions.

Assembly Motion:
Online Vote Results:
Assembly Action :

As Modified
Failed - Support: 30.67% (96) Oppose: 69.33% (217)
None

Online Floor Modification:

503.1 General. Unless otherwise specifically modified in Chapter 4 and this chapter, building height, number of stories and building area shall not exceed the limits specified in Sections 504 and 506 based on the type of construction as determined by Section 602 and the occupancies as determined by Section 302 except as modified hereafter. Building height, number of stories and building area provisions shall be applied independently. Each portion of a building separated by one or more fire walls complying with Section 706 shall be considered to be a separate building. Buildings shall not cross lot lines.

Exception: Party walls in compliance with Section 706.1.1 may cross property lines.

G 130-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal clearly separates the scoping of fire walls from the design requirements for fire walls. Section 706.1 is the location of the standards for fire walls and is similar other provisions in Chapter 7 which are the 'cook books' for each type of wall and horizontal assemblies. The committee hopes that this will reduce requests for duplication of other systems such as sprinkler systems, electrical systems, etc, in each portion of a structure separated by fire walls. The new text in 503.1 clearly states why fire walls are needed for addressing height and area limitations as well as type of construction.

Assembly Action :

None

G 131-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found this proposal really confusing. They found the requirement for roof use to be related to the use of the story below totally inappropriate as the use of the roof may be totally different than those located on the top story. The reference to Section 506.2 was unclear whether the intent was addressing the roof use or the whole building. Adding 'occupied roofs' into Section 1004.5 makes sense and should be included in anything that is returned. The committee later expressed encouragement to the proponents of all the occupied roof proposals to attempt to work together to create a solution for consideration at the public comment hearings.

Assembly Action :

None

G 132-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would have the net effect of requiring buildings to be protected from themselves. The committee did not find this necessary or appropriate. These issues are adequately addressed in other provisions of the code including Chapter 6 and 12.

Assembly Action :

None

G 133-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

TABLE 1020.1

CORRIDOR FIRE-RESISTANCE RATING

| OCCUPANCY | OCCUPANT LOAD SERVED BY CORRIDOR | REQUIRED FIRE-RESISTANCE RATING (hours) | |
|------------------------|--|--|------------------------------------|
| | | Without sprinkler system | With sprinkler system ^e |
| H-1, H-2, H-3 | All | Not Permitted | 1 ^d |
| H-4, H-5 | Greater than 30 | Not Permitted | 1 ^c |
| A, B, E, F, M, S, U | Greater than 30 | 1 | 0 |
| R | Greater than 10 | Not Permitted 1 ^d | 0.5 ^c / 1 ^d |
| I-2 ^a , I-4 | All | Not Permitted | 0 |
| I-1, I-3 | All | Not Permitted | 1 ^{b,c} |

a. For requirements for occupancies in Group I-2, see Sections 407.2 and 407.3.

b. For a reduction in the fire-resistance rating for occupancies in Group I-3, see Section 408.8.

c. Buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2 where allowed.

d. Group R-3 and R-4 buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.3. See Section 903.2.8 for occupancies where automatic sprinkler systems are permitted in accordance with Section 903.3.1.3.

Committee Reason: The proposal is essentially a clarification within the broader reorganization of Chapter 5 height and area provisions adopted into the 2015 code. The change with the modification clarifies what the installation of a 13-d sprinkler system does or doesn't grant.

Assembly Action :

None

G 134-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is another of a group of proposals trying to address the issue of use of building's roof. This proposal was found to be incomplete in addressing the issue. Perhaps a solution might be a new section in Chapter 4 where all rules for use of a roof could be gathered in one place. Simply stating that use of a roof isn't a story doesn't address safety of occupants of a roof. The committee later expressed encouragement to the proponents of all the occupied roof proposals to attempt to work together to create a solution for consideration at the public comment hearings.

Assembly Action :

None

G 135-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would have significant cost impacts to a reasonable construction type. The code already addresses the differences between wood frame construction versus other materials in the height and area tables. If this were to be adopted, it either belongs in Chapter 33 which addresses safeguards during construction or in the IFC. The code provides for the local code official to provide firefighting access during construction; such is a local issue that shouldn't be overridden in the national code. The committee saw this as having a killing effect on development of housing in locations which are infills to the existing urban fabric. The proposal would have a permanent impact on a building for an issue that appears to be primarily related to the construction phase of projects. There was no justification provided for the proposed 1/3 diagonal separation of the proposed roads.

Assembly Action :

None

G 136-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The code change is onerous for mezzanines. The code permits lowered ceiling heights in portions of the egress pathway. The committee did not find that the proponent's reasonings justified changing the height requirements for mezzanines.

Assembly Action :

None

G 137-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal was found to be an appropriate clean up of text addressing the situation where both mezzanines and equipment platforms are in the same space. It closes a potential loophole between the two provisions.

Assembly Action :

None

G 138-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

505.2.1 Area limitation. The aggregate area of a *mezzanine* or *mezzanines* within a room shall be not greater than one-third of the floor area of that room or space in which they are located. The enclosed portion of a room shall not be included in a determination of the floor area of the room in which the *mezzanine* is located. In determining the allowable *mezzanine* area, the area of the *mezzanine* shall not be included in the floor area of the room.

Where a room contains both a *mezzanine* and an *equipment platform*, the aggregate area of the two raised floor levels shall be not greater than two-thirds of the floor area of that room or space in which they are located.

Exceptions:

1. The aggregate area of *mezzanines* in buildings and structures of Type I or II construction for special industrial occupancies in accordance with Section 503.1.1 shall be not greater than two-thirds of the floor area of the room.
2. The aggregate area of *mezzanines* in buildings and structures of Type I or II construction shall be not greater than one-half of the floor area of the room in buildings and structures equipped throughout with an *approved automatic sprinkler system* in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 and an *approved emergency voice/alarm communication system* in accordance with Section 907.5.2.2.
3. The aggregate area of a *mezzanine* within a *dwelling unit* that is located in a building equipped throughout with an approved automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2 shall not be greater than one-half of the floor area of the room, provided:
 1. ~~The mezzanine, other than~~ Except for enclosed closets and bathrooms, ~~the mezzanine~~ shall be open to the room in which such *mezzanine* is located.
 2. The opening to the room shall be unobstructed except for walls not more than 42 inches (1067 mm) in height, columns and posts, and
 3. Exceptions to Section 505.2.3 shall not be permitted.

Committee Reason: The change provides design flexibility for dwelling unit design without impacting safety. It will likely not result in a significant increase in occupant load within any individual dwelling unit. The modification provided better clarity for the first sub-item to this new third exception. The visibility requirement of the mezzanine is maintained.

Assembly Action :

None

G 139-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal is a clean up of text within the exceptions, specifically between #5 and #2. It also provides consistency with Chapter 10.

Assembly Action :

None

G 140-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Items G140-15, G152-15 and G171-15 were considered together. The committee disapproved all three. They were unconvinced by the proponents' reason statement that these changes are the way to address buildings in higher risk areas. The committee felt that the imposing this requirement on Seismic zones C and D - but not E and F was not logical.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 141-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the change would allow consistent sizes with out occupancies where greenhouses will be allowed or commonly occur. There is still relatively low levels of combustible materials in these facilities.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 142-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal is another one addressing fires during construction. This is already adequately address via the authorities granted in Chapter 33 and the IFC. There is nothing which assures the space required by this proposal would actually stay open and functional. Construction crews will use such spaces for staging of materials and similar activities.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 143-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language with respect to yards versus courts versus open space, in the proposal is unclear. This is a fire code issue and shouldn't be brought into the IBC. The definition would imply that a building would be required to address a fire access route all the way back to a fire station. A private land owner can not be expected to control what is going on in the public rights of way.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 144-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistent with its action on G142-15, the committee disproved this item. Again this is trying to address risks during construction and such should be addressed in the IBC.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 145-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would impact unlimited area buildings, and the committee felt the code already adequately addresses the yards surrounding such buildings. Yards are clearly defined. The language would appear to impose a fire access road completely around such buildings. The proposal adds uncertainty to these provisions.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 146-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides clarification regarding spaces associated with the indoor sports facilities. It assures that sprinkler systems are not waived in spaces of potentially high fuel loading such as storage and vendor spaces. These spaces are often located directly under the arena's seating. These spaces are frequently unoccupied during events and a fire in such spaces could go unnoticed for a potentially hazardous length of time.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 147-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee found the increase from 10% to 50% to be excessive and has the net effect of defeating the mixed occupancy provisions of the code. You could end up with assembly areas, storage areas, laundry facilities being half a building without proper sprinkler protection. If it would to be revised for public comment, it should include more specificity regarding the occupancies allowed under this exception and make it clear they are ancillary to the residential use.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 148-15

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Committee Action: | Disapproved |
| Committee Reason: This proposal is unclear as to the extent of application in a mixed occupancy building. If the Group I-2 occupancy is only a minor portion of the building, it could impose significant requirements onto the balance of the building. An attempt to modify the language for clarity wasn't found to be clarifying. The text doesn't say whether the language 'shall apply' is meant to apply throughout the building or throughout a smaller area. | |
| Assembly Action : | None |

G 149-15

| | |
|---|------------------------------|
| Committee Action: | Approved as Submitted |
| Committee Reason: The proposal provides consistency of language through the several sections and recognizes that the provisions of Chapter 5 now address building height and number of stories as separate criteria. | |
| Assembly Action : | None |

G 150-15

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Committee Action: | Disapproved |
| Committee Reason: The proposal was found to be confusing. It adds undefined terminology (un-separated uses) which will be confused with non-separated uses. The impact on high-rise buildings was of particular concern. | |
| Assembly Action : | None |

G 151-15

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| Committee Action: | Approved as Submitted |
| Committee Reason: The proposal is a good clarification regarding the interaction between occupancy separations and the establishment of separate fire areas. The committee found the wording a little awkward but felt it does convey the intent of the proposal. | |
| Assembly Action : | None |

G 152-15

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Committee Action: | Disapproved |
| Committee Reason: Items G140-15, G152-15 and G171-15 were considered together. The committee disapproved all three. They were unconvinced by the proponents reason statement that these changes are the way to address buildings in higher risk areas. The committee felt that the imposing of a minimum of 2 hour fire resistive construction to be excessive. | |
| Assembly Action : | None |

G 153-15

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Committee Action: | Disapproved |
| Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal was unclear and that the intent of the proposal is already covered in the code in Table 602. | |
| Assembly Action : | None |

G 154-15

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| Committee Action: | Approved as Submitted |
| Committee Reason: The proposal provides a needed link to the standards for these facilities found in the Fire Code. | |
| Assembly Action : | None |
| Analysis. The proposal contains a typographical error. The section referenced in the IFC should be shown as Section 608, not 609. | |

G 155-15

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Committee Action: | Disapproved |
| Committee Reason: The table is addressing where separations are required, the proposal adds requirements regarding the room itself. This change goes beyond the purpose of the table. This seems to be in conflict with G154-15 which removes the provisions and sends the user to the IFC. | |
| Assembly Action : | None |

G 156-15

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Committee Action: | Disapproved |
|--------------------------|--------------------|

Committee Reason: Consistent with the approval of G154-15, and disapproval of G155-15, the committee disapproved this proposal because again it was addressing the room for the batteries rather than addressing room separation. The latter is the purpose of the table.

Assembly Action :

None

G 157-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The provisions for electrical rooms found in the National Electrical Code (NEC) can be an unwelcome surprise if not found early in the design process. Many feel that because there are construction aspects to the NEC requirements that they should be located in the IBC. The committee found that the proposal and the version contained in the proposed modification still contained too many unclear performance elements. The lack of specificity would result in uneven compliance. Among the questions raised was coordination with the requirements for multiple exits from an electrical room.

Assembly Motion:

As Modified

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 20.63% (65) Oppose: 79.37% (250)

Assembly Action :

None

Online Floor Modification:

509.5 Electrical room construction. Rooms containing transformers shall be in accordance with Section 1010.1.10 and with this section.

1. Where Table 509 only specifies separation without protection for rooms containing electrical transformers, the room shall be in accordance with the following:

1.1. Ventilation openings in surrounding building exterior walls or roof/ceiling construction shall be provided with an open area of not less than 3 square inches for each kVA of transformer capacity or not less than 1 square foot, whichever is greater. Ventilation openings shall be in accordance with ~~Table Sections 705.8 and~~ 716.5 and protected with screens, grating or louvers. The ventilation openings shall be located in accordance with one of the following:

1.1.1. Provide 100 percent of ventilation openings near the ceiling of the electrical room; or

1.1.2. Provide half of the ventilation openings at the floor and the balance of the openings near the ceiling of the electrical room.

1.2. Electrical rooms shall be provided at the exterior of the building to allow natural ventilation in accordance with Item 1, or shall be provided with mechanical ventilation located and sized to effectively control the transformer full load losses and limit the temperature rise in accordance with the transformer rating.

1.3. Where the room is located at slab on grade condition, a concrete slab not less than 4 inches thick shall be provided.

1.4. Doors from the electrical room shall swing in the direction of egress travel away from the electrical room. Doors shall be self-closing to a latched and locked position and shall be provided with panic hardware.

1.5. Pipes and ducts, other than those that service the electrical room, shall not pass through an electrical room.

2. Where Table 509 specifies both separation and protection for rooms containing electrical transformers, the room shall be in accordance with Item 1 and the following:

2.1. ~~the~~ The room shall be separated and protected as specified in Table 509 or it shall be located in by an enclosure constructed of concrete or similar materials providing not less than ~~three~~ one hour fire-resistance-rated construction ~~with and protected as specified in Table 509, or without protection the enclosure shall be increased to 3 hour fire-resistance-rated construction. In either case, opening protectives shall be provided in accordance with~~ ~~Table Sections 705.8 and~~ 716.5.

G 158-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The complete elimination of an area limitation of these facilities was not acceptable. If they are larger than 10% of a story there is other avenues in the code to address these uses.

Assembly Action :

None

G 159-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Incidental use provisions are 'use' related and therefore has an impact on decisions of height and area in a building design. The committee felt that Chapter 5 is the better location. Without a compelling reason to move the location, people are used to where these provisions are found, and should remain in this location.

Assembly Action :

None

G 160-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides design flexibility to address unique sites. It is consistent with other provisions of the code where you support rated construction with structure of like rating. This is not about gaming the intent of this provision, but solves a real life design issue in hillside locations. The word 'horizontal' can be a hang up in the reasonable solutions to a steep site.

Assembly Action :

None

G 161-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal's intent is to clarify the construction of the horizontal assembly. The committee suggested that a better clarification if the change remains in Item 1 is to simply say the horizontal assembly is made of non-combustible materials. An alternative suggested was to move the construction requirement for the horizontal assembly to be located in Item 2 - which specifies the construction of the building below the horizontal assembly.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 43.73% (129) Oppose: 56.27% (166)

Assembly Action :

None

G 162-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found the proposal to be a flawed concept. Section 510.6 has its own set of parameters for the special design allowed under that section; 510.2 also has its unique set of parameters for special design. It is irrelevant to try to take one element of the criteria of Section 510.6 and superimpose it into 510.2.

Assembly Action :

None

G 163-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: If the two are equivalent, there shouldn't be any need to provide the various performance parameters. The change could simply be that the lower building could be a Type III building rated to 3 hours. There appears to be conflicts with the reference to Section 722. Maintenance and inspection procedures do not belong in this part of the code.

Assembly Action :

None

G 164-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found that the proposed removal of sprinkler based allowances for greater area as well as other tradeoffs. The committee expressed concerns over the veracity of the study reference by the proponent. The proposed requirement for minimum two hour rated construction was found to be unjustified.

Assembly Action :

None

G 165-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was uncomfortable that the proposal would allow a more than doubling of the height (Number of stories) allowed in buildings of Type IV construction which would result in an overall increase in fuel load. The committee recognized the hard work that went into the proposal and that it included provisions intended to assure that a 9 story wood frame building was a safe one. The committee felt that the text requiring 50 foot separation was unclear whether it applied to one side, or all sides, of the building. While testimony was clear that the proposal required 2 hour construction, and such construction would need to comply with the tested assemblies, the committee was unclear regarding the testing of these assemblies and hoped the language would be stronger regarding such. The Chapter 7 references appear to be to specific attachments to steel and concrete framing and not to wood as would occur in these buildings. There was discomfort that such a building could be the upper building of a podium structure under Section 510.2. Finally, it was suggested that the exit separations be allowed to be of other materials in addition to the CLT as currently listed in the proposal.

Assembly Motion:

As Modified

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 12.11% (43) Oppose: 87.89% (312)

Assembly Action :

None

Online Floor Modification:

510.12 Group R-1 and R-2 buildings of Type IV HT construction. The height and story limitations for buildings of Type IV HT construction in Groups R-1 and R-2 shall be increased to nine stories and 100 feet (30 480 mm) provided all of the following are met:

1. The ~~heavy timber load bearing~~ construction shall be of solid heavy timber elements not less than 2 hour fire resistance rated and protected with a minimum of one layer of 5/8 inch type X gypsum board on all interior wall surfaces and a minimum of two layers of 5/8 inch type X gypsum board on the ceiling side of all horizontal assemblies.
2. The building has a fire separation distance of not less than 50 feet (15 240 mm).
3. The exits are segregated in an area enclosed by a cross laminated timber 2 hour fire-resistance-rated walls protected with two layers of 5/8 inch type X gypsum board or equivalent on the room side of all walls adjacent to the enclosure.
4. Wall and ceiling assemblies with multiple layers of gypsum board shall be permitted to be furred with noncombustible or fire retardant treated wood furring provided the cavity is filled with securely attached mineral wool insulation and at least one layer of gypsum board is directly attached to the heavy timber structure. Only the layers of gypsum board applied directly to the heavy timber in accordance with the applicable E119 or UL 263 test report shall be utilized to meet the 2 hour required fire resistance rating. Multiple layers of gypsum board shall be permitted to be secured to furring as required in Section 722.5.1.2.1 or Figure 722.5.1(3) for columns and in Section 722.3.2.5 for walls. Attachment of multi layer gypsum wallboard to ceilings shall be permitted to be as required for single assemblies attached to resilient channels in Table 721.1(3) and the base layer or layers shall be permitted to be attached directly to the Type IV structure as required by item 21 of Table 721.1(3). Other attachment shall be permitted to be used if specified by the manufacturer and approved.
5. Buildings of Type IV construction shall be permitted to be located over a building with multiple occupancy groups meeting the provisions of Section 510.2.

G 166-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was the last of a group of proposals trying to address occupied roofs. The committee felt that the introduction of temporary use into this added to the confusion. What the proposal addressed could meet the definition of story and really is no longer an 'occupied roof'. There is no minimum size of the cover which would trigger the requirements. This one, compared to the others did attempt to address fire code issues. There was concern that if this is temporary, that 180 days allowed for temporary uses/structures would be too long a time period. The committee expressed encouragement to the proponents of all the occupied roof proposals to attempt to work together to create a solution for consideration at the public comment hearings.

Assembly Action :

None

G 167-15

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: There has been confusion and controversy through the years whether the primary frame was included in the exemption from fire protection as specified in footnote b to Table 601. Interpretations have varied. the committee approved this change because they concluded that it reflects the very original intent of the table and this footnote.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 168-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The code allows what the proposed language in the new footnote would clearly allow, but it requires assembly of information from multiple parts of the code and isn't readily understood from the assembly of those various pieces. This new footnote makes it clear how those pieces can be brought together.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 169-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is trying to inject a fire resistance construction as related to fire separation distance into Table 601. Such is not the purpose of Table 601 but is the purpose and intent of table 602.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 170-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee appreciated the effort to reorganize these provisions, but there were concerns that the proposal was incomplete. Testimony indicated that some key provisions were missing. Specifically identified by the committee was the nailing of furring strips are not found in the section suggested by the proponents; and information provided elsewhere does not adequately address foam insulation. There were two proposed modifications that would have improved the text of the proposal. The committee was uncomfortable with the reduction of the list currently in Section 603.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 171-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Items G140-15, G152-15 and G171-15 were considered together. The committee disapproved all three. They were unconvinced by the proponents' reason statement that these changes are the way to address buildings in higher risk areas. The committee felt that the impact of this proposal would be to essentially ban non-rated construction.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 172-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was uncomfortable that the research does show equivalency between walls of non-combustible materials and the wood products and engineered wood products that would be allowed by this change. These are not non-combustible materials.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 173-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal creates confusion because it would allow fire retardant treated wood in the exterior wall regardless of how it is used and not limited to specified structural elements. The committee preferred the solution provided by G175-15.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 174-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this item consistent with its disapproval of G173-15. G175-15 was the preferred solution to the issue.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 175-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This solution was preferred over that proposed in G173 and G174-15. The revised text is very clear and avoids the potential confusion that FRTW could be installed in these walls for other purposes.

Assembly Action : None

G 176-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The intent when FRTW was brought into the code was to allow both exterior wall and interior applications. If there was a problem with FRTW in these locations, the fire services would be raising the red flags. The committee was not presented with any data that indicates that the use of FRTW in these locations was causing problems.

Assembly Action : None

G 177-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee understood that one of the legacy codes included text which accomplished the intent of this change. Building materials have evolved and the regulations have evolved, the committee didn't see the need to resurrect a 20 year old provision. The exterior 'noncombustible' material isn't specified. If a wall has been tested 2-hour assembly with FRTW, why isn't that assembly acceptable.

Assembly Action : None

G 178-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal clarity for the use and application the various engineered wood products for both the designers and local building officials.

Assembly Action : None

G 179-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides necessary consolidation and eliminates duplicative text between Chapters 6 and 23. The revised table is sorely needed to make help the users of the code. Moving the table to Chapter 23 is totally appropriate. The was comfort that with a detailed comparison this is a good clean up with no technical changes. As with any major revision, there remained concerns that all pieces have been maintained and there might be some unintended consequences. The new organization provides better logic for the requirements.

Assembly Action : None

G 180-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is a companion piece to G179-15. G179 reorganizes the heavy timber provisions. This change provides corrections to the various new section numbers resulting from G179-15.

Assembly Action : None

G 181-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was found to be confusing as to what was the real intent regarding the concealed spaces and what is allowed with sprinklers in these spaces. Further in the confusion is what is the intent if these spaces includes FRTW versus untreated wood. The committee was uncomfortable with third option for the treatment of concealed spaces.

Assembly Action : None

G 182-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found the proposed text very confusing. They felt that the term 'associated element' was undefined. They weren't sure what the phrasing 'rated as required for the wall' was going to accomplish.

Assembly Action : None

G 183-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the solution provided by G184-15. This proposal would result in the wood versus the wall having the minimum dimension, and therefore is grammatically confused.

Assembly Action : None

G 184-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the intent of the requirements for minimum thickness of CLT. It will coordinate with G179-15 the committee approved earlier. There was concern that the change results in there being no minimum thickness required for FRTW used in these locations.

Assembly Action : None

G 185-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee found this to be a good additional reference to another allowance for combustible materials allowed for Types I and II construction. It is consistent in intent with many of the other items listed in this section.

Assembly Action : None

G 186-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

1203.2 Roof ventilation. Roof assemblies shall be ventilated in accordance with this section or shall ~~meet the unvented attic or unvented enclosed rafter assembly requirements of comply with~~ Section 1203.3.

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the provisions regarding ventilation and what is unvented. The modification removed extra text that had proved confusing.

Assembly Action : None

G 187-15

Committee Action: Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : None

G 188-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal didn't include data to support this technical change. The footnote was confusing because its placement in the table appears to limit its applicaiton to Climate Zone 3B, but the footnote itself addresses 3A, 3B and 3C; therefore the application is unclear. The cost impact statement is questionable because this change would add a construction requirement, but the proponent says there would be no impact on cost of construction.

Assembly Action : None

G 189-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

1203.4 Under-floor ventilation. The space between the bottom of the floor joists and the earth under any building except spaces occupied by basements or cellars shall be provided with ventilation in accordance with Sections 1203.4.1, 1203.4.2 ~~and or~~ 1203.4.3.

1203.4.1 Ventilation openings. Ventilation openings through foundation walls shall be provided. The openings shall be placed so as to provide cross ventilation of the under-floor space. The net area of ventilation openings shall be in accordance with Section 1203.4.1.1 or 1203.4.1.2. Ventilation openings shall be covered for their height and width with any of the following materials, provided that the least dimension of the covering shall be not greater than $\frac{1}{4}$ inch (6.4 mm):

1. Perforated sheet metal plates not less than 0.070 inch (1.8 mm) thick.
2. Expanded sheet metal plates not less than 0.047 inch (1.2 mm) thick.
3. Cast-iron grilles or gratings.
4. Extruded load-bearing vents.
5. Hardware cloth of 0.035-inch (0.89 mm) wire or heavier.
6. Corrosion-resistant wire mesh, with the least dimension not greater than $\frac{1}{8}$ inch (3.2 mm).
7. Operable louvres, where ventilation is provided in accordance with Section 1203.4.1.2.

~~For buildings in flood hazard areas as established in Section 1612.3, the openings for under-floor ventilation shall be designed and installed in accordance with ASCE 24.~~

1203.4.4 Flood hazard areas. For buildings in flood hazard areas as established in Section 1612.3, the openings for under-floor ventilation shall be deemed as meeting the flood opening requirements of ASCE 24 provided that the ventilation openings are designed and installed in accordance with ASCE 24.

Committee Reason: The proposal cleans up the section and provides appropriate references to the IMC and IECC. Modifications place text in the appropriate location and assure that the 3 design options are clearly options and not all required simultaneously. The committee expressed concerns regarding two terms which used and undefined. As they are not common terms, the proponents were encouraged to provide public comment to address. The terms in question are 'extremely cold' and 'detrimental loss of energy'.

Assembly Action : None

G 190-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal allows for a performance based option for complying with the requirements of this section..

Assembly Action :

None

G 191-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The code already sufficiently addresses these issues. However, we may need to address smaller square footages in the code in the future.

Assembly Action :

None

G 192-15

THIS IS A 3 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD THE THE IBC GENERAL COMMITTEE, PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE AND PART III WAS HEARD BY THE IPC/IPSDC COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This helps clarify the code and provides the designer with valuable information. The pointer to the IEBC is valid and useful. This action is consistent with previous actions by the IPC and IMC committees.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. It provides a clear connection between the IBC and the IMC and IFGC.

Assembly Action :

None

Part III

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. Part III of this code change proposal, considered by the IPC Committee, addressed the scope and application of the International Plumbing Code. The action taken by the IPC Committee on this proposal coupled with the voting actions at the 2015 Public Comment Hearings and the Online Governmental Consensus Vote will be limited to an advisory recommendation to the ICC Board of Directors who will determine the final disposition on these proposed changes.

G 193-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Toilet room requirements and the required number of plumbing fixtures are building design issues and, as such, this information should remain in the building code. Furthermore, the required number of plumbing fixtures are based on occupant load and the occupant load is also addressed in the building code.

Assembly Action :

None

G 194-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

TABLE 3001.2

ELEVATORS AND CONVEYING SYSTEMS AND COMPONENTS

| TYPE | STANDARD |
|--|---|
| Elevators, escalators, dumbwaiters, moving walks, material lifts | ASME A17.1/CSA B44, <u>ASME A17.7/CSA B44.7</u> |
| Belt manlifts | ASME A90.1 |
| Conveyors and related equipment | ASME B20.1 |

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Automotive lifts | ALI ALCTV |
| Platform lifts, stairway chairlifts, wheelchair lifts | ASME A18.1 |
| <u>Industrial scissors lifts</u> | <u>ANSI MH29.1</u> |

Committee Reason: This proposal adds standards that clarify the application of the code section. The modification further clarifies the application of the proposal.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 195-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

3001.2 Emergency elevator communication systems for the deaf, hard of hearing and speech impaired. An emergency two-way communication system shall be provided that:

1. Is a visual ~~and~~ text-based and a video-based ~~24/7~~ live interactive system;
2. Is fully accessible by the: deaf and hard of hearing ~~and~~ the speech impaired, ~~the visually impaired,~~ and shall include voice-only options for hearing individuals.
3. ~~Is located between the elevator car~~The ability to communicate with emergency personnel utilizing existing video conferencing technology ~~and the local emergency authorities at a point outside of the hoistway~~ chat / text software, or other approved technology.

Committee Reason: This belongs in the code. A significant part of the population is serviced by this proposal where currently there is a void. Current technologies should be able to be readily adapted to meet the requirements of this proposal. The committee approved modifications are intended to provide more flexibility and options for manufacturers and for compliance.

Assembly Motion: **Disapprove**
Online Vote Results: **Successful** - Support: 69.77% (217) Oppose: 30.23% (94)
Assembly Action : **Disapproved**

G 196-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The previous committee approval of G 194-14 as modified has addressed these concerns.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 197-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is appropriate for the IEBC and a corresponding/companion code change has been previously approved by the IEBC Committee.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 198-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent has not provided a reason for the proposed reduction in height from 4 to 3 stories.

Assembly Action : **None**

G 199-15

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : **None**

G 200-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The study cited in the testimony on the floor as substantiation for this proposal is still underway. It is premature to make a decision on this proposal before the study is completed and adequate technical justification is provided.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**
Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 21.11% (72) Oppose: 78.89% (269)
Assembly Action : **None**

G 201-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposed change provides much needed clarity by adding a rating requirement. Further modification in the Public Comment process may be beneficial.

Assembly Action :

None

G 202-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal as it clarifies the intent of previous editions of the code.

Assembly Action :

None

G 203-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal significantly clarifies the intent. However, the ability to move fire equipment between floors may also be a concern.

Assembly Action :

None

G 204-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is a necessary clarification to the code that addresses items that are commonly misinterpreted.

Assembly Action :

None

G 205-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee action to disapprove this proposal is consistent with previous committee action to approve G 203-15.

Assembly Action :

None

G 206-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There are some portions of this proposal that may be valid. However, there is a common misunderstanding that fire service elevators are intended to transfer one team of firefighters. The real object is to stay operational for the entire duration of the fire in order to move firefighting equipment and injured firefighters, etc.

The proposal does not clearly state that the approval is intended to be by the fire service.

Assembly Action :

None

G 207-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Where there are many elevators in a building, it should be possible to evaluate what the real need for emergency power requirements is.

The addition of the number of occupant self evacuation elevators is beneficial.

The committee recommends that the CTC or other parties submit public comments to: 1) Clarify Item 2 to give a start time for the 15 minute evacuation period; 2) Indicate the signage that is required, beyond what is already required; 3) Indicate the percentage of disabled occupants that should be assumed in the analysis.

Assembly Action :

None

G 208-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: It is a big challenge dealing with garages and open parking structures and this proposal helps. Open parking structures in particular are very low hazard.

Assembly Action :

None

G 209-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There are inconsistencies with this proposal and the radon requirements in the International Residential Code. This belongs in the appendix as it should be a jurisdictional decision. That would also be consistent with the IRC. The fatal flaw is that, as written, the proposal requires all means of remediation be implemented.

Assembly Motion:**As Modified****Online Vote Results:****Failed** - Support: 15.85% (39) Oppose: 84.15% (207)**Assembly Action :****None****Online Floor Modification:**

~~3005.1 General. For the purposes of Section 3005, buildings with crawl spaces shall include all buildings with a floor supported above grade.~~

3002.1 Membrane materials. Acceptable soil gas retarder membranes shall consist of a single layer of polyethylene, not less than 0.006-inch (6 mils) thick with a maximum perm rating of 0.3. Polyvinyl chloride (PVC), ethylene diene ter polymer (EPDM), neoprene or other non-deteriorating, non-porous material ~~may be used instead of polyethylene, provide the installed thickness of the alternate material has greater or equal tensile strength, resistance to water vapor transmission, resistance to puncture, and resistance to deterioration determined in accordance with ASTM E 154.~~ The membrane shall be placed to minimize seams and to cover all of the soil below the building floor.

3003.3.1 Sealants. Sealants shall be selected and installed in compliance with ASTM C 920 ~~and ASTM C 1199.~~

1. Sealant materials shall be compatible with the materials they join, including curing compounds and admixtures, and with materials that will be applied over them, including floor finishing materials.
2. Field-molded sealants shall be installed in sealant reservoirs proportioned, cleaned of laitance and prepared in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations. For elastomeric sealants, this generally requires the installation of a bond breaker or backer rod shall be provided where required by the sealant manufacturer's installation instructions. Where installed sealant is not protected by a finished floor or other protective surface, it shall be suitable to withstand the traffic to which it will be exposed. Waterstops shall be preformed from polyvinyl chloride or other non-corrosive material.

G 210-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal requires a fire evacuation analysis. Not all buildings may need that. Furthermore, the design team will be required to hire a separate expert, which is cost prohibitive.

Assembly Action :**None****G 211-15****Committee Action:****Approved as Modified**

~~3111.1.3 Guards. Installations shall comply with Section 1015.6 prior to installation of solar thermal systems or photovoltaic solar energy systems.~~

Committee Reason: The change is a very good cleanup. Maintable parts are covered in Section 1015. The modification removed a fatal flaw in the original proposal.

Assembly Action :**None****G 212-15****Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The ASCE standard addresses both tensile and membrane/air supported structures, which is a good addition to the code.

Assembly Action :**None****G 213-15****Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: These issues are already covered by the code in Section 3103.1.1. The code official can already tell you what requirements must be applied for a temporary structure. The proposal as written says you must do everything. That may be overkill in certain circumstances. We need similar requirements, but these need work. We need a one time permit for short term permits that can be renewed annually. As written, the proposal could put very onerous requirements on small tents that are up for only a few days. The thresholds are not right. It should state what requirements in Chapter 16 must be complied with. This is written as an exception to Chapter 16. That is rather awkward. The proposal needs work, though the general concept is good and should be pursued.

Assembly Motion:**As Submitted****Online Vote Results:****Successful** - Support: 59.39% (196) Oppose: 40.61% (134)**Assembly Action :****Approved as Submitted****G 214-15****Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Exception 2 conflicts with ADA requirements. An elevator or lift for a temporary use structure that may only be there for 15 or 20 days or less is not realistic.

Assembly Action :**None****G 215-15****Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language and the flammability levels of the roof structure are problematic.

Assembly Action :

None

G 216-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

3104.5.2.2 Glass. The wall shall be constructed of a tempered, wired or laminated glass. ~~The glass wall and doors separating the interior of the building from the pedestrian walkway. The glass~~ shall be protected by an *automatic sprinkler system* in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 that, when actuated, shall completely wet the entire surface of interior sides of the wall or glass. Obstructions shall not be installed between the sprinkler heads and the wall or glass. The glass shall be in a gasketed frame and installed in such a manner that the framing system will deflect without breaking (loading) the glass before the sprinkler operates.

Committee Reason: This is a great and much needed cleanup to the code section. The modification further clarifies the proposal.

Assembly Action :

None

G 217-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal results in a massive and unreasonable increase in exit access travel distance.

Assembly Action :

None

G 218-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Trellises are not defined in Section 3105. Trellis requirements are not related to canopies and awnings. This is the wrong place for the provisions and the proposed changes do not improve the code.

Assembly Action :

None

G 219-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The concept is good. However, there are problems with the proposal as currently written. Definitions should not carry technical requirements. It may not be appropriate in the awnings and canopies section. It exempts R3 occupancies, but its application regarding R2 occupancies should be clarified. A percentage opening requirement might be more appropriate as opposed to the specific requirements that are proposed.

Assembly Motion:

As Modified

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 38.38% (109) Oppose: 61.62% (175)

Assembly Action :

None

Online Floor Modification:

SECTION 202

DEFINITIONS

TRELLIS. A permanent structure or architectural projection of rigid and open lattice construction that provides shading, identity or decoration. ~~Trellises may be constructed of lattice members so that a sphere of 10 inches minimum in diameter can pass through, or of members running in one direction only with a minimum clear spacing between the members of not less than 4 inches. A trellis is permitted to be structurally independent or supported by attachment to a building on one or more sides.~~

3105.3 Design and construction. Awnings, canopies and trellises shall be designed and constructed to withstand wind or other lateral loads and live loads as required by Chapter 16 with due allowance for shape, open construction and similar features that relieve the pressures or loads. Structural members shall be protected to prevent deterioration. Awnings and trellises shall have frames of noncombustible material, fire-retardant-treated wood, wood of Type IV size, heavy timber or 1-hour construction with combustible or noncombustible covers and shall be either fixed, retractable, folding or collapsible.

Exception: Trellises in Group R-3 occupancies shall be permitted to be constructed of any materials allowed by this code.

3105.3.1 Trellis. A trellis shall be constructed of lattice members so that a sphere of 10 inches minimum in diameter can pass through, or of members that are running in one direction only have a minimum clear spacing between the members of not less than 4 inches. A trellis is permitted to be structurally independent or supported by a building on one or more sides.

G 220-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: NFPA 286 is a much more robust test and, based on testimony, does not appear to hurt industry. As such, the proposal improves the code with no downside.

Assembly Action :

None

G 221-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal conflicts with the International Fire Code. It is almost right, but it is not quite right, though the concept is good. Under Section 3111.1.1.1, it should be split into parking and non-parking requirements. It should be clarified that the reduction in fire resistance is for the array and not the main structure of the building. Should it make a difference if the area under the array is sprinklered? Leaving it up to the code official to determine the gaps between arrays

is not appropriate. Under Section 3111.1.1.2, where it indicates there is "no use under the array," it is not clear what that means. Buildings with setbacks may also need to be addressed.

Assembly Action :

None

G 222-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

3112.6 Membrane structures. Greenhouses that are ~~considered~~ membrane structures shall comply with Section 3102.

Committee Reason: The proposal provides a helpful collection of regulations which affect greenhouses. The proposal primarily references other provisions of the code, but the other locations are quite scattered and the provisions may be missed. The modification removed an unnecessary word in the provision.

Assembly Action :

None

G 223-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is consistent and needed given what was just approved regarding relocatable buildings for the International Existing Building Code. The Commonwealth of Virginia has a program that is very similar to this and it works. Guidance in the code for this is welcome. We have had difficulty approving relocatable buildings and this would help significantly. We need to know what information should be required for approval for these types of structures.

Assembly Action :

None

G 224-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

G 225-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Security of a construction site should not be a building code issue. There is no mention of security in the scope and intent of the code. This is a means and methods issue and should be left up to the contractor and owner and possibly insurance companies. There are ambiguities in the proposal. Does this require a surveillance system? Does it require a full time guard? These issues could have considerable impact on building costs.

Assembly Action :

None

G 226-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is a need to address the general concepts in this proposal. However, there are problems this proposal. The provisions should be in the International Fire Code. The thresholds should be re-evaluated. We should not need someone on site 24/7 for small buildings. It is large construction sites that should be the focus. Calling out one type of construction is inappropriate. It should apply to all construction types. We cannot regulate arson and stupidity. As written it is unenforceable.

Assembly Motion:

As Modified

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 8.13% (27) Oppose: 91.87% (305)

Assembly Action :

None

Online Floor Modification:

3302.3.1 Special requirements for Type V buildings with combustible framing material. Where a building using combustible framing members exceeds the allowable height or number of stories for designation NS in Tables 504.3 or 504.4, the following shall be required. For the purposes of this section footnote d in Tables 504.3 or 505.4 shall not apply:

1. The fire prevention program superintendent responsibilities required in Section 3308 of the International Fire Code shall be provided by an approved agency. The approved agency shall meet the following requirements:
 - 1.1. Shall provide all information as necessary for the building official to determine that the agency meets the applicable requirements.
 - 1.2. Shall be objective, competent and independent from the contractor or owner responsible for the fire prevention program.
 - 1.3. Shall employ experienced personnel educated in supervising and evaluating safe jobsite practices to provide services to perform a fire watch and the enforcement of the fire prevention program.
2. Qualified personnel of the approved agency shall be onsite 24 hours of each day starting the day that combustible framing materials are delivered to the site up through completion of the building.
3. Smoking and cooking shall be prohibited.
4. Temporary heating and hot work shall be supervised by the fire prevention program superintendent or agency.

G 227-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The language "concentrations significant enough to cause environmental contamination" is ambiguous and unenforceable. The proposal regulates issues that a building official should not be involved with.

Assembly Action :

None

G 228-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The reference to the IFC is acceptable. However, there are many deficiencies in this proposal. These types of requirements do not belong in this section of the code. The proposal is redundant. The information is provided in the International Fire Code. The reference to only Type V construction is concerning. A 4 story building of Residential R3 or R4 occupancy with multiple dwelling units, regardless of area, would be required to have fire department vehicle access on all sides. Requirements related to fire hose extension may be preferable. Highly urban residential buildings and such buildings in rural areas on steeply sloped sites would not be able to comply with these provisions. This is consistent with previous committee action regarding fire department vehicle access on proposals G 143 and G 145. If this is about reviewing something before it is constructed, it belongs in Chapter 1.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 229-15

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is a beneficial change that coordinates requirements between the International Building Code and the International Existing Building Code.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 230-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would be extremely difficult to comply with. Systems are designed for the building in its completed state. This could not be achieved in a reasonable fashion. These types of decisions should be in the hands of the jurisdiction. If this were a good idea, which it is not, it would belong in the International Fire Code.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 231-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal goes way too far. The language is too wide open and could lead to interpretations that vary significantly from one jurisdiction to another. It should reference a standard to clarify its application. It places too much responsibility on the code official. It is proposed to the wrong chapter. It should be in the administrative provisions of the code (Chapter 1). This is already covered by OSHA 1926. Section 110 of the code also covers this subject.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 232-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This belongs in the International Fire Code. The committee had concerns regarding the language "where required by the building or fire official." This could put those officials under scrutiny under various circumstances.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 233-15

Committee Action:**Approved as Modified**

I103.1 Enclosure walls. Enclosure walls shall be permitted to be of any configuration, provided the open or glazed area of the longer wall and one additional wall is equal to at least 65 percent of the area below a minimum of 6 feet 8 inches (2032 mm) of each wall, measured from the floor. Openings shall be permitted to be enclosed with insect screening, translucent or transparent plastic conforming to the provisions of Sections 2606 through ~~2610~~ 2644, glass conforming to the provisions of Chapter 24, or any combination of the foregoing.

Committee Reason: This proposal provides needed guidance and clarifies the code. The committee modification corrects the section reference as suggested on the floor by the proponent.

Assembly Action :**None**

G 234-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The guideline referenced does not meet ICC requirements for referenced standards. The requirements are not inclusive enough. Provisions related to existing buildings should be in the International Existing Building Code, not the International Building Code. The term "substantially" is subjective and is not enforceable. However, the general concept may be worthy of further development.

Assembly Motion:**As Submitted****Online Vote Results:****Failed** - Support: 9.63% (31) Oppose: 90.37% (291)**Assembly Action :****None**

G 235-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Placing this information in an appendix gives jurisdictions a needed option for regulating prototype and repetitive building designs.

Assembly Action :

None

G 236-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There are many issues with this proposal, whether it is in an appendix or not. There are items that are missed and sentences that are incomplete. One table is missing Group I-2, I-3 and I-4 occupancies. This is a public policy question. It doesn't make sense to have a resilient building that may survive, while the surrounding infrastructure, such as roadways that lead to it, may not, leaving it on an island. It seems that what we really have is an infrastructure problem, which is not a building code issue.

Assembly Action :

None

G 237-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

ATTIC. The space between the ceiling framing of the top *story* and the underside of the roof ~~rafters~~.

Committee Reason: The committee felt that there was a strong need to improve the definition of attic. The proposal as modified by the committee provides a better definition than what is currently in the code. The committee realizes that there may be other further improvements that could be made and hopes that this will occur during the public comment process.

Assembly Action :

None

INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE - STRUCTURAL

2015 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

S 1-15

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that Section 1505.10 could be interpreted as an exception to the other parts of Section 1505. Therefore the inclusion of Section 1505 to apply to roof gardens and landscaped roofs is appropriate.

Assembly Action : **None**

S 2-15

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the new UL 2703 standard was appropriate and provides the test method for testing multiple panels for each racking system and that either standard can be used to establish a fire classification of the photovoltaic panel system.

Assembly Action : **None**

S 3-15

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that Section 1508, which referenced Chapter 23, was not required as the information in chapter 23 is also in Chapter 15. Further, the committee agreed that wood fiberboard was the current industry term for cellulosic fiberboard complying with ASTM C 208, Type II.

Assembly Action : **None**

S 4-15

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that keeping the codes current with updated referenced standards was important.

Assembly Action : **None**

S 5-15

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that removing Type I polyisocyanurate board would remove a product that is currently widely used in building construction without justification.

Assembly Action :

None

S 6-15

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that keeping the codes current with updated referenced standards was important.

Assembly Action :

None

S 7-15

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-GENERAL COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal because it clarifies and improves the code.

Assembly Action :

None

S 8-15

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-GENERAL COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is already allowed by Item 1. The reason statement appears to indicate that these could be unrated combustible panels, which is problematic. There are requirements based on fire separation distance, but there should also be a height limit. When does a fuel load become excessive? This is too open ended.

Assembly Action :

None

S 9-15

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-GENERAL COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is a good catch. It deletes repetitive, redundant material that serves no purpose in the code.

Assembly Action :

None

S 10-15

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal based on the following: No data was submitted to substantiate the need to these inspections; would result in unnecessary cost increase for relatively small buildings; on smaller projects these are evaluated by the code official; and code officials can require special inspection if they need to using Chapter 1 of the code.

Assembly Action :**None**

2015 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL EXISTING BUILDING CODE

EXISTING BUILDING CODE COMMITTEE

A. Hal Key, PE, Chair
Fire Protection Engineer
A H Key Engineers
Allen, TX

Richard W. Wood, CBO, FM, Vice Chair
Rep: New Hampshire Fire Prevention Society
Life Safety Systems Manager
University of Massachusetts - Lowell
Lowell, MA

Christopher E. Chwedyk, AIA, NCARB
Rep: American Institute of Architects
Director
Burnham/The Code Group, Inc.
Chicago, IL

Michael D. DeVore, CFPS
Fire Protection Specialist
State Farm
Bloomington, IL

Gregg Fields, CBO
Rep: Virginia Building and Code Officials
Association
Deputy Director
Department of Code Administration,
City of Alexandria, VA
Spotsylvania, VA

William V. Funk, Jr., MCP
Supervisor-Building Inspections
Cecil County Government
Elkton, MD

Robert Hanbury, CGR
Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Owner
House of Hanbury Builders Inc.
Newington, CT

Jeffrey M. Hugo, CBO
Manager of Codes
National Fire Sprinkler Association
Essexville, MI

Edward J. Kaminski, PE
Fire Protection Engineer
Clark County Building Department Fire
Prevention Bureau
Las Vegas, NV

Dana MacAllister, CBO
Building Official
Town of Milford, NH
Milford, NH

Steven L. McDaniel, CPCA
Building Official
City of Corning
Corning, NY

Jeri L. S. Morey
Owner
Jeri L. S. Morey, Architect
Corpus Christi, TX

Michael J. Nugent, CBO
Building Official
City of Rock Hill, SC
Rock Hill, SC

Jeffrey T. O'Neill, AIA, ACHA
Rep: American Society of Healthcare
Engineering
Director, Engineering Services
Pennsylvania Hospital/Penn Medicine
Philadelphia, PA

Clayton Talbot, M.Ed.
Plans Examiner
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN

Staff Secretariat:
Beth Tubbs, PE, FSFPE
Senior Staff Engineer
Codes and Standards Development
ICC - Boston Field Office

INTERNATIONAL EXISTING BUILDING CODE

2015 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

EB 1-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon concern that not all states reference the IFC. This additional language does not clarify to what level you must comply with the IFC and provides unnecessary language.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 50.91% (84) Oppose: 49.09% (81)

Assembly Action :

Approved as Submitted

EB 2-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was concern that a reference to other than the "building official" would cause confusion. A building official is the most appropriate enforcement entity for an existing building code.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 3-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The dictionary definition of "damage" was felt to be sufficient. In addition, the concept presented in new Section 501.2.1 of a 5% increase in spacial volume was confusing and would be difficult to measure.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 4-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The addition of the term "existing structure" was appropriate as the term is used interchangeably with the term "existing building" within the IEBC. This clarifies that the meaning of the terms is essentially the same with the current exception to the fact that the definition from the IBC has language for the flood provisions. This is intended to be revised in the Group B cycle by the proponent.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 5-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as it will create more confusion in the application of the exception. There were suggestions that a different format was needed.

EB 6-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal simply provides all the relevant references to the flood provisions found in the IEBC. This is a more comprehensive approach that will better address all methods in the IEBC.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 7-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved in favor of what is presented in code change proposal EB8-15. EB8-15 places the seismic design and evaluation criteria in an independent Section in Chapter 3 rather than as a subsection to Section 301.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 34.85% (46) Oppose: 65.15% (86)

Assembly Action :

None

EB 8-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as the format of the chapter will be clearer. Section 301 is intended to describe the three compliance methods. The seismic criteria are to be applied to all three methods where referenced and need to be located in a standalone section.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 9-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The prescriptive method was felt to be a viable option for many projects and would reduce the flexibility of the document if deleted. There was concern with how the deletion of Chapter 4 would integrate with the other major format changes being proposed in this cycle.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 10-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal will make the repair provisions more consistent for each method. The committee felt that repairs do not require several different methods of compliance. Having a standalone chapter for repairs will make the code more clear.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 11-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Relocated or moved buildings do not require various compliance methods. Currently, Chapter 4 does a poor job of addressing such buildings. Chapter 13 is more comprehensive and should apply in all cases. Chapter 13 Relocated or Moved Buildings will simply be renumbered as Chapter 14 and the performance method will become Chapter 13.

It should be noted that Section 509 should be deleted.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 12-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The existing language was considered sufficient. The addition of historic buildings may limit the applicability. Also, this conflicts with the action taken on EB11-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 13-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal which specifies the 2009 edition of A117.1 was felt necessary to avoid difficulties in achieving compliance for existing buildings. The newer edition of A117.1 which is currently being developed is likely to have much more rigid requirements that will cause costly compliance issues. There was concern that the adoption of a specific edition should be revisited in future editions as these concerns may lessen. Also, it was suggested that a more precise application of A117.1 could be provided to avoid application of overly restrictive requirements to certain features without losing the reference to the most recent standard once it becomes available.

Assembly Motion: **Disapprove**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 40.46% (70) Oppose: 59.54% (103)

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 14-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal cleans up repetitive language in Chapters 4 and 6 now found in Chapter 3. This was felt to be a cleaner approach in having such provisions in one more globally applicable section of the code.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 15-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it was consistent with EB14-15 that removes repetitive language already located in the more general provisions found in Chapter 3.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 16-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal adds the same language found in Section 803.6 to the prescriptive method. The committee felt it was appropriate to provide this same flexibility within the prescriptive method to allow reduction in fire resistance rating when an automatic sprinkler system is installed. There was some concern that this was unnecessary as the IBC would already allow such a relaxation. However, it was felt that without this language it was difficult to accomplish such reductions.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 17-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: It was felt that Section 1401.3.1, though covered by Section 115, was still necessary. It provides a mechanism within the method itself to address unsafe conditions. This is of particular concern if Section 115 is modified or removed during the adoption process.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 18-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was too specific to one classification of hazardous materials. In addition, the topic appeared to be outside the scope of the IEBC and is more appropriately addressed by the IFC. Also, there was concern with the use of the terminology "special hazards point suppression system" in terms of determining what would be an acceptable system. The increases in allowance of pyrophorics caused concern. Finally, if this topic is addressed in the IEBC then operational permit requirements are necessary in Section 105.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 5.79% (11) Oppose: 94.21% (179)

Assembly Action :

None

EB 19-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was editorial in nature and the phrase "complying with" is preferred over "conforming to."

Assembly Action :

None

EB 20-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was concern that this proposal added unnecessary wording to an issue that is technically already addressed. Also, the cost implication of this new section is unclear. The 20% cost limit provided for the accessible route requirements does not appear to be applicable.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 37.87% (64) Oppose: 62.13% (105)

Assembly Action :

None

EB 21-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as it was not felt necessary to add these requirements to the IEBC already addressed by the IFC. In addition, there was concern that the cost impact was not addressed in enough detail and education is a better way to encourage the use of such detection.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 22-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal simply makes the escalator width requirements consistent with the IBC for existing

buildings. This was felt to be appropriate and an improvement to the IEBC.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 23-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

403.2 Locking arrangements in Group E occupancies. Where approved by the code official, egress doors from classrooms, offices and other occupied rooms in Group E occupancies shall be allowed to be provided with locking arrangements designed to keep intruders from entering the room ~~that require a key, special knowledge or effort~~ when all of the following conditions are met:

1. The door shall be capable of being unlocked from outside the room with a key or other approved means.
2. Modifications shall not be made to existing listed panic hardware, fire door hardware or door closers.
3. Modifications to fire door assemblies shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
4. ~~The unlatching of the door or leaf shall be allowed to require two operations.~~

704.2 Locking arrangements in Group E occupancies. Where approved by the code official, egress doors from classrooms, offices and other occupied rooms in Group E occupancies shall be allowed to be provided with locking arrangements designed to keep intruders from entering the room ~~that require a key, special knowledge or effort~~ when all of the following conditions are met:

1. The door shall be capable of being unlocked from outside the room with a key or other approved means.
2. Modifications shall not be made to existing listed panic hardware, fire door hardware or door closers.
3. Modifications to fire door assemblies shall be in accordance with NFPA 80. .
4. ~~The unlatching of the door or leaf shall be allowed to require two operations.~~

Committee Reason: The committee preferred this proposal over E57-15 Part II with the inclusion of the modification. Note that E57-15 Part II was approved. This proposal provides special locking arrangements if they are necessary versus mandating the use of such arrangements. The modification deletes the language from each proposed section that states "that require a key, special knowledge and effort" as the verbiage would limit the provisions only to those types of locks. Item 4 was deleted from each section as it conflicts with accessibility requirements.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 24-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The current verbiage was considered adequate. In fact, the language in 402.5 was felt unnecessary and consistency with that section was not necessary.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 25-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The requirements for CO detection were felt to be sufficiently addressed by the IFC and were not necessary in the IEBC.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 33.67% (67) Oppose: 66.33% (132)

Assembly Action :

None

EB 26-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal appropriately distinguishes everyday maintenance of buildings versus the repair of damage to a building. This better coordinates and differentiates the content of the IEBC with the IPMC.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 27-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There were several concerns with this proposal. The language "where approved" creates a burden on the code official. Though NFPA 101 does allow such ladders the requirements are more restrictive than what is presented in the proposal. This proposal could allow ladders several stories high as no specific limits are provided. Also, as worded the types of ladders used may vary widely, which did not seem to be the intent of the proponent.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 28-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved for consistency with the current provisions in Section 805.3.1.2.1 Item 4.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 29-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

406.2 Replacement window opening control devices. In Group R-2 or R-3 buildings containing dwelling units and one- and two-family dwellings and townhouses regulated by the *International Residential Code*, window opening control devices complying with ASTM F 2090 shall be installed where an existing window is replaced and where all of the following apply to the replacement window:

1. The window is operable;
2. The window replacement includes replacement of the sash and the frame;
3. One of the following applies
 1. In Group R-2 or R-3 building containing dwelling units, the top of the sill of the window opening is at a height less than 36 inches (915 mm) above the finished floor; or
 2. In one- and two-family dwellings and townhouses regulated by the *International Residential Code*, the top of the sill of the window opening is at a height less than 24 inches (610 mm) above the finished floor;
4. The window will permit openings that will allow passage of a 4-inch-diameter (102 mm) sphere when the window is in its largest opened position; and
5. The vertical distance from the top of the sill of the window opening to the finished grade or other surface below, on the exterior of the building, is greater than 72 inches (1829 mm).

The window opening control device, after operation to release the control device allowing the window to fully open, shall not reduce the minimum net clear opening area of the window unit to less than the area required by Section 1029.2 of the *International Building Code*.

Exceptions:

1. Operable windows where the top of the sill of the window opening is located more than 75 feet (22860 mm) above the finished grade or other surface below, on the exterior of the room, space or building, and that are provided with window fall prevention devices that comply with ASTM F 2006.
2. Operable windows with openings that are provided with window fall prevention devices that comply with ASTM F 2090.

406.3 Replacement window emergency escape and rescue openings. Where windows are required to provide *emergency escape* and *rescue openings* in Group R-2 and R-3 occupancies and one- and two-family dwellings and townhouses regulated by the *International Residential Code*, replacement windows shall be exempt from the requirements of Sections 1030.2, 1030.3 and 1030.5 of the *International Building Code* and Sections R310.2.1, R310.2.2 and R310.2.3 of the *International Residential Code* accordingly provided the replacement window meets the following conditions:

1. The replacement window is the manufacturer's largest standard size window that will fit within the existing frame or existing rough opening. The replacement window shall be permitted to be of the same operating style as the existing window or a style that provides for an equal or greater window opening area than the existing window.
2. The replacement of the window is not part of a change of occupancy.

Window opening control devices complying with ASTM F 2090 shall be permitted for use on windows required to provide emergency escape and rescue openings.

702.4 Window opening control devices on replacement windows. In Group R-2 or R-3 buildings containing dwelling units and one- and two-family dwellings and townhouses regulated by the *International Residential Code*, window opening control devices complying with ASTM F 2090 shall be installed where an existing window is replaced and where all of the following apply to the replacement window:

1. The window is operable;
2. The window replacement includes replacement of the sash and the frame;
3. One of the following applies:
 1. In Group R-2 or R-3 buildings containing dwelling units, the top of the sill of the window opening is at a height less than 36 inches (915 mm) above the finished floor; or
 2. In one- and two-family dwellings and town-houses regulated by the *International Residential Code*, the top sill of the window opening is at a height less than 24 inches (610 mm) above the finished floor;
4. The window will permit openings that will allow passage of a 4-inch-diameter (102 mm) sphere when the window is in its

largest opened position; and

5. The vertical distance from the top of the sill of the window opening to the finished grade or other surface below, on the exterior of the building, is greater than 72 inches (1829 mm).

The window opening control device, after operation to release the control device allowing the window to fully open, shall not reduce the minimum net clear opening area of the window unit to less than the area required by Section ~~4029.2~~ 1030.2 of the *International Building Code*.

Exceptions:

1. Operable windows where the top of the sill of the window opening is located more than 75 feet (22 860 mm) above the finished grade or other surface below, on the exterior of the room, space or building, and that are provided with window fall prevention devices that comply with ASTM F 2006.
2. Operable windows with openings that are provided with window fall prevention devices that comply with ASTM F 2090.

702.5 Replacement window emergency escape and rescue openings. Where windows are required to provide emergency escape and rescue openings in Group R-2 and R-3 occupancies and one- and two-family dwellings and townhouses regulated by the *International Residential Code*, replacement windows shall be exempt from the requirements of Sections 1030.2, 1030.3 and 1030.5 of the *International Building Code* and Sections ~~R310.2~~ R310.2.1, R310.2.2 and R310.2.3 of the *International Residential Code* accordingly, provided the replacement window meets the following conditions:

1. The replacement window is the manufacturer's largest standard size window that will fit within the existing frame or existing rough opening. The replacement window shall be permitted to be of the same operating style as the existing window or a style that provides for an equal or greater window opening area than the existing window.
2. The replacement of the window is not part of a change of occupancy.

Window opening control devices complying with ASTM F 2090 shall be permitted for use on windows required to provide *emergency escape and rescue openings*.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it correlates the window replacement requirements in the prescriptive method with the performance method. The prescriptive method had not initially referenced one and two family dwellings as regulated by the IRC. There were several modifications that simply addressed editorial revisions. In section 406.2 item 2 the missing words "of the" were added to complete the phrase "the top of the sill." . The reference to Section R310.2.2 was added to Section 406.3 to more comprehensively reference the appropriate requirements of the IRC. Finally, the reference to Section 1029.2 was revised to Section 1030.2 in Section 702.4. This revision to Section 1030.2 will also be addressed as errata in the 2015 IEBC.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 30-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was appropriate as it simply coordinates the change of occupancy requirements in Section 407.4 with the changes made to the definition of change of occupancy and the provisions in Chapter 10 in the 2015 IEBC.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 31-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as NFPA 914 does not specifically require a fire protection plan. Additionally the application of such standard was more appropriately applied by the fire official versus a building/code official. Finally it was felt unnecessary to have more links to the IFC in the IEBC.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 32-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was not felt necessary based upon the action on EB11-15. It was noted that if this proposal was to go forward the reference should be revised to the IBC versus to the IEBC within the text.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 33-15

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Though this proposal was viewed as a shift from the format of the IEBC it was felt for consistency purposes that the accessibility provisions should be located in one location within Chapter 3. The provisions are meant to apply equally to all methods.

Assembly Motion:**Disapprove****Online Vote Results:****Failed** - Support: 36.31% (61) Oppose: 63.69% (107)**Assembly Action :****None**

EB 34-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as code change proposal EB13-15 already addressed the concern with the particular edition of A117.1 referenced. Instead of locating in a single location in Chapter 3 this proposal would locate the specific edition of A117.1 throughout the code. A single more general location was preferred for ease of application and for the consistent long term maintenance of the reference.

Assembly Action :**None**

EB 35-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was concern that the phrase "maximum extent feasible" would create too large of a loophole for compliance.

Assembly Action :**None**

EB 36-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the current language would already address the maintenance of the accessible means of egress. Additional specific language was not necessary.

Assembly Action :**None**

EB 37-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Though there was some merit to having a benchmark there was concern with origination of 3000 square feet. Additionally, the wording proposed was felt to be somewhat awkward.

Assembly Action :**None**

EB 38-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon concerns that the revised language expands the requirements too broadly. In addition, it was felt that this expansion would significantly increase cost of construction

Assembly Action :**None**

EB 39-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal removes a phrase that is misplaced. Simply focusing on smaller alterations is appropriate to allow the omission of Type B dwelling or sleeping units. This omission should not also require a change of occupancy.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 40-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal provides consistency between the work area method and prescriptive language in terms of accessible entrances. This is also seen as a reasonable accommodation when an accessible entrance is already provided elsewhere.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 41-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal makes the provisions more consistent with ADA and provides clarification. In addition, the provisions are more consistent between the work area method and prescriptive method.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 42-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was concern with how this proposal would work with the exception to Section 907.5.2.3 of the IBC and IFC. More specifically, the concern was that visible alarms would potentially be required by this proposal where not required by the IBC or IFC.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 35.03% (55) Oppose: 64.97% (102)

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 43-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based primarily on the preference to code change proposal EB44-15 and concern with the change to "four or more" where it had simply been based upon any number of units being altered. EB44-15 was also disapproved.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 44-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The concern with this proposal is allowing the same exception in the prescriptive method as work area method. The change was seen as too significant. There was also concern with determining the dates when a change of occupancy was issued.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 45-15

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the intent and removes subjective terms with regard to the obstruction of means of egress.

Assembly Action :**None**

EB 46-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was concern that the proposal adds back in the use of the term "unisex" when it has previously been removed. The list of sections listed seems to have omitted certain subsections from Section 1109.2.1 and should be further reviewed. Finally, there was concern with the requirement for 2 water closets where previously only 1 was required.

Assembly Action :**None**

EB 47-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as the term "code official" may not be the authority with regard to historic buildings. In addition, the use of the term "authority having jurisdiction" is a more appropriate term than "applicable governing authority." There was a suggestion that a definition for "authority having jurisdiction" would be useful.

Assembly Action :**None**

EB 48-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The term "public" is preferred as it correlates with ADA and the IBC for accessibility. The term public entrance is more easily determined than main exit. It was also pointed out that the "main" entrance may not be "public."

Assembly Action :**None**

EB 49-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: There was agreement that family or assisted bathrooms are needed in these types of occupancies and uses when additional toilet fixtures are being added. In addition, this requirement is consistent with the IBC requirements.

Assembly Action :**None**

EB 50-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it would make the IEBC more difficult to use even though the intent was to simplify. The IEBC is already written differently than the IBC and this will cause further confusion with such a drastic change in format.

Assembly Action :**None**

EB 51-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal inappropriately provides requirements within the definition. In addition, the proposed

Section 502.4 would be more appropriately located with the section dealing with alterations. There was also a general concern that the list of items provided does not clarify the application of the code.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 52-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal is a good clarification that the focus should be on the state of the building, system or equipment prior to the damage that has occurred versus the before the repair was undertaken.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 53-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The overall concept was appropriate but there were several concerns. First, the committee felt that this should be covered by the IPC versus IEBC. Second, the repair chapter of the IEBC did not appear to be an appropriate location. Finally, there was a concern with the output criteria and the proposed definition of "scald hazard."

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 2.5% (4) Oppose: 97.5% (156)

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 54-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Although there may be a need for these allowances there was concern that this would cause problems in states with water shortage concerns.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 55-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the concept that the deletion both makes the work area method consistent with the prescriptive method and that a blanket exclusion is inappropriate. As the reason statement notes, the technical infeasibility concept and 20% cost limit are available to designers.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 56-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved with concern with actions taken on the accessibility provisions in other code change proposals. More specifically, code change proposal EB33-15 moved all the accessibility provisions into Chapter 3 and the provisions of Section 705 were essentially deleted.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 57-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This deletion of this section was appropriate as there are no applicable provisions referenced from

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 58-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There were two main concerns with this proposal. First, mixed use buildings may contain Group R-4 occupancies and the total occupant load can easily surpass 30. Secondly, the reason statement refers to residents but the requirements refer to occupants. Though the residents may never exceed 30 the number of occupants may.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 59-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was viewed as excessive for a level 2 alteration. In addition, it works against the intent of the IEBC to encourage the reuse of buildings. A particular example of this concern was a building with a large site that technically has access to a municipal water supply but would require extensive site work to gain access to the water.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 60-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the reason provided for disapproval on EB59-15. The proposal was seen as excessive.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 61-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

~~804.2.4~~ 904.1.4 Other required automatic sprinkler systems. *No change to text.*

Committee Reason: This proposal was seen as reasonable but only if moved to the Level 3 alterations provisions. The modification simply moved the section from Section 804.2.4 to Section 904.1.4 bringing the provisions into Level 3 alterations.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 62-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal is simply a clarification with the addition of the term "manual." Section 1103.7.7 of the IFC only requires a manual fire alarm system. Smoke alarms are dealt with separately in Section 804.4.3.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 63-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

805.3.1.1 Single-exit buildings. A single exit or access to a single exit shall be permitted from spaces, any story or any occupied roof where one of the following exist:

1. The occupant load, number of dwelling units and exit access travel distance do not exceed the values in Table 805.3.1.1(1) or 805.3.1.1(2).

2. In Group R-1 or R-2, non-sprinklered buildings, individual single-story or multistory dwelling or sleeping units shall be permitted to have a single exit or access to a single exit from the dwelling or sleeping unit provided one of the following criteria are met:

2.1 The occupant load is not greater than 10 and the exit access travel distance within the unit does not exceed 75 feet (22 860 mm).

2.2 The building is not more than three stories in height; all 3rd story space is part of a dwelling with an exit access doorway on the 2nd story; and the portion of the exit access travel distance from the door to any habitable room with any such unit to the unit entrance doors ~~shall not exceed~~ does not exceed 50 feet (15 240mm).

3. In buildings of Group R-2 occupancy of any number of stories and with not more than four dwelling units per floor; served by an interior exit stairway with a smokeproof enclosure in accordance with Sections 909.20 and 1023.11 of the *International Building Code* or an exterior exit stairway where the portion of the exit access travel distance from the dwelling unit entrance door to the exit is a maximum of 20 feet (6096mm).

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it aligns the allowance of single exit buildings with the IBC. It would be inappropriate for the IEBC to be more restrictive than the IBC. The modification simply makes an editorial revision to Item 2.2 to be consistent with the terminology used in Item 2.1. The revision revises "shall not exceeds" to "does not exceed."

Assembly Action :

None

EB 64-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal is consistent with EB63-15 but focuses only on care occupancies. The committee approved the proposal for consistency with the action taken on EB63-15 and as a precaution so that minimally these issues are addressed. The committee also agreed with the proponent's reason.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 65-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal for consistency on the action on EB44-15. In addition, determining the certificate of occupancy for existing buildings can be problematic in smaller jurisdictions.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 66-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was seen as excessive and would be costly even though it was located with the level 3 alteration provisions. There was concern that the cost limits typically used for accessible route would not be applicable to accessible means of egress as written. Finally, there was concern with the reference to Section 1009 of the IBC. Section 1009 has an exception for existing buildings. Note that E34-15 addresses that particular exception.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 67-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason. More specifically, the proposal appropriately divides the two conditions into the proper risk categories in Section 1012.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 68-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. BOTH PARTS WERE HEARD BY THE IEBC COMMITTEE.

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was focused upon the building code and was strictly a capacity issue for storm shelters. In addition it was agreed that the scope needed to be revised to be compatible with ICC 500. The committee felt that these requirements and criteria added clarity to the application of the storm shelter provisions. In particular, the exception addressing new buildings on an existing Group E occupancy site was felt to be a necessary allowance

Assembly Action :

None

EB 69-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The relocation of provisions out of the repair section was felt to be an appropriate clarification. The provisions on unsafe buildings and relocated buildings tend to be lost in the repair section.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 70-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1203.5 Interior finishes. The existing interior finishes shall be accepted when it is demonstrated that they are the historic finishes.

Committee Reason: The inclusion of floors as part of the interior finishes was felt to be necessary. As currently written the section is limited to walls and ceilings. The modification further clarified the application of this section by using consistent terminology "interior" with reference to finishes.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 71-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement. More specifically, this proposal appropriately removes language that would better be located in an administrative section.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 72-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Although the addition of the reference to Chapter 4 would make the reference to methods more consistent, there was concern that this section was generally unnecessary and further modifications to the section were not appropriate.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 73-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1401.2.3 Additions. *Additions to existing buildings* shall comply with the requirements of the *International Building*

Code and or the International Residential Code for new construction. The combined height and area of the existing building and the new addition shall not exceed the height and area allowed by Chapter 5 of the International Building Code. Where a fire wall that complies with Section 706 of the International Building Code is provided between the addition and the existing building, the addition shall be considered a separate building.

Committee Reason: This proposal was seen as a necessary clean up to clarify the two codes that are intended for additions are either the IBC or IRC. The modification changed the reference to the two codes from "and" to "or." As originally drafted it would technically require compliance with both codes. The intention was to comply with one or the other.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 74-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The main concern with this proposal was the deletion of the last sentence. In some cases existing buildings may have more conservative construction features than new buildings. Eliminating this sentence would eliminate the ability to simply comply with the IBC.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 75-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it more comprehensively references all of the relevant accessibility requirements found in the IEBC. There was concern raised in the correlation with this proposal and EB33-15 going forward. EB33-15 moved all the accessibility requirements to Chapter 3.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 76-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was concern with this added language that it would complicate an already difficult relationship between various I-Codes. In addition, it was felt that referencing such documents is inappropriate. The performance method does not logically compare to prescriptive documents.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 77-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The reference to "other codes" is necessary as there are minimum provisions that must be met from other I-Codes.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 78-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as appropriate data was not provided to justify the need to change the scores for Group R occupancies. Also, it was pointed out that the scores cannot be compared against other occupancies. Instead the scores were developed independently for each occupancy classification to be compared to the mandatory safety score in Table 1401.8.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 79-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was felt to be a necessary clarification of the vertical opening value (VO). Having a specific reference to the value in Section 1401.6.6 is helpful.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 80-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal inappropriately places smoke alarm requirements in the fire alarm section. Generally, prescriptive requirements such as this should not be located in the performance method.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 81-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was purely editorial and answers questions regarding the application of this table.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 82-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the same concerns raised with code change proposal EB78-15 and would upset the balance of the scoring method.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 83-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved with the primary concern that Item 2 was not consistent with the IBC.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 84-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The criteria in this section are focused upon egress lighting not emergency lighting therefore the addition of this term is inappropriate. The issue is more about the emergency power provided. Also, a better reference than Section 2702 would be Sections 1008.3.4 and 1013.6.3. In addition, Section 1401.6.15 already makes the necessary scoping that the section is focused upon the emergency power for the egress lighting.

Assembly Action :

None

EB 85-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was felt to be overly restrictive and works against the concept of the performance

method. It should reference the IBC instead of IFC. Also, cost impact was not appropriately addressed and there may be legal implications from a fair housing standpoint.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 86-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved with concern regarding the broadening of the application of these criteria to both NFPA 13R and 13D. In addition, the committee felt it was inappropriate for the scores for category e and f to be the same. One is for required systems (e) and the other if for non required systems (f). Generally, there was concern as to how these revisions will affect the mandatory safety scores.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 87-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the actions taken on EB78-15 and EB82-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 88-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The concept of providing credit for the use of ESFR sprinkler systems was appropriate for non required systems but not for required systems. In terms of quick response sprinklers, there was concern that these are already required in residential occupancies and it did not seem appropriate to provide additional credit through reference to this footnote.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 89-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal inappropriately now includes Group A-5 occupancies where they had not been addressed before. In addition, the proposal was disapproved to be consistent with EB78-15, EB82-15 and EB87-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 90-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the previous actions on code change proposals EB78-15, EB82-15, EB87-15 and EB89-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

EB 91-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the previous actions on code change proposals EB78-15, EB82-15, EB87-15, EB89-15 and EB90-15.

EB 92-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it removes means of egress from the final score without making appropriate adjustments to the mandatory safety scores.

Assembly Action :**None**

EB 93-15

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC MEANS OF EGRESS CODE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The reference back to Chapter 11 is not needed.

Assembly Action :**None**

EB 94-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon several concerns. First, such requirements belong in ASME A17.1 and go beyond that required by A117.1. Second, there was concern that such equipment would create a significant increase in cost. Third, the studies noted were not well identified. Finally, it is unclear which elements being altered in an elevator would trigger this requirement.

Assembly Action :**None**

2015 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL FUEL GAS CODE

FUEL GAS CODE COMMITTEE

Michael D. Redifer, MCP, Chair

Building Official
City of Newport News
Newport News, VA

Paul W. Cabot, CGE, Vice Chair

Administrator National Fuel Gas Code
American Gas Association
Washington, DC

James Anjam

Field Services Section Chief
Arlington County, Virginia
Arlington, VA

Sylvester Caudle

Rep: American Gas Association
Market Advisor, Codes & Standards
Southern California Gas Company
Los Angeles, CA

Arthur G. Cordes

Senior Technical Advisor
New York City Department of Buildings
New York, NY

Mike Deegan

Rep: American Gas Association
Gas Operations Coordinator
Clearwater Gas System (City of Clearwater)
Clearwater, FL

Ronnie Ray Frazier

Rep: American Gas Association
Codes and Standards Manager
Atmos Energy
Arlington, TX

William T. Hamilton, CGE

Rep: American Gas Association
Manager Technical Training
UGI Utilities, Inc.
Reading, PA

Iredell County
Statesville, NC

Andrea Lanier Papageorge, JD, MBA

Rep: American Gas Association
Manager, Building and Gas Codes and
Standards
AGL Resources
Atlanta, GA

Timothy H. Swanson, CBCO, CFCO

Chief Building Official
City of Greeley
Greeley, CO

Brian K. Whitten

Chief Code Enforcement
Ohio Department of Commerce, Division of
State Fire Marshal
Reynoldsburg, OH

Staff Secretariat:

Gregg Gress

Senior Technical Staff
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hills, IL

AGA Liaison

Jim Ranfone, Managing Director
American Gas Association
Washington, DC

Lynn Niblock, MCP

Director of Development Services

INTERNATIONAL FUEL GAS CODE

2015 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

FG 1-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

TOILET, GAS-FIRED. ~~An A packaged and completely assembled appliance, comprised of containing a toilet and an incinerator that is manufactured and installed as one complete unit, and is used to reduce human fecal matter to ash incinerates refuse instead of flushing it away with water.~~

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's reason statement. The modification makes the definition consistent with the ANSI standard for such appliances.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 2-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based upon the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Motion:

Disapprove

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 46.51% (60) Oppose: 53.49% (69)

Assembly Action :

None

FG 3-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based upon the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 4-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based upon the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 5-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based upon the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 6-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based upon the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 7-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based upon the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 8-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based upon the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 9-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Motion:

Disapprove

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 53.15% (59) Oppose: 46.85% (52)

Assembly Action :

Disapproved

FG 10-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Motion:

As Modified

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 80.18% (89) Oppose: 19.82% (22)

Assembly Action :

Approved as Modified

Online Floor Modification:

UNIT HEATER. A self-contained, automatically controlled, vented, fuel-gas-burning space-heating appliance, intended for installation in the space to be heated ~~without the use of ducts~~, and having integral means for circulation of air.

FG 11-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

303.3 Prohibited locations. Appliances shall not be located in sleeping rooms, bathrooms, toilet rooms, storage closets or surgical rooms, or in a space that opens only into such rooms or spaces, except where the installation complies with one of the following:

1. The *appliance* is a direct-vent *appliance* installed in accordance with the conditions of the listing and the manufacturer's instructions.
2. Vented room heaters, wall furnaces, vented decorative appliances, vented gas fireplaces, vented gas fireplace heaters and decorative appliances for installation in vented solid fuel-burning fireplaces are installed in rooms that meet the required volume criteria of Section 304.5.

3. A single wall-mounted unvented room heater is installed in a bathroom and such unvented room heater is equipped as specified in Section 621.6 and has an input rating not greater than 6,000 Btu/h (1.76 kW). The bathroom shall meet the required volume criteria of Section 304.5.
4. A single wall-mounted unvented room heater is installed in a bedroom and such unvented room heater is equipped as specified in Section 621.6 and has an input rating not greater than 10,000 Btu/h (2.93 kW). The bedroom shall meet the required volume criteria of Section 304.5.
5. The *appliance* is installed in a room or space that opens only into a bedroom or bathroom, and such room or space is used for no other purpose and is provided with a solid weather-stripped door equipped with an *approved* self-closing device. All *combustion air* shall be taken directly from the outdoors in accordance with Section 304.6.
6. A ~~gas~~ clothes dryer is installed in a residential bathroom or toilet room ~~and having~~ a permanent opening having with an area of not less than 100 square inches ~~is provided that allows the toilet room or bathroom to communicate~~ communicates with a ~~common hallway~~ space outside of a sleeping room, bathroom, toilet room, or common space storage closet.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification replaced the undefined terms common hallway and common space with references to the spaces outside of the room containing the dryer.

Assembly Motion:

Disapprove

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 70.09% (75) Oppose: 29.91% (32)

Assembly Action :

Disapproved

FG 12-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

303.3.1 Fireplaces and decorative appliances in Group I-2 Condition 2 occupancies. Gas fireplace appliances and decorative gas appliances shall be prohibited in Group I-2, condition 2 occupancies except where such appliances are direct-vent appliances installed in public lobby and waiting areas that are not within smoke compartments containing patient sleeping areas. ~~Such fireplace appliances and decorative appliances shall be installed in accordance with all of the following:~~

- ~~1. The appliances shall be vented to the outdoors.~~
- ~~2. The appliances be of the direct-vent type.~~
- ~~3. The appliances shall automatically shut off upon activation of the fire alarm system serving the occupancy.~~
- ~~4. The appliance controls shall be located where they can be accessed only by facility staff.~~
- ~~5. A carbon monoxide detector with a local alarm shall be provided and installed in accordance with Section 915 of the International Fire Code.~~

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification deletes the list of 5 requirements, some of which are already addressed by the codes. Items 1 and 2 in the list are appropriately combined and located in the main paragraph. Item 4 would be difficult to enforce.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 13-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed requirement will increase the cost of construction by enlarging the pit on the control side of the appliance. There is no substantiation for the elevation height above the pit floor.

Assembly Motion:

As Modified

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 60.91% (67) Oppose: 39.09% (43)

Assembly Action :

Approved as Modified

Online Floor Modification:

303.7 Pit locations. Appliances installed in pits or excavations shall not come in direct contact with the surrounding soil and shall be installed not less than 6 3 inches above the pit or excavation floor. The sides of the pit or excavation shall be held back a minimum of 12 inches (305 mm) from the appliance. Where the depth exceeds 12 inches (305 mm) below adjoining grade, the walls of the pit or excavation shall be lined with concrete or masonry, such concrete or masonry shall extend a minimum of 4 inches (102 mm) above adjoining grade and shall have sufficient lateral load-bearing capacity to resist collapse. Excavation on the control side of the appliance shall extend not less than 30 inches (762 mm) horizontally from the appliance. The appliance shall be protected from flooding in an approved manner.

FG 14-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Motion:

Disapprove

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 71.05% (81) Oppose: 28.95% (33)

Assembly Action :

Disapproved

FG 16-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the preference for the similar proposal FG17-15.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 17-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

401.9 Identification. Each length of pipe and tubing and each pipe fitting, utilized in a fuel gas system, shall bear the identification of the manufacturer.

Exceptions:

1. Steel pipe sections that are: two feet and less in length and cut from longer sections of pipe in the field and threaded in the field.
2. Steel pipe fittings 2 inch and less in size.
3. Where identification is provided on the product packaging or crating.
4. Where other approved documentation is provided.

Committee Reason: There is no technical justification for requiring steel pipe and small fittings to be identified. There have been no problems with steel pipe that is not identified. The modification removes the limitation for pipe to be cut and threaded in the field, because such operations can occur in other locations such as fabrication shops .

Assembly Motion:

Disapprove

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 46.6% (48) Oppose: 53.4% (55)

Assembly Action :

None

FG 18-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval is based on the preference for the similar proposal FG17-15.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 19-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the preference for similar proposal FG20-15.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 20-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Motion:

Disapprove

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 49.53% (53) Oppose: 50.47% (54)

Assembly Action :

None

FG 21-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The words "buried gas" do not make sense. There is no specific coverage for underground vaults.

Assembly Motion: As Submitted

Online Vote Results: Failed - Support: 43.81% (46) Oppose: 56.19% (59)

Assembly Action : None

FG 22-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Motion: Disapprove

Online Vote Results: Successful - Support: 61.61% (69) Oppose: 38.39% (43)

Assembly Action : Disapproved

FG 23-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the preference for the similar proposal FG22-15.

Assembly Action : None

FG 24-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

FG 25-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

404.14 Piping underground beneath buildings. *Piping* installed underground beneath buildings is prohibited except where the *piping* is encased in a conduit of wrought iron, plastic pipe, steel pipe, a piping or encasement system listed ~~sleeve system or for installation beneath buildings, or other~~ *approved* conduit material designed to withstand the superimposed loads. The conduit shall be protected from corrosion in accordance with Section 404.11 and shall be installed in accordance with Section 404.14.1 or 404.14.2.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification clarifies that the system must be listed for the intended application as opposed to any application.

Assembly Action : None

FG 26-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Motion: Disapprove

Online Vote Results: Failed - Support: 46.3% (50) Oppose: 53.7% (58)

FG 27-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The code official could always approve an alternative sediment trap device with or without the deleted text..

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 61.17% (63) Oppose: 38.83% (40)

Assembly Action :

Approved as Submitted

FG 28-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no technical justification for the proposal. There is no evidence of a problem.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 29-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 30-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no history of a problem or evidence of a hazard with the current code allowance. The code already allows a redundant shutoff valve to be installed at the appliance location.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 54.72% (58) Oppose: 45.28% (48)

Assembly Action :

Approved as Submitted

FG 31-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 32-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

410.2 MP regulators. MP pressure regulators shall comply with the following:

1. The MP regulator shall be *approved* and shall be suitable for the inlet and outlet gas pressures for the application.
2. The MP regulator shall maintain a reduced outlet pressure under lock-up (no-flow) conditions.
3. The capacity of the MP regulator, determined by published ratings of its manufacturer, shall be adequate to supply the *appliances* served.
4. The MP pressure regulator shall be provided with *access*. Where located indoors, the regulator shall be vented to the outdoors or shall be equipped with a leaklimiting device, in either case complying with Section 410.3.

5. A tee fitting with one opening capped or plugged shall be installed between the MP regulator and its upstream shutoff valve. Such tee fitting shall be positioned to allow connection of a pressure-measuring instrument and to serve as a sediment trap.
6. A tee fitting with one opening capped or plugged shall be installed not less than 10 pipe diameters downstream of the MP regulator outlet. Such tee fitting shall be positioned to allow connection of a pressure-measuring instrument. ~~As gas The tee fitting is not required where the MP regulator serves an appliance that has a pressure test port on the gas control inlet side of and the gas control of an appliance served by the MP regulator is an alternative to the downstream tee fitting, where such~~ appliance is located in the same room as the MP regulator.
7. Where connected to rigid piping, a union shall be installed within 1 foot (304 mm) of either side of the MP regulator.

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification restates the proposed text in a more concise form.

Assembly Action : **None**

FG 33-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : **None**

FG 34-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. Code officials have been requiring listed gas connectors instead of the historically used surgical tubing.

Assembly Motion: **Disapprove**

Online Vote Results: **Successful** - Support: 66.04% (70) Oppose: 33.96% (36)

Assembly Action : **Disapproved**

FG 35-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no evidence of a problem with such connections under a manufactured home. Gas piping and connectors are allowed in crawl spaces. The term "gas service" could be confused with the utility service which is not within the scope of the code.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 40.57% (43) Oppose: 59.43% (63)

Assembly Action : **None**

FG 36-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal creates conflict with Table 503.4. Manufacturers might not have evaluated their appliances for use with all UL1738 listed materials.

Assembly Action : **None**

FG 37-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : **None**

FG 38-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text would not allow a dedicated HVAC system for the pool area. No technical justification was offered for the prohibition. There is no evidence that humidity negatively affects appliances.

Assembly Motion:

As Modified

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 60.19% (65) Oppose: 39.81% (43)

Assembly Action :

Approved as Modified

Online Floor Modification:

Outdoor or return air for forced-air heating and cooling systems shall not be taken from the following locations:

1. Closer than 10 feet (3048 mm) from an *appliance* vent outlet, a vent opening from a plumbing drainage system or the discharge outlet of an exhaust fan, unless the outlet is 3 feet (914 mm) above the outside air inlet.
2. Where there is the presence of objectionable odors, fumes or flammable vapors; or where located less than 10 feet (3048 mm) above the surface of any abutting public way or driveway; or where located at grade level by a sidewalk, street, alley or driveway.
3. A hazardous or insanitary location or a refrigeration machinery room as defined in the *International Mechanical Code*.
4. A room or space, the volume of which is less than 25 percent of the entire volume served by such system. Where connected by a permanent opening having an area sized in accordance with Section 618.2, adjoining rooms or spaces shall be considered as a single room or space for the purpose of determining the volume of such rooms or spaces.

Exception: The minimum volume requirement shall not apply where the amount of return air taken from a room or space is less than or equal to the amount of supply air delivered to such room or space.

5. A room or space containing an *appliance* where such a room or space serves as the sole source of return air.

Exception: This shall not apply where:

1. The *appliance* is a direct-vent *appliance* or an *appliance* not requiring a vent in accordance with Section 501.8.
 2. The room or space complies with the following requirements:
 1. The return air shall be taken from a room or space having a volume exceeding 1 cubic foot for each 10 Btu/h (9.6L/W) of combined input rating of all fuel-burning appliances therein.
 2. The volume of supply air discharged back into the same space shall be approximately equal to the volume of return air taken from the space.
 3. Return-air inlets shall not be located within 10 feet (3048 mm) of a draft hood in the same room or space or the combustion chamber of any atmospheric burner *appliance* in the same room or space.
 3. Rooms or spaces containing solid fuel-burning appliances, provided that return-air inlets are located not less than 10 feet (3048 mm) from the firebox of such appliances.
6. A closet, bathroom, toilet room, kitchen, garage, boiler room, furnace room or unconditioned attic.

Exceptions:

 1. Where return air intakes are located not less than 10 feet (3048 mm) from cooking appliances and serve only the kitchen area, taking return air from a kitchen area shall not be prohibited.
 2. Dedicated forced air systems serving only a garage shall not be prohibited from obtaining return air from the garage.
 7. A crawl space by means of direct connection to the return side of a forced-air system. Transfer openings in the crawl space enclosure shall not be prohibited.
 8. Indoor swimming pool enclosures and associated deck areas except where the air from such spaces ~~are~~ is dehumidified in accordance with Section 403.2.1 Item # 2 of the *International Mechanical Code*.

FG 39-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: No technical justification was offered. The Z21/83 standards have no issues with these appliances. The added moisture is beneficial humidification.

Assembly Action :

None

FG 40-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

623.2 Prohibited location. Cooking appliances designed, tested, *listed* and *labeled* for use in commercial occupancies shall not be installed within dwelling units or within any area where domestic cooking operations occur.

Exceptions:

1. Appliances that are also listed as domestic cooking appliances.
2. Where the installation is designed by a licensed Professional Engineer, in compliance with the manufacturer's installation instructions.

Committee Reason: Homeowners request commercial appliances for their kitchens. The state of Georgia has successfully allowed what the proposal permits. The modification ensures that the appliance manufacturer's instructions are adhered to in addition to the design requirements specified by the engineer.

Assembly Action : **None**

FG 41-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Section 303 already covers this and applies regardless of the appliance type.

Assembly Action : **None**

FG 42-15

THIS IS A 3 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IFGC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-MECHANICAL COMMITTEE. PART III WAS HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The current code, the appliance manufacturer's instructions and the definition of water heater all already prohibit what the proposed text states.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 39.25% (42) Oppose: 60.75% (65)

Assembly Action : **None**

Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language seems to say that water heaters cannot be used for space heating. There needs to be a differentiation between the two types of heaters.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 35.64% (36) Oppose: 64.36% (65)

Assembly Action : **None**

Part III

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the action taken on the other two Parts of this proposal.

Assembly Action : **None**

FG 43-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. Approval is consistent with the action taken on FG5-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

2015 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL MECHANICAL CODE

MECHANICAL CODE COMMITTEE

Mark Riley, Chair

Mechanical Inspector
Safebuilt/City of Troy Building Department
Troy, MI

Robert J. Schutz, PE, PS, CBO, Vice Chair

Assistant Chief Building Official (Acting)
City Of Columbus – Building Services
Department
Columbus, OH

John Ainslie

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
President
Ainslie Group
Virginia Beach, VA

David C. Beahm, CBO

Building Official
County of Warren
Front Royal, VA

Donald Chaisson, LEED AP

Rep: Air Conditioning Contractors of America:
New England
Sr. Field Representative
APA LLC
Canton, MA

Wm. Scott Copp

Sr. Project Manager
T. Y. Lin International
Rochester, NY

Eli P. Howard, III

Executive Director, Technical Services
Sheet Metal & Air Conditioning Contractors
National Assn.
Chantilly, VA

Marshall A. Kaminer, PE

Executive Engineer
New York City Department of Buildings
New York, NY

Bruce Lambright

Administration Manager -
Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing/Storm Water
City of Houston, Texas
Houston, TX

Greg Lavriha, PE

Senior Project Engineer, Mechanical
Karpinski Engineering
Cleveland, OH

Jason Phelps

Plans Examiner III
City of Hillsboro
Hillsboro, OR

Gary H. Pomerantz, PE, LEED AP

Executive Vice President
WSP
512 Seventh Avenue
New York, NY

John K. Taecker, PE

Senior Regulatory Engineer
UL LLC
San Jose, CA

Brent Ursenbach

Mechanical & Energy Code Official
Salt Lake County, Planning & Dev. Services
Salt Lake City, UT

Adam Vaczek, CEM

Senior Consultant
Ivey Engineering, Inc.
San Diego, CA

Staff Liaison:

Gregg Gress

Senior Technical Staff
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hill, IL

INTERNATIONAL MECHANICAL CODE

2015 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

M 1-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

M 2-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

M 3-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. Not all appliances are required to be served by hoods, such as UL 710B listed appliances. The proposal helps define what is commercial.

Assembly Action : None

M 4-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Section 1101.10 says all that is necessary, therefore a definition is not needed. The commonly accepted meaning of the terms is adequate.

Assembly Action : None

M 5-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

MACHINERY ROOM. An enclosed space that, ~~where~~ is required by Chapter 11 to contain refrigeration equipment; ~~must~~ and to comply with ~~the requirements set forth in~~ Sections 1105 and 1106.

Committee Reason: The proposal is consistent with ASHRAE 15 and IAR 2 language and clarifies that not all rooms that contain refrigeration equipment are machinery rooms. The modification coordinates the language with that found in IAR 2 and clearly specifies the two conditions that define a machinery room.

Assembly Action : None

M 6-15

Part

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The term copper alloy is used in the product standards. Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : None

M 8-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : None

M 9-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Ventilation in Section 403 of the IMC is not solely supplying outdoor air. The proposal will cause confusion and conflicts with Section 401 of the IMC and also ASHRAE 62.1.

Assembly Action : None

M 10-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed standard is in draft form and not likely to be completed by the Public Comment Hearings. The content could change before the draft is finalized.

Assembly Action : None

M 11-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

303.7 Pit locations. Appliances installed in pits or excavations shall not come in direct contact with the surrounding soil and shall be installed not less than ~~6-3~~ inches above the pit floor. The sides of the pit or excavation shall be held back not less than 12 inches (305 mm) from the *appliance*. Where the depth exceeds 12 inches (305 mm) below adjoining grade, the walls of the pit or excavation shall be lined with concrete or masonry. Such concrete or masonry shall extend not less than 4 inches (102 mm) above adjoining grade and shall have sufficient lateral load-bearing capacity to resist collapse. Excavation on the control side of the appliance shall extend not less than 30 inches (762mm) horizontally. The *appliance* shall be protected from flooding in an *approved* manner.

Committee Reason: Service access is important. Proposal correlates with Sections 306.1 and 304.10 of the IMC. The modification makes the proposal consistent with Section 304.10 of the IMC.

Assembly Action : None

M 12-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

M 13-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

M 14-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

TABLE 305.4

PIPING SUPPORT SPACING^a

| PIPING MATERIAL | MAXIMUM HORIZONTAL SPACING (feet) | MAXIMUM VERTICAL SPACING (feet) |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| ABS pipe | 4 | 10c |
| Aluminum pipe and tubing | 10 | 15 |
| Brass pipe | 10 | 10 |
| Brass tubing, 1 1/4-inch diameter and smaller | 6 | 10 |
| Brass tubing, 1 1/2-inch diameter and larger | 10 | 10 |
| Cast-iron pipe ^b | 5 | 15 |
| Copper or copper-alloy pipe | 12 | 10 |
| Copper or copper-alloy tubing, 1/4-inch diameter and smaller | 6 | 10 |
| Copper or copper-alloy tubing, 1/2-inch diameter and larger | 10 | 10 |
| CPVC pipe or tubing, 1 inch and smaller | 3 | 10c |
| CPVC pipe or tubing, 1 1/4-inch and larger | 4 | 10c |
| Lead pipe | Continuous | 4 |
| PB pipe or tubing | 2 2/3 (32 inches) | 4 |
| PE-RT | 2 2/3 (32 inches) | 10c |
| PE-RT > 1 1/4 inches | 4 | 10c |
| PEX tubing | 2 2/3 (32 inches) | 10c |

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|-----|
| Polypropylene (PP) pipe or tubing, 1 inch or smaller | $2\frac{2}{3}$ (32 inches) | 10c |
| Polypropylene (PP) pipe or tubing, $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches or larger | 4 | 10c |
| PVC pipe | 4 | 10c |
| Steel tubing | 8 | 10 |
| Steel pipe | 12 | 15 |

For SI: 1 inch = 25.4 mm, 1 foot = 304.8 mm.

a. See Section 301.18.

b. The maximum horizontal spacing of cast-iron pipe hangers shall be increased to 10 feet where 10-foot lengths of pipe are installed.

c. Mid-story guide.

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification recognizes the different support practice for pipe verses tube.

Assembly Action :

None

M 15-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-MECHANICAL COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Required clearances are already addressed in the appliance manufacturer's instructions. Deletion of this text will eliminate conflicts with the appliance installation instructions.

Assembly Action :

None

M 17-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

M 18-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There exists some gypsum products that comply with ASTM E136 as noncombustible. This would create an issue with gypsum board shafts that enclose grease ducts, regarding the required clearance between the grease duct and the shaft walls.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 19-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Buildings are constructed to be more airtight. Occupants don't open windows as needed for natural ventilation. This section should not revert back to 2009 text as this is a step in the wrong direction.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 20-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal addresses only dwelling units and is too extreme for single family dwellings. The proposed definition of nontransient is confusing relative to multi-family buildings verses hotels. The term transient is already defined and the proposed definition omits sleeping rooms. In some climates, the proposal is overkill. The proposal should be climatic location oriented. Cost is an issue for installing makeup air systems.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 21-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Not every kitchen needs mechanical ventilation. The proposed text belongs in Section 505. The proposal is not considerate of the kitchen size. It would be difficult to size the exhaust system. The requirements should be tailored to the climatic location.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 22-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 23-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: With the deletion of Section 403.2.2, corridors would no longer be covered. Nontransient is not the exact opposite of transient. Sleeping rooms are not addressed.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 24-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 25-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

403.3.2.4 System controls. ~~Control devices~~ Where provided within a dwelling unit, controls for outdoor air ventilation systems shall ~~be provided with include~~ text or a symbol indicating the ~~device's system's~~ function.

Committee Reason: The proposal is an inexpensive solution to prevent occupants from inadvertently shutting off the ventilation system. The controls need to be identified and known to the occupants. The modification clarifies that the text applies to controls within dwelling units and better aligns the text with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

M 26-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. This proposal provides for proper equipment selection and consistent ratings among various manufacturers.

Assembly Action :

None

M 27-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. This is a life safety issue.

Assembly Action :

None

M 28-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. The proposal provides better text structure for understanding.

Assembly Action :

None

M 29-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Occupants would be at risk when entering a garage after the ventilation system has been shut down for a while. CO is hazardous and the minimum exhaust rate is justified. NFPA standards require ventilation for automated parking garages with no vehicles operating inside.

Assembly Action :

None

M 30-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

506.1 General. Commercial kitchen hood ventilation ducts and exhaust *equipment* shall comply with the requirements of this section. Commercial kitchen grease ducts shall be designed for the type of cooking appliance and hood served.

507.1.2 Domestic cooking appliances used for commercial purposes. Domestic cooking appliances utilized for commercial purposes shall be provided with Type I or Type II hoods as required for the type of cooking appliances and processes ~~processes~~ in accordance with Sections 507.2 and 507.3. Domestic cooking appliances utilized for domestic cooking shall comply with Section 505.

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification clarifies that the exhaust system is designed for both the appliance and the cooking process.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 31-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Research does exist to support the required separation requirements in the IMC and ASHRAE 62.1.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 32-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would not allow individual fans to discharge to a multi-story exhaust shaft having a fan on the top of the shaft. The proposal would require more roof penetrations.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 33-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal limits design freedom. No evidence was provided that makeup air is deficient in such occupancies. Section 501 of the IMC adequately addresses pressure balances.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 34-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Lack of maintenance is the problem, not lack of access. The proposal is too vague regarding the type of access. The current code requires a means for cleanout. Short duct runs may not need access for cleaning.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 35-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: If flashed properly, lint cannot enter the building. No justification for singling out dryers as opposed to other exhaust terminals. The example photos were all installations that were improperly installed to begin with.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 36-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Section 504.4 applies to both commercial and residential and this proposal would eliminate coverage for commercial installations.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 37-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

M 38-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. The code lacks coverage for terminal configurations.

Assembly Action :

None

M 39-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: No justification was offered for the percentage increases in area. It would be hard to determine the direction of flow changes regarding the angles. For engineered systems, the proposed text may not apply. The proposed text should apply only to dryers that depend solely on the integral blower.

Assembly Action :

None

M 40-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The more appropriate location is Section 504.8. This text belongs in the IRC, not the IMC.

Assembly Action :

None

M 41-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-MECHANICAL COMMITTEE.

Part Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text is redundant with the appliance manufacturer's instructions. The current text refers to "diameter" which already implies that round duct is required.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 44.21% (84) Oppose: 55.79% (106)

Assembly Action :

None

Part Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

M 42-15

Committee Action:**Approved as Modified**

504.8.2 Duct installation. Exhaust ducts shall be supported at 4-foot (1219 mm) intervals and secured in place. The insert end of the duct shall extend into the adjoining duct or fitting in the direction of airflow. Ducts shall not be joined with screws or similar fasteners that protrude more than 1/8 inch (3.2 mm) into the inside of the duct. Where dryer exhaust ducts are enclosed in wall or ceiling cavities, such cavities shall ~~have a least dimension allow the installation of not less than 4.25 inches (108 mm). Round the duct shall not be deformed without deformation.~~

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. Deformed ducts can fail during cleaning operations. The manufacturer's instructions do not address cavity size and duct deformation. The modification eliminates an exact dimension.

Assembly Action :**None**

M 43-15**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The 12 foot interval is too great for ducts that are not mechanically fastened and rely on taped joints only. The current 4 foot interval provides stability for ducts being cleaned mechanically.

Assembly Action :**None**

M 44-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified**

505.4 Other than Group R. In other than Group R occupancies, where domestic cooktops, ranges, and open-top broilers are ~~installed~~ used for domestic purposes, domestic cooking exhaust systems shall be provided.

Committee Reason: The code needs the added coverage for domestic exhaust equipment and needs to reference the relevant product standards. The modification limits the application to domestic uses as was intended in the revised text of Section 505.4, however, such distinction was lost as the section was originally revised.

Assembly Action :**None**

M 45-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified**

505.1 Domestic systems. Where domestic range hoods and domestic appliances equipped with downdraft exhaust are provided, such hoods and appliances shall discharge to the outdoors through sheet metal ducts constructed of galvanized steel, stainless steel, aluminum or copper. Such ducts shall have smooth inner walls, shall be air tight, shall be equipped with a backdraft damper, and shall be independent of all other exhaust systems. Installations in Group I-1 and Group I-2 occupancies shall be in accordance with the International Building Code and Section 904.13 of the International Fire Code.

Exceptions:

1. In other than Group I-1 and I-2, where installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and where mechanical or natural ventilation is otherwise provided in accordance with Chapter 4, listed and labeled ductless range hoods shall not be required to discharge to the outdoors. ~~Installations in Group I-1 and Group I-2 occupancies shall be in accordance with Section 407.2.6 of the International Building Code and Section 904.13 of the International Fire Code.~~
2. Ducts for domestic kitchen cooking appliances equipped with downdraft exhaust systems shall be permitted to be constructed of Schedule 40 PVC pipe and fittings provided that the installation complies with all of the following:
 1. The duct shall be installed under a concrete slab poured on grade.
 2. The underfloor trench in which the duct is installed shall be completely backfilled with sand or gravel.
 3. The PVC duct shall extend not more than 1 inch (25 mm) above the indoor concrete floor surface.
 4. The PVC duct shall extend not more than 1 inch (25 mm) above grade outside of the building.
 5. The PVC ducts shall be solvent cemented.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modifications eliminate the reference to an IBC section number that is not encompassing of all Group I uses, and move the proposed exception into the main section because the new text is not an exception.

Assembly Action :**None**

M 46-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Section 505.2 is under domestic kitchens. Space cooling and the exception are unrelated to Section 505. If electric appliances are used, they are no longer covered for makeup air. The code needs a holistic instead of a piece-meal approach to air balance and makeup air. The proposal eliminates the system control requirements and may relax the requirements for exhaust.

Assembly Action :

None

M 47-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

M 48-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements

Assembly Action :

None

M 49-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal requirements are extreme. There is no basis for the proposed numbers. The level of effectiveness for the pollution control units is not specified. Does it matter which occupancy existed first? (i.e. the dwelling unit or the food establishment)

Assembly Action :

None

M 50-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal does not state the duration, pressure or temperature requirements for the water test. Light tests are used successfully. Power washing should be only an option, not the required test. This is overkill for short duct runs. If the duct gets wet during the test, it will be impossible to find the leaks.

Assembly Action :

None

M 51-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

506.5.2 Pollution Control Units. Where provided. ~~Pollution-pollution~~ control units shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions and shall be in accordance with all of the following:

1. Pollution control units shall be listed and labeled in accordance with UL 1978.
2. Fans serving pollution control units shall be listed and labeled in accordance with UL 762.
3. Pollution control units shall be mounted and secured in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions and the International Building Code.
4. Pollution control units located indoors shall be listed and labeled for such use. Where enclosed duct systems, as required by Section 506.3.11, are connected to a pollution control unit, such unit shall be located in a room or space having the same fire-resistance rating as the duct enclosure. Access shall be provided for servicing and cleaning of the unit. The space or enclosure shall be ventilated in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions.
5. A clearance of not less than 18 inches (457 mm) shall be maintained between the pollution control unit and combustible

material.

6. Roof mounted pollution control units shall be listed for exterior installation and shall be mounted not less than 18 inches (457 mm) above the roof.
7. Exhaust outlets for pollution control units shall be in accordance with Section 506.3.13.
8. An airflow differential pressure control shall be provided to monitor the pressure drop across the filter sections of a pollution control unit. When the airflow is reduced below the design velocity, the airflow differential pressure control shall activate a visual alarm located in the area where cooking operations occur.
9. Pollution control units shall be provided with a factory installed fire suppression system.
10. Service space shall be provided in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions for the pollution control unit and the requirements of Section 306.
11. Wash down drains shall discharge through a grease interceptor and shall be sized for the flow. Drains, shall be sealed with a trap or other approved means to prevent air bypass. Where a trap is utilized it shall have a seal depth that accounts for the system pressurization and evaporation between cleanings.
12. Protection from freezing shall be provided for the water supply and fire suppression systems where such systems are subject to freezing.
13. Duct connections to pollution control units shall be in accordance with Section 506.3.2.3. Where water splash or carryover can occur in the transition duct as a result of a washing operation, the transition duct shall slope downward toward the cabinet drain pan for a length not less than 18 inches (457 mm). Ducts shall transition to the full size of the units inlet and outlet openings.
14. Extra heavy duty appliance exhaust systems shall not be connected to pollution control units except where such units are specifically designed and listed for use with solid fuels.
15. Pollution control units shall be maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. These units are being installed today and need coverage. The modification removes any ambiguity about whether these units are required to be installed.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 52-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal exempts all hoods from the code's prescriptive requirements and depends solely on the listing. UL 710 does not address all of the requirements proposed for deletion. Some life safety requirements would be eliminated, such as interference with appliance venting. Section 508.1 is not covered in the appliance listing. Section 304.1 already require compliance with manufacturer's instructions.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 53-15

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : **None**

M 54-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: NFPA 96 would allow the AHJ to exempt the appliance from a hood, but the proposed text would allow such exemption without AHJ approval. The appliances are not required to comply UL 2162.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 55-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 56-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

M 57-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: In some cases, small quantities of materials can be hazardous. The level of supervision in labs is not consistent. Labs can have multiple purposes, some more hazardous than others. The proposal is too broad and encompassing and not limited to any use group. Labs use varying quantities of chemicals.

Assembly Action :

None

M 58-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: No criteria is proposed for the spark detection system. The proposal could be interpreted that fire suppression is not required. Other methods of protection could be used besides that proposed. The exceptions might not apply if a spark detection system is required.

Assembly Action :

None

M 59-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

510.8.4 Duct cleanout. Ducts conveying combustible dust as part of a dust collection system shall be equipped with cleanouts that are provided with approved access, pre-designed to be disassembled for cleaning, or engineered for automatic cleanouts. ~~The~~Where provided, cleanouts shall be located at the base of each vertical duct riser and at intervals not exceeding 20 foot in horizontal sections of duct.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification allows other designs. The prefix "pre" was deleted before "engineered" because it is not known what is meant by "pre-engineered."

Assembly Action :

None

M 60-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The current code requirement is not overly burdensome and is needed for life safety. What is being conveyed in the system can change as operations change. Discharging the exhaust to the outdoors is an alternative to the current code requirements.

Assembly Action :

None

M 61-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 62-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed text would prohibit the installation of a dedicated HVAC system for the pool area.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 63-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed text would be confusing to code officials. Items # 1 and 2 require a door undercut even if a return air opening is installed in the room served by the door. The scope is too limited and should address occupancies such as I-2.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 64-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. Under this proposal, framing cavities will no longer be excluded.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 65-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The change to the 2015 IMC to require 25/50 flame/smoke indices for the materials that bound the plenum was significant, and this proposal would be a step backwards.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 66-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. The proposal would prevent something such as paint from being used, just because the paint was listed for use in a plenum, as opposed to the paint being listed as a means of protecting the material from exposure in a plenum.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 67-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 68-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the action taken on M76-15

Assembly Action :

None

M 69-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. BOTH PARTS WERE HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the action taken on M70-15.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the action taken on M70-15.

Assembly Action :

None

M 70-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. BOTH PARTS WERE HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

602.2.1.6 Foam plastic insulation in plenums as interior finish or interior trim. ~~Where exposed to the airflow in plenums, foam plastic insulation in plenums used as interior wall or ceiling finish or interior trim, shall exhibit a flame spread index of 25 or less and a smoke-developed index of 50 or less when tested in accordance with ASTM E84 or UL 723 at the maximum thickness and density intended for use, and shall be tested in accordance with NFPA 286 and meet the acceptance criteria of Section 803.1.2 of the International Building Code.~~

Exceptions:

1. Foam plastic ~~insulation~~ in plenums used as interior wall or ceiling finish or interior trim, shall exhibit a flame spread index of 75 or less and a smoke-developed index of 450 or less when tested in accordance with ASTM E84 or UL 723 at the maximum thickness and density intended for use, where it is separated from the airflow in the plenum by a thermal barrier complying with Section 2603.4 of the International Building Code.
2. Foam plastic ~~insulation~~ in plenums used as interior wall or ceiling finish or interior trim, shall exhibit a flame spread index of 75 or less and a smoke-developed index of 450 or less when tested in accordance with ASTM E84 or UL 723 at the maximum thickness and density intended for use, where it is separated from the airflow in the plenum by corrosion-resistant steel having a base metal thickness of not less than 0.0160 inch (0.4 mm).
3. Foam plastic ~~insulation~~ in plenums used as interior wall or ceiling finish or interior trim, shall exhibit a flame spread index of 75 or less and a smoke-developed index of 450 or less when tested in accordance with ASTM E84 or UL 723 at the maximum thickness and density intended for use, where it is separated from the airflow in the plenum by not less than a 1 inch (25mm) thickness of masonry or concrete.

Committee Reason: The proposal reorganizes the text for ease of use and also adds an option for concrete protection of the foam plastic. The modification removes language that is redundant with Section 602.2.1. The modification deletes the word "insulation" as it matters not what form the foam plastic takes.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

2603.7 Foam plastic insulation in plenums as interior finish or interior trim. ~~Foam plastic insulation in plenums used as interior wall or ceiling finish, or interior trim, shall exhibit a flame spread index of 25 or less and a smoke-developed index of 50 or less when tested in accordance with ASTM E 84 or UL 723 at the maximum thickness and density intended for use, and shall be tested in accordance with NFPA 286 and meet the acceptance criteria of Section 803.1.2.~~

Exceptions:

1. Foam plastic ~~insulation~~ in plenums used as interior wall or ceiling finish, or interior trim, shall exhibit a flame spread index of 75 or less and a smoke-developed index of 450 or less when tested in accordance with ASTM E 84 or UL 723 at the maximum thickness and density intended for use, where it is separated from the airflow in the plenum by a thermal barrier complying with Section 2603.4.
2. Foam plastic ~~insulation~~ in plenums used as interior wall or ceiling finish, or interior trim, shall exhibit a flame spread index of 75 or less and a smoke-developed index of 450 or less when tested in accordance with ASTM E 84 or UL 723 at the maximum thickness and density intended for use, where it is separated from the airflow in the plenum by corrosion-resistant steel having a base metal thickness of not less than 0.0160 inch (0.4 mm).
3. Foam plastic ~~insulation~~ in plenums used as interior wall or ceiling finish, or interior trim, shall exhibit a flame spread index of 75 or less and a smoke-developed index of 450 or less when tested in accordance with ASTM E 84 or UL 723 at the maximum thickness and density intended for use, where it is separated from the airflow in the plenum by not less than a 1 inch (25mm) thickness of masonry or concrete.

Committee Reason: The committee reason is identical to the reason for M70-15, Part I.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 71-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the action taken on M76-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 72-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the action taken on M76-15

Assembly Action : **None**

M 73-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the action taken on M76-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 75-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the action taken on M76-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 76-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

602.2.1.7 Plastic plumbing piping and tubing. Plastic piping and tubing used in plumbing systems ~~exposed within a plenum~~ shall be listed and labeled as having a flame spread index not greater than 25 and a smoke-developed index not greater than 50 when tested in accordance with ASTM E 84 or UL 723.

Exception: Plastic water distribution piping and tubing listed and labeled in accordance with UL 2846 as having a peak optical density not greater than 0.50, an average optical density not greater than 0.15, and a flame spread distance not greater than 5 feet (1524 mm), and installed in accordance with its listing.

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification eliminates redundant words because this section is about materials within plenums. The deleted words would allow materials to cover the pipes where such materials were not listed for the application of covering pipes.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 77-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It is not necessary for the code to clarify what is in the test standards, nor is it necessary to focus on a single aspect of such standards.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 78-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the action taken on M79-15

Assembly Action : **None**

M 79-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. The proposal is consistent with the format for other code sections for coverage of materials in plenums.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 80-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would bring the code into the business of writing test standards. Who determines if the test methods were modified. The adjective "strict" before the word accordance implies that there is some other level of compliance with the standard requirements and that AHJ approval may be involved.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 81-15

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : **None**

M 82-15

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : **None**

M 83-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

M 84-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Detailed installation instructions do not belong in the code. The proposal is not consistent with the SMACNA standard for such ducts.

Assembly Action :

None

M 85-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The 5 foot length is an arbitrary number. The proposal will increase the cost of construction. Sheet metal ducts can also be installed improperly, so why focus only on flexible ducts?

Assembly Action :

None

M 86-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

M 87-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

M 88-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Section 603.5 is for nonmetallic ducts. Section 603.8.3 is for underground ducts and addresses plastic ducts. This proposal could allow plastic ducts above ground.

Assembly Action :

None

M 89-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

603.5.2 Phenolic ducts. Nonmetallic phenolic ducts shall be constructed and installed in accordance with the SMACNA Phenolic Duct Construction Standards.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification is for consistency with other similar text in the IMC.

Assembly Action : None

M 90-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Flexible ducts are not temporary. The code does require ducts to be cleaned. The word "inaccessible" is subjective. The use of a product should not be limited simply because it is sometimes improperly installed. The proposal would limit the use of 2 inch high velocity ducts which are concealed.

Assembly Action : None

M 91-15

Committee Action: Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : None

M 92-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Products are installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. The current text is needed to distinguish between flexible ducts and connectors. Duct installation and design is specified in the code already.

Assembly Action : None

M 93-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The code should refer to just ducts as opposed to nonmetallic and plastic. UL181 is not the appropriate standard. There is no rationale for limiting plastic underground ducts to PVC only.

Assembly Action : None

M 94-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

603.8.2 Sealing. Ducts shall be sealed and secured and then tested with air to a pressure of not less than 2 inches water column (498 Pa) for not less than 5 minutes. Testing shall be performed in the presence of the code official and prior to concrete encasement in concrete or direct burial. Ducts shall be leak tested as required by Section C403 of the *International Energy Conservation Code*.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. Testing of ducts is necessary. The modification deletes the requirement for the code official to observe the testing which caused concern for some. The modification provides the allowable leakage rate and uses existing IECC testing criteria.

Assembly Action : None

M 95-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was no justification for deleting HDPE plastic materials. There was no justification for requiring 25/50 flame/smoke indices. Disapproval was based on the action taken on M93-15.

Assembly Action : None

M 96-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The leakage rate for snap-lock and button-lock joints is insignificant and acceptable within conditioned spaces.

Assembly Action : None

M 97-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Dissapproval was consistent with the action taken on M84-15, M85-15 and M92-15. Section 603.6.1.1 is unenforceable. There is no need to cherry pick portions of product standards and print them in the codes.

Assembly Action : None

M 98-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

604.3 Coverings and linings. Coverings and linings, including adhesives where used, shall have a flame spread index not more than 25 and a smoke-developed index not more than 50, when tested in accordance with ASTM E 84 or UL 723, using the specimen preparation and mounting procedures of ASTM E 2231. Duct coverings and linings shall not flame, glow, smolder or smoke when tested in accordance with ASTM C 411 at the temperature to which they are exposed in service. The test temperature shall not fall below 250°F (121°C). Coverings and linings shall be listed and labeled.

Exception: Polyurethane foam insulation that is spray applied to the exterior of ducts in attics and crawlspaces shall have a flame spread index not greater than 75 and a smoke-developed index not greater than 450, subject to all of the following requirements:

1. The foam plastic insulation complies with the requirements of Section 2603 of the *International Building Code*.
2. The foam plastic insulation is protected against ignition in accordance with the requirements of Section 2603.4.1.6 of the *International Building Code*.

604.4 Foam plastic insulation. Foam plastic used as duct coverings and linings shall conform to the requirements of Section 604.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The use of spray foam insulation is growing and the code needs to address it. The modifications restore Section 604.4 to ensure proper code enforcement and provide both flame and smoke indices to fully assess the material.

Assembly Action : None

M 99-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This product needs to be stamped with the product R-value for both the insulation alone and the insulation with an air space. The product installation would be better understood if the product-only R-value was indicated. This product is commonly installed without an air space between it and the duct. There is a significant difference in performance between installing the product with an air space and without an air space.

Assembly Action : None

M 100-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The water vapor permeance for the spray foam cannot be compared to a metal foil retarder. The proposed rating is appropriate for the material.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 101-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed text is difficult to enforce and is appropriate for the IGCC, but overkill for the IMC. The equipment manufacturer's instructions already cover this.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 102-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 103-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Masonry chimneys are not within the scope of Section 805.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 104-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

916.1 General. Pool and spa heaters shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. Oil-fired pool and spa heaters shall be tested in accordance with UL 726. Electric pool and spa heaters shall be tested in accordance with UL 1261, UL 1563 or CSA C22.2 No. 218.1. ~~Gas-fired pool heaters shall comply with ANSI Z21.56/CSA 4.7.~~ Pool and spa heat pump water heaters shall comply with UL 1995, AHRI 1160, or CSA C22.2 No. 236.

Exception: Portable residential spas and portable residential exercise spas shall comply with UL 1563 or CSA C22.2 No. 218.1.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification deletes AHRI 1160 which is already referenced in the IECC. Gas heaters are covered by the IFGC and the new exception recognizes integral heaters in spas listed to UL1563.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 105-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed standard does not cover all types of systems and it should be an option rather than mandatory. Chapter 9 addresses appliances and equipment, not systems. The proposed text could conflict with Section 1210.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 106-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The quantity of fuel allowed in such units is excessive. The allowable NOx emissions are above the EPA limits for such. These units should be prohibited in other occupancies besides Group E and I.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 107-15

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : **None**

M 108-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

929.1 General. ~~High~~ Where provided, high volume large diameter fans shall be tested and labeled in accordance with AMCA 230, ~~listed~~ and ~~installed~~ labeled in accordance with UL 507, and installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification brings in the necessary requirement for such fans to be listed to a product safety standard.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 109-15

THIS IS A 3 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IFGC COMMITTEE. PART III WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-MECHANICAL COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with, and was based on the issues raised for, Parts II and III

Assembly Action : **None**

Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is not enforceable and does not account for direct-vent appliances. The term "enclosure" is not defined and could be interpreted as an entire basement.

Assembly Action : **None**

Part III

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The term "enclosure" is not defined. The proposal limits the use of some appliances.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 110-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

M 111-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1006.6 Safety and relief valve discharge. Safety and relief valve discharge pipes shall be of rigid pipe that is *approved for* the temperature of the system. Highpressure-steam safety valves shall be vented to the outside of the structure. The discharge piping serving pressure relief valves, temperature relief valves and combinations of such valves shall:

1. Not be directly connected to the drainage system.
2. Discharge through an air ~~gap break~~ located in the same room as the appliance.
3. Not be smaller than the diameter of the outlet of the valve served and shall discharge full size to the air ~~gap break~~.
4. Serve a single relief device and shall not connect to piping serving any other relief device or equipment.
5. Discharge to the floor, to the pan serving the boiler or storage tank, to a waste receptor or to the outdoors.
6. Discharge in a manner that does not cause personal injury or structural damage.
7. Discharge to a termination point that is readily observable by the building occupants.
8. Not be trapped.
9. Be installed so as to flow by gravity.
10. Not terminate more than 6 inches (152 mm) above the floor or waste receptor.
11. Not have a threaded connection at the end of such piping.
12. Not have valves or tee fittings.
13. Be constructed of those materials listed in Section 605.4 of the *International Plumbing Code* or materials tested, rated and approved for such use in accordance with ASME A112.4.1

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The proposal is consistent with IPC Section 504.6. The modification changes air gap to air break, which is more representative of the actual installations addresses by Chapter 10.

Assembly Action :

None

M 112-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal could create conflict with the referenced standards. Section 1004.1 already covers this.

Assembly Action :

None

M 113-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

SECTION 202 DEFINITIONS

DIRECT SOLAR SYSTEM. *No change to text.*

SECTION 202 DEFINITIONS

INDIRECT SOLAR SYSTEM. *No change to text.*

SECTION 202 DEFINITIONS

NO-FLOW CONDITION (SOLAR). *No change to text.*

1402.2 Access. Access shall be provided to solar thermal equipment for maintenance. Solar thermal systems and appurtenances shall not obstruct or interfere with the operation of any doors, windows or other building components requiring operation or access. Roof-mounted solar thermal equipment shall not obstruct or interfere with the operation of roof-mounted equipment, appliances, chimneys, ~~plumbing vents~~, roof hatches, smoke vents, skylights and other roof penetrations and openings.

1402.3.1 Relief device. Each section of the system in which excessive pressures are capable of developing shall have a relief device located so that a section cannot be valved off or otherwise isolated from a relief device. Relief valves shall comply with the requirements of Section 1006.6. For indirect solar systems, pressure relief valves in solar loops shall also comply with SRCC 300.

1402.5.3 Direct systems for other than potable water distribution systems. Where a solar thermal system directly heats water for a system other than a potable water distribution system, a potable water supply connected to such system shall be protected by a ~~against backflow preventer in accordance with an intermediate atmospheric vent complying with ASSE 1012. Where solar thermal system directly heats chemically treated water for a system other than a potable water distribution system, a potable water supply connected to such system shall be protected by a reduced~~

~~pressure principle backflow prevention assembly complying with ASSE 1013.~~ the *International Plumbing Code*.

1404.4 Heat exchangers. Heat exchangers shall be labeled to indicate the heat exchanger type with one of the following:

1. "Single-wall without leak protection"
2. "Double-wall with no leak protection"

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification appropriately defers to the IPC for backflow protection coverage; adds the word "solar" to clarify the scope of the definitions and eliminates the concern for placing solar panels over plumbing vents.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 114-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the action taken on M125-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 115-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 116-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 117-15

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : **None**

M 118-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 119-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

M 120-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.**Assembly Action :****None**

M 121-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified**

This section applies only to industrial occupancies and refrigerated rooms for manufacturing, food and beverage preparation, meat cutting, other processes and storage. Machinery rooms are not required where all of the following conditions are met:

1. The space containing the machinery is separated from other occupancies by tight construction with tight-fitting doors.
2. Access is restricted to authorized personnel.
3. The floor area per occupant is not less than 100 square feet (9.3 m²) where machinery is located on floor levels with exits more than 6.6 feet (2012 mm) above the ground. Where provided with egress directly to the outdoors or into *approved* building exits, the minimum floor area shall not apply.
4. Refrigerant detectors are installed as required for machinery rooms in accordance with Section 1105.3.

Exceptions:

1. Refrigerant detectors are not required in unoccupied areas that contain only continuous piping that does not include valves, valve assemblies, equipment, or equipment connections.
2. Where approved alternatives are provided, refrigerant detectors for ammonia refrigeration are not required for rooms or areas that are always occupied, and for rooms or areas that have high humidity or other harsh environmental conditions that are incompatible with detection devices.
5. Surfaces having temperatures exceeding 800° F (427° C) and open flames are not present where any Group A2, B2, A3 or B3 refrigerant is used (see Section 1104.3.4).
6. All electrical *equipment* and appliances conform to Class 1, Division 2, *hazardous location* classification requirements of NFPA 70 where the quantity of any Group A2, B2, A3 or B3 refrigerant, other than ammonia, in a single independent circuit would exceed 25 percent of the lower flammability limit (LFL) upon release to the space.
7. All refrigerant-containing parts in systems exceeding 100 horsepower (hp) (74.6 kW) drive power, except evaporators used for refrigeration or dehumidification; condensers used for heating; control and pressure relief valves for either; and connecting piping, shall be located either outdoors or in a *machinery room*.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification limits the exception to ammonia which was the intent and which is consistent with ASHRAE 15.

Assembly Action :**None**

M 122-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.**Assembly Action :****None**

M 123-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified**

1105.6.1.1 Indoor exhaust opening location. Indoor mechanical exhaust intake openings shall be located where refrigerant leakage is likely to concentrate based on the refrigerant's relative density to air. ~~Air, the location of the air current paths and refrigerating machinery location shall be accounted for in locating such intake openings.~~

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification is for consistency with ASHRAE 15 text format and also clarifies that "machinery" is specific to refrigeration machinery.

Assembly Action :**None**

M 124-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The proposal makes a critical distinction.

Assembly Action :

None

M 125-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The IIAR 2 standard is not fully developed and until it is, ASHRAE 15 is better.

Assembly Action :

None

M 126-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The equipment manufacturer's instructions already cover this. The proposed text provides no guidance or direction, is vague and is not enforceable. Section 1107.2.1 already covers this issue and so does ASHRAE 15 referenced in Section 1101.6.

Assembly Action :

None

M 127-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: M128-15 has preferable text and is more inclusive. "Means of egress" was not revised in the second sentence.

Assembly Action :

None

M 128-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal does not address living quarters. The term "exit" could condense items 1 through 4 into a single item. The terminology is inconsistent with the IBC.

Assembly Action :

None

M 129-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

M 130-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

M 131-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: M132-15 is the preferred proposal because it makes ASTM B 819 an option instead of mandating compliance with both ASTM B 280 and B 819.

Assembly Action :

None

M 132-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

M 133-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1107.5.3 Copper tube. Copper tube used for refrigerant piping erected on the premises shall be seamless copper tube of Type ACR (hard or annealed) complying with ASTM B 280. Where approved, copper tube for refrigerant piping erected on the premises shall be seamless copper tube of Type K, L or M (drawn or annealed) in accordance with ASTM B 88. Annealed temper copper tube shall not be used in sizes larger than a 2-inch (51 mm) nominal size. Mechanical joints, other than press-connect joints listed for refrigerant piping, shall not be used on annealed temper copper tube in sizes larger than 7/ 8-inch (22.2 mm) OD size.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification clarifies that the code is referring only to press-connect joints that are listed for refrigerant piping applications.

Assembly Action :

None

M 134-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text mandates compliance with CSA B214, therefore it is not optional. Section 1201.3 allows ASME B31.9 as an alternative to the code provisions, therefore the code already provides an alternative standard.

Assembly Action :

None

M 135-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

M 136-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

M 137-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

M 138-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

M 139-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : None

M 140-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal references a standard that does not apply to the product.

Assembly Action : None

M 141-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

M 142-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text is too general and could allow the product to be used for applications for which it is not listed. The current exception # 1 already allows the primer to be omitted.

Assembly Action : None

M 143-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text is already in the product standard and the manufacturer's installation instructions, therefore there is no need to duplicate it in the code.

Assembly Action : None

M 144-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

M 145-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. Approval is consistent with action taken on M8-15.

Assembly Action :

None

M 146-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text would prohibit the application of tees in primary/secondary loop configurations and would prohibit "monoflow" tees.

Assembly Action :

None

M 147-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal is too broad and restrictive. Some rooms and zones could require mismatched special radiation elements.

Assembly Action :

None

M 148-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Current Section 1206.2 already addresses draining of the system. It is impossible to install and start-up a system without air vents, therefore it is unnecessary to state that air vents are required.

Assembly Action :

None

M 149-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The use of anti-freeze solutions is not the only means of protecting a system from freezing.

Assembly Action :

None

M 150-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

1208.1 General. Hydronic piping systems shall be tested hydrostatically at one and one-half times the maximum system design pressure, but not less than 100 psi (689 kPa). The duration of each test shall be not less than 15 minutes.

Exception: For plastic PEX piping systems, testing with a compressed gas shall be an alternative to hydrostatic testing where compressed air or other gas pressure testing is specifically authorized by all of the manufacturer's instructions for the plastic PEX pipe and fitting products installed at the time the system is being tested, and compressed air or other gas testing is not otherwise prohibited by applicable codes, laws or regulations outside of this code.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification limits the air testing to PEX pipe and tubing because such non-rigid polyolefin material does not pose a danger. Products other than PEX are not recommended to be tested with compressed gases.

Assembly Action : None

M 151-15

Committee Action: Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : None

M 152-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This fixes an oversight in the coverage for PEX joints. Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : None

M 153-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

M 154-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : None

M 155-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

M 156-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: UI 79 is for fuel dispensing equipment and is not appropriate for the pumps covered in this code section. UI 343 has more coverage than UL 79, such as for different fuel oil types and different testing requirements.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 157-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 158-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 159-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The proposal provides a necessary link to the IBC.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 160-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. BOTH PARTS WERE HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the action on M70-15 and M79-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the action on M70-15 and M79-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

M 161-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The Committee's action was based on action taken on M125-15 and M114-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

2015 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL PLUMBING CODE

PLUMBING CODE COMMITTEE

Dave W. Cantrell, Chair
Chief Plumbing Inspector
Public Health - Seattle & King County
Seattle, WA

Charles E. Gerber, Vice Chair
Mechanical/Plumbing Inspector Supervisor
County of Henrico
Henrico, VA

Joseph Ackroyd, PE
Director of Engineering
New York City Department of Buildings
New York, NY

James C. Finley, PE
Rep: Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors
Association
President
C.N. Finley
New Orleans, LA

Scott J. Friesen, PE
Senior Consultant
Ivey Engineering, Inc.
San Diego, CA

Philip Hoffman, CSP, CGB, CGP
Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Hoffman Custom Built Homes LLC
La Place, LA

Lawson Losh
Plumbing Inspector
State of Delaware
Dover, DE

Ken Loucks
Regulatory Compliance Manager
Schier Products Company
Edwardsville, KS 66111

Joseph T. Madziar
Chief, Plumbing Division
State of Michigan
Lansing, MI

Philip F. Parisi, Jr., PE
Associate Partner
Jaros Baum & Bolles Consulting Engineers
New York, NY

John A. Robitaille, CBO
Rep: New Castle County Department of Lane
Use
Certified Building and Site Inspector
Wilmington, DE

Matthew T. Rozzell, CBO
Building Official
City of Happy Valley
Happy Valley, OR

Billy Smith
Rep: American Society of Plumbing Engineers
Executive Director/CEO
American Society of Plumbing Engineers
Montgomery, AL

Shawn Strausbaugh
Construction Plans Examiner
Arlington County, VA
Arlington, VA

Gary Wickham
Senior Sales Manager
AB&I Foundry
Oakland, CA

Staff Secretariat:
Fred Grable, PE
Senior Staff Engineer - Plumbing
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hills, IL

INTERNATIONAL PLUMBING CODE

2015 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

P 1-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: As there is a change as to the type of materials that can possibly used for for a building sewer, there needs to be some distance away from the outside of the building before the changeover can occur (from building drain to building sewer).

Assembly Action :

None

P 2-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Waste and soil are already clear in the code. There doesn't need to be another definition for waste.

Assembly Action :

None

P 3-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This definition is needed so that everyone understands what type of valve this is.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 4-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Approving this text would result in no definition for water of a temperature between 111F and 134F. Changing a definition to solve the issue of Legionella bacteria growth is not the solution.

Assembly Action :

None

P 5-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal would create a new definition for a vent stack. The phrase "vent stack" is already defined. The new definition will only add confusion.

Assembly Action :

None

P 6-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This definition is the same one that is currently in the IMC. As the IPC allows use of these same type of fittings, adding the definition will be useful for clarity.

Assembly Action :

None

P 7-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The IPC needs a definition for a pool. Perhaps the IPSPSC definition should be used instead of the current definition.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 8-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The code only needs to require third party certification for the items that the code specifies a standard for compliance.

Assembly Motion: **Disapprove**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 40.48% (68) Oppose: 59.52% (100)

Assembly Action : **None**

P 9-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: There needs to be emphasis on ensuring quality of the these pipe materials. The Annex in the ASTM standards provides additional requirements to ensure a quality product.

Assembly Motion: **Disapprove**

Online Vote Results: **Successful** - Support: 58.97% (92) Oppose: 41.03% (64)

Assembly Action : **Disapproved**

P 10-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: These screens could be too easily dislodged or removed to be effective. Product could be proprietary.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 11-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The IPC needs to be aligned with the IRC on this subject as the types of piping covered and the minimum sheathing thickness do not need to be different between the two codes.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 12-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The IRC was changed last cycle to allow a lesser dimension, One quarter inch less clearance is not going to make that much of a difference other than to allow slightly more latitude in placement of piping through wall stud or ceiling joist.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 13-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This information is already in the standards for the pipe product. Putting it in the code might create a conflict with what is currently in the code. Inspectors will find these trench width requirements difficult to understand.

Assembly Motion: **As Submitted**

Online Vote Results: **Failed** - Support: 13.89% (25) Oppose: 86.11% (155)

Assembly Action : **None**

P 14-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This subject is already covered in the IBC in the structural chapter. The proposed text is similiar to what is in the IMC but not all of what is the IMC. The IPC doesn't need any more information like this put into it.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 15-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

308.10 Thermal expansion tanks. A thermal expansion tank shall be supported according to the manufacturer's instructions. Tanks shall not be supported by the piping that connects to the thermal expansion tank.

Committee Reason:

For the Modification only:

Some thermal expansion tank manufacturer's instructions do have installation instructions and even though the code requires, in general, the following of installation instructions, this is a good reminder for these components.

For the proposal As Modified:

Some thermal expansion tank manufacturer's instructions do not state anything about support of the tank. As a minimum, piping should not be used to support these tanks.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The language seems to not require the tank to be supported at all. This is a good idea that needs some language rework for a public comment.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 48.75% (78) Oppose: 51.25% (82)

Assembly Action :

None

P 16-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Provides guidance for hanger spacing for new sizes of piping that can be used.

Assembly Action :

None

P 17-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Many people are not going to understand what copper alloy is especially when the standards for the materials still having a title that includes the term "brass". Would like to see a public comment that retains two separate rows, one for copper alloy pipe at 10 foot horizontal spacing and one for copper alloy tubing at 8 foot horizontal spacing.

Assembly Action :

None

P 18-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Committee wanted to be consistent with their action on P16-15.

Assembly Action :

None

P 19-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This section has not been clear to many as to what was necessary to prevent drain and waste piping sway. This new language provides sufficient direction.

Assembly Motion:

Disapprove

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 27.22% (43) Oppose: 72.78% (115)

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 20-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This exception needs to be more specific about what piping this applies to. Is this only intended for DWV piping?

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Air testing (of plastic piping) is not safe to do. This exception could be misunderstood to by inspectors to just allow air testing for plastic piping.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 40.74% (66) Oppose: 59.26% (96)

Assembly Action :

None

P 21-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The cost impact of "will not increase the cost of construction" is not accurate. There will be additional labor costs to perform the required testing.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 23.27% (37) Oppose: 76.73% (122)

Assembly Action :

None

P 22-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The 10 feet of water head pressure equals 4.33psi which is only marginally less than a 5 psi of air pressure test. The water test shouldn't be significantly less pressure than an air test.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 45.81% (71) Oppose: 54.19% (84)

Assembly Action :

None

P 23-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: To be consistent with the action on P22-15.

Assembly Action :

None

P 24-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Simply filling (with water) a building sewer having a low slope and a short length doesn't apply much pressure at all to determine if a leak exists in a joint.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 14.19% (22) Oppose: 85.81% (133)

Assembly Action :

None

P 25-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee did not know what a "reliability centered program" was. Further explanation is needed to understand this proposal.

Assembly Action :

None

P 26-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 27-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee believes that farm stands would be covered by the current Item 2 of this section's exceptions.

Assembly Action :

None

P 28-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: All rooms in any building could be simultaneously occupied.

Assembly Action :

None

P 29-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: As stated in the reason statment, the IBC allows the occupant load to be reduced for spaces and this would provide the relief for the number of plumbing fixtures that the proponent is seeking to achieve.

Assembly Action :

None

P 30-15

The following is errata that was posted on the ICC website:

| NO. | CLASSIFICATION | OCCUPANCY | DESCRIPTION | WATER CLOSETS (URINALS: SEE SECTION 419.2) | | LAVATORIES | | BATHTUBS/ SHOWERS | DRINKING FOUNTAIN (SEE SECTION 410) | OTHER |
|-----|----------------|------------------|---|---|--|---|--------|----------------------|---|----------------|
| | | | | MALE | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | | | |
| 1 | Assembly | A-1 ^d | Theaters and other buildings for the performing arts and motion pictures | 1 per 125 | 1 per 65 | 1 per 200 | | — | 1 per 500 | 1 service sink |
| | | A-2 ^d | Nightclubs, bars, taverns, dance halls and buildings for similar purposes | 1 per 40 | 1 per 40 | 1 per 75 | | — | 1 per 500 | 1 service sink |
| | | | Restaurants, banquet halls and food courts | 1 per 75 | 1 per 75 | 1 per 200 | | — | 1 per 500 | 1 service sink |
| | | | Casinos | 1 per 100 for the first 400 and 1 per 250 for the remainder exceeding 400 | 1 per 50 for the first 400 and 1 per 150 for the remainder exceeding 400 | 1 per 250 for the first 750 and 1 per 500 for the remainder exceeding 750 | | — | 1 per 1,000 | 1 service sink |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|---|-------------|----------------|
| | | A-3 ^d | Auditoriums without permanent seating, art galleries, exhibition halls, museums, lecture halls, libraries, arcades and gymnasiums | 1 per 125 | 1 per 65 | 1 per 200 | — | 1 per 500 | 1 service sink |
| | | | Passenger terminals and transportation facilities | 1 per 500 | 1 per 500 | 1 per 750 | — | 1 per 1,000 | 1 service sink |
| | | | Places of worship and other religious services | 1 per 150 | 1 per 75 | 1 per 200 | — | 1 per 1,000 | 1 service sink |

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Casinos can have numerous types of uses within the casino building. Putting all casinos under the same row doesn't seem to be what the proponent is intending to accomplish.

Assembly Action :

None

P 31-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Raising the number of occupants threshold and applying the note to all service sink applications would result in some occupancies that really need these sinks, such as small healthcare offices and small restaurants not to have service sinks (but need them to meet other regulations).

Assembly Action :

None

P 33-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agrees with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 34-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Based on changes made to Section 403.1 for the 2012 IPC, the occupancy classssification of a building space no longer impacts the selection of the row in Table 403.1 for determining the number of plumbing fixtures. The use description does, therefore, the occupancy classssification column needs removed from the table to avoid confusion about how the table is to be used.

Assembly Action :

None

P 35-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Actual data has not been provided to justify the changes. The studies cited are over 30 years old. Doubling the quantities of some fixtures based on this old data isn't appropriate as no new studies are showing a need for more fixtures.

Assembly Action :

None

P 36-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. BOTH PARTS WERE HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is a terminology issue as "aquatic recreation" seems to be pointing to pools only in aquatic recreational facilities. The ISPCS already covers those requirements so this proposal isn't needed-the requirement is already covered.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistency with action on P36 Part I.

Assembly Action : None

P 37-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal would require fixtures in excess of the minimum requirements of the code.

Assembly Action : None

P 38-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Family-assisted use toilet facilities are already gender-neutral. The code doesn't need to establish another category for toilet facilities.

Assembly Action : None

P 39-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistency with the action on P39-15.

Assembly Action : None

P 40-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed language results in not knowing how to calculate the number of males and females. If these new requirements result in a greater minimum number of plumbing fixtures, that will result in additional cost. More cost would conflict with the cost impact statement on the proposal.

Assembly Action : None

P 41-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: One committee member's single-person survey indicated that women would not use a single-user toilet facility that was also used by men. Proposal P42-15 is a superior proposal to this proposal.

Assembly Action : None

P 42-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Who will determine what is "primarily" drinking and dining? This is too ambiguous for the code.

Assembly Action : None

P 43-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The code identifies male and female facilities and there isn't any need for anything other to be in the code. "Single stall" seems to indicate a compartment but a single user toilet room doesn't have a compartment.

Assembly Action : None

P 44-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no real technical justification to change mercantile back to 50 when it was just changed to 100 in the 2012 edition. A 100 person occupant load is a 6000 square foot tenant space which is still fairly small as far as typical mercantile tenant spaces are today. Requiring separate male/female toilet rooms for those spaces would be a undue hardship.

Assembly Motion:
Online Vote Results:
Assembly Action :

As Submitted
Failed - Support: 47.4% (73) Oppose: 52.6% (81)
None

P 45-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The required plumbing fixtures do not have to be *in* the same building that creates the demand for the plumbing fixtures.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 46-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-GENERAL COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is a necessary code addition to make sure that fixtures other than water closets are proportionally distributed where multiple toilet facilities are in a building.

Assembly Action : **None**

Part II

THE IBC-G COMMITTEE IS ONLY TO DECIDE WHETHER THIS SECTION SHOULD BE PLACED CHAPTER 29. THE TECHNICAL PART OF THE NEW SECTION WILL BE DECIDED BY THE IPC COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal to be consistent with previous action by the IPC Committee on Part I of the proposal.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 47-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Assisted accessible bathrooms do not include assistance. If you have assistance, it falls outside of accessibility.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 48-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 49-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 50-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement. Also, for consistency with the manufacturer's standards.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 51-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 52-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 53-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Approving this proposal would prohibit some types of bathtub waste assemblies as they use slip joints on other than tubular waste.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 47.26% (69) Oppose: 52.74% (77)

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 54-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-GENERAL COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This requirement would be well above code minimum. The cost impact would be significant; much more than the \$200 stated.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved to correspond with the previous action of the 2015 IRC PM Committee on Part I of this code change.

Assembly Action :

None

P 55-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The standard for bathtubs is in the process of being revised to be more clear on this issue. Until the revision is complete, the code should not be revised.

Assembly Action : None

Part II

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Tubs are being sold without overflow openings. The code should not be requiring plumbers to be drilling holes in tubs in the field in order to comply with the code.

Assembly Action : None

P 56-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Dishwashing machines made to this standard will sanitize dishes better as they generate 150 degree F water.

Assembly Action : None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the contents of NSF 104 - 2014 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 57-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement. This change will keep readers from going to Chapter 8 for drain connection information.

Assembly Action : None

P 58-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal aligns the standard to what is the current standard used in the industry.

Assembly Action : None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASHRAE 18-2008 (RA 2013) with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 59-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The requested increase to thirty is arbitrary. The current threshold of 15 is not overly conservative.

Assembly Action : None

P 60-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: A threshold of 50 seems to be an arbitrary number. People need free access to water. Allowing 15 people not have access to water is one thing but 50 seems to be excessive number of people to have to go without water.

Assembly Motion: As Submitted

Online Vote Results: Failed - Support: 40.38% (63) Oppose: 59.62% (93)

Assembly Action : None

P 61-15

Committee Action: Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASSE 1071-2012 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 62-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee prefers the text of P63-15.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASSE 1071-2012 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 63-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

411.3 Water supply. The temperature of the Where hot and cold water supply is supplied to an emergency shower or eyewash station the temperature of the water supply shall only be controlled by a temperature actuated mixing valve complying with ASSE 1071.

Committee Reason:

For the Modification only:

The correct water temperature to a safety shower can be supplied by mixed hot and cold water supply, storage tanks or tankless water heaters. Only where hot and cold water supplies are mixed is there a need for a mixing valve.

For the proposal As Modified:

The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Motion:

Disapprove

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 52.94% (81) Oppose: 47.06% (72)

Assembly Action :

Disapproved

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASSE 1071 - 2012 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 64-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Faucets with temperature limit stop could be too easily replaced by a a faucet that doesn't have a limit stop.

Assembly Action :

None

P 65-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The code doesn't mention anything about shower drains being required for outdoor rinsing showers yet this proposal requires connecting the drain to a specific location. It isn't appropriate to direct this water to a building storm drain system as the code prohibits such connections.

Assembly Action :

None

P 66-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed language applies to all sinks but that is not the intent of the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 67-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement. The plumbing code should not be involved with interior finishes of the building or space.

Assembly Action :

None

P 68-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

P 69-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 70-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement. There are other measures that the healthcare industry uses to reduce or eliminate the problems that the current code section was intended to cover.

Assembly Action :

None

P 71-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 72-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Healthcare procedures have evolved where 180 degree F water is not used.

Assembly Action :

None

P 73-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 74-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is not a definition for flushing rim sink and there is too much confusion about what kind of sink is being regulated by this section.

Assembly Action :

None

P 75-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

422.8 Ice ~~prohibited in soiled utility room.~~ **producing plumbing appliances** ~~Machines for ice~~ producing ice, or any device for the storage of ice, plumbing appliances shall not be located in a soiled utility room.

Committee Reason: For the Modification only:

The code need only to be concerned with ice producing plumbing appliances (providing the water supply and drainage connections for such appliances).

For the proposal As Modified:

The plumbing code cannot control the handling or storage of ice in any room.

Assembly Action :

None

P 76-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Requiring integral check valves for head shampoo sink faucets will eliminate thermal shock to a person having their head shampooed.

Assembly Action :

None

P 77-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The ASSE 1017 and ASSE 1070 valves are being misapplied for this point-of-use outlet.

Assembly Action :

None

P 78-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Marking requirements for shower valves need to be vetted through the standards committees, not driven by the code.

Assembly Action :

None

P 79-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Shower valves are tested at the flow rates of showerheads that the manufacturer recommends for use. The code cannot control what happens after inspection of the installation.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 20.51% (32) Oppose: 79.49% (124)

Assembly Action :

None

P 80-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P77-15.

Assembly Action :

None

P 81-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There needs to be protection against scalding in tub applications. Also, some tubs are fitted with hand showers. The water temperature needs to be limited just like any other shower application.

Assembly Action :

None

P 82-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The requirement for access is already required by the standard. The phrase "large enough" is too vague as to what is needed.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 49.4% (83) Oppose: 50.6% (85)

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: What is "large enough"? This needs to be quantified.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 53% (53) Oppose: 47% (47)

Assembly Action :

Approved as Submitted

P 83-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 84-15

The following is errata that was not posted on the ICC website:

SECTION 202 DEFINITIONS

ACCESSIBLE. Describes a site, building, facility or portion thereof that complies with Chapter 11 of the International Building Code.

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 86-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Requiring a 3 inch trap is overkill. The proposed exception appears to override the requirements for service sinks in Table 403.1.

Assembly Action :

None

P 87-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The use of "close proximity" is confusing. The proposed requirements are a design responsibility and not a code issue.

Assembly Action :

None

P 88-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The phrase "to prevent Legionella bacteria growth" should not be in code language. Temperature control is not the only method to control Legionella growth.

Assembly Action :

None

P 89-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Consistency with what the IRC recognizes as a solar water heater for potable water.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of SRCC 100-13 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 90-15

The following is errata that was posted on the ICC website:

502.6 Water heater replacement and scald protection. Where the water temperature in a hot water distribution system changes as the result of a water heater replacement, repair or an alteration of the hot water distribution system such as a water heater thermostat adjustment or master mixing valve adjustment or replacement, each shower or combination tub-shower supplied by the system shall be inspected for the presence of a means for reducing scald hazards to the users.

Where the means for limiting the hot water temperature is a master mixing valve complying with ASSE 1017, a mixing valve complying with ASSE 1070 or an integral limit stop on the shower or combination tub-shower valve, adjustments shall be made in accordance with Section 502.6.1. Where the means for limiting the hot water temperature discharged at the fixture is a device complying with ASSE 1062, then the operation of the device shall be verified that it significantly reduces flow when the discharge temperature approaches 120°F (48.8°C).

Where a shower or tub-shower combination does not have a means for scald protection for a user, a means shall be installed in accordance with Section 502.6.2.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The scald hazard definition is inadequate and the references in Section 506.2 are incorrect.

Assembly Action : None

P 91-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: A pan does provide some security for knowing that a T & P valve is leaking.

Assembly Action : None

P 92-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P91-15.

Assembly Action : None

P 93-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Same size PEX pipe connected with insert fittings is not large enough inside diameter for proper T & P valve relief flow.

Assembly Action : None

Part II

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

P2804.6.1 Requirements for discharge pipe. The discharge piping serving a pressure-relief valve, temperature-relief valve or combination valve shall:

1. through 13. *Remain unchanged.*

14. Be one nominal size larger than the size of the relief valve outlet, where the relief valve discharge piping is constructed of PEX or PE-RT tubing installed with insert fittings.

Committee Reason: For the Modification only:

There is no need to be specific about PEX and PE-RT; any type of piping that is connected using an insert fitting needs to be upsized.

For the proposal As Modified:

Insert fittings into "same size as the valve outlet" piping will cause a restriction in flow from the relief valve which could affect the safety of the equipment.

Assembly Action : None

P 94-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This would be a direct conflict with Item 4 of Section 504.6.

Assembly Action : None

P 95-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Installing a pan under small instantaneous water heaters is impractical.

Assembly Action : None

P 96-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Making the statement that a pan is optional for all other applications is not necessary in code language. Indicating that pans required by a design professional have to comply with pan material requirements is also not necessary.

Assembly Action : None

P 97-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 98-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ANSI/NGWA 01-14 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ANSI/NGWA 01-14 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 99-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Committee's action on P98-15 already resolved the issue.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ANSI/NGWA 01-14 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

Part II

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ANSI/NGWA 01-14 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 100-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Backflow protection should be based on the degree of hazard at each application and not on the types of buildings.

Assembly Action :

None

P 101-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: A 3/4 inch minimum size for a water service line is a good starting point. Fixture flow rates are being reduced so the 3/4 inch size becomes even more appropriate. Increasing the minimum size will significantly increase the cost of construction because of increased tap fee and larger meter

size fee.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This will increase the cost of the tap fee and water meter and is a large cost to the homeowner forever.

Assembly Action :

None

P 102-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Allowing a controlled and limited amount of warm water to pass into the cold water system as part of a recirculation system does not create a hazard for the cold water system.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 9.83% (17) Oppose: 90.17% (156)

Assembly Action :

None

P 103-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: An available flow pressure of 8 psi is not correct as shower control valves will not work at this low of pressure.

Assembly Action :

None

P 104-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Water purveyors size the water meter and provides the water meter. The sizing methodology is confusing.

Assembly Action :

None

P 105-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The next phase of the PERC study needs to be completed before water closet water consumption (per full flush) is reduced further as there are concerns about not enough water to move solids along long runs of horizontal piping.

Assembly Motion:

As Modified

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 11.43% (20) Oppose: 88.57% (155)

Assembly Action :

None

Online Floor Modification:

TABLE 604.4

MAXIMUM FLOW RATES AND CONSUMPTION FOR PLUMBING FIXTURES AND FIXTURE FITTINGS

| PLUMBING FIXTURE OR FIXTURE FITTING | MAXIMUM FLOW RATE OR QUANTITY ^b |
|---|--|
| Lavatory, private | 2.2 gpm at 60 psi |
| Lavatory, public (metering) | 0.25 gallon per metering cycle |
| Lavatory, public (other than metering) | 0.5 gpm at 60 psi |
| Shower head ^a | 2.5 gpm at 80 psi |
| Sink faucet | 2.2 gpm at 60 psi |
| Urinal | 1.0 gallon per flushing cycle |
| Water closet — private and non-remote public ^d | 1.28 gallons per flushing cycle ^{c,d,e} |
| Water closet — remote public ^d | 1.6 gpf |

For SI: 1 gallon = 3.785 L, 1 gallon per minute = 3.785 L/m, 1 pound per square inch = 6.895 kPa.

a. A hand-held shower spray is a shower head.

- b. Consumption tolerances shall be determined from referenced standard.
- c. The effective flush volume for a dual-flush water closet is defined as the composite, average flush volume of two reduced flushes and one full flush. ~~In public settings, the maximum water use of a dual flush water closet is based solely on its full flush operation; not an average of full and reduced volume flushes.~~
- d. ~~A water closet is remote where its discharge is combined with less than 1.5 DFU discharge from other fixtures and such discharge flows horizontally for 30 feet or more.~~ 1.6 gallons per flushing cycle is permitted at a location where no other fixtures discharge upstream of the drain line connection to the water closet.
- e. 1.6 gallons per flushing cycle for a water closet connected to a building's existing sanitary drainage piping.

P 106-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P108-15.

Assembly Action : None

P 107-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P108-15.

Assembly Action : None

Part II

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The plumbing code is a minimum standard for safety. Energy and water savings belong in codes that are for "above-code" programs.

Assembly Action : None

P 108-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There are unknown problems with lowering water flow rates. Consistent with committee's action on P110-15.

Assembly Action : None

P 109-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P108-15.

Assembly Action : None

Part II

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is a concern that in older homes, the slope of some piping is very steep and it is known that it takes more water to move solids in piping with greater slope. This code affects older homes where water closets are replaced. Some jurisdictions are allowing greater water closet flows in some applications in order to make the drainage system work.

Assembly Action : None

P 110-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The IgCC provides the guidance for the lower flow fixtures. The PERC study needs to be finished before the IPC moves towards lower flow rates for water closets.

Assembly Action : None

P 111-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This would limit the practice of extending water distribution lines for future fixture installations.

Assembly Action :

None

P 112-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of CSA B137.18-13 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 113-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 114-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P50-15.

Assembly Action :

None

P 115-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

605.4 Water distribution pipe. Water distribution pipe shall conform to NSF 61 and shall conform to one of the standards listed in Table 605.4. ~~Hot and cold~~ Water distribution pipe and tubing shall have a pressure rating of not less than 100 psi (690 kPa) at 180°F (82°C).

Committee Reason: For the Modification only:

The terms "hot" and "cold" are unnecessary as the intent is that all water distribution piping must comply.

For the proposal As Modified:

The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

P2906.5 Water-distribution pipe. Water-distribution piping within dwelling units shall conform to NSF 61 and shall conform to one of the standards indicated in Table P2906.5. ~~Hot and cold~~ Water distribution pipe and tubing shall have a pressure rating of not less than 100 psi at 180°F (689 kPa at 82°C).

Committee Reason: For the Modification only:

The terms "hot" and "cold" are unnecessary as the intent is that all water distribution piping must comply.

For the proposal As Modified:
The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 117-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: All of the proposed information is already in the standard for the product.

Assembly Action : **None**

Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: An excessive amount of text is being added to the code but doesn't does add any useful information.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 118-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 119-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The standard was omitted from table in last code cycle.

Assembly Action : **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASSE 1062-2011 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 120-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of CSA B137.18 -13 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 121-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This information is already in the referenced standard.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 122-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Section 605.6 and 605.9 are duplicated. This would be too stringent for the distribution piping for the balance of the code. The proponent indicated that he failed to put in the proposal "without metal insert stiffeners" to qualify where compression fittings cannot be used.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 123-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of IAPMO/ANSI Z1157-2014 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 124-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The new standard provides more options.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of MSS SP-122-2012 and SP-139-2014 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The added standard provides more options for builders.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of MSS SP-122-2012 and SP-139-2014 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 125-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of MSS SP-122-2012 and SP-139-2014 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 126-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P50-15.

Assembly Action :

None

P 127-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is a valid standard for the code. The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 128-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WILL BE HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WILL BE HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE. SEE THE TENTATIVE HEARING ORDERS FOR THESE COMMITTEES.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The current text is superior and easier to understand than the proposed language. Also, the proposed text seems to indicate that pipe threads would have to be cut with dies. That is not accurate.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Section P3003.4.1 has the phrase "shall not be prohibited" and doesn't make sense.

Assembly Action :

None

P 129-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 130-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: "Other components" seems vague. The elastomeric seal needs approval but these other components don't which seems to allow anything to be installed the joint (without approval).

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 23.49% (35) Oppose: 76.51% (114)

Assembly Action :

None

P 131-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The standard is being revised and it is not completed at this time.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Standard ASTM 813 does not yet include the necessary references to make the standard in coordination with the proposal.

Assembly Action :

None

P 132-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 133-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is a work item being discussed for the next revision of the standard. There is a conflict with the color in the previous part of the code.

Assembly Action : None

Part II

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Proponent wants to build consensus with other parties on this proposal and bring back in public comment.

Assembly Action : None

P 134-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P50-15.

Assembly Action : None

P 135-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee is not certain that the solvent cement standard covers joining two different types of piping.

Assembly Action : None

Part II

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : None

P 136-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The standard is in draft form and cannot be approved for inclusion into the code at this point in the code development process. This draft standard appears to be mostly an operational standard and not a construction standard.

Assembly Action : None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASHRAE 188 (SPC 188) with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 137-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Hot water piping is already required to be insulated. The separation distance is excessive.

Assembly Action : None

P 138-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Removal of this section removes a requirement that is important for energy conservation. Using the reason for removal that the section promotes Legionella bacteria growth is not appropriate.

Assembly Action : None

P 139-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is more of a health and safety issue versus energy savings. The committee prefers the language currently in the code.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 140-15

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : **None**

P 141-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Alternate methods for accomodating thermal expansion are needed in the code.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 142-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal not needed as committee's action on P141-15 provides the necessary language to allow for alternate methods.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 143-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P88-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 144-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: These requirements are already in the standards for water heaters and do not need to be in the code.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 145-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Limiting the velocities in the piping to the velocity limit for copper piping is restrictive for other piping materials. Section 607.6 limits designer flexibility in system design.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 146-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Section 501.3 already requires a drain valve which can be used for flushing. The installation of flushing tees should be in accordance with the water heater manufacturer's instructions.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 147-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Manufacturer's instructions for these devices already cover these requirements. Why can't a ladder be used to do some testing? Contrary to what is claimed in the cost impact statement, this proposal will increase the cost of construction.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 148-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This information is already in the product standards however, there is useful information in what is presented. Use of "shall not be" is not acceptable code language. The committee prefers use of "shall be" in code language.

Assembly Action :

None

P 149-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

608.4 Potable water handling and treatment equipment. Water pumps, filters, softeners, tanks and other appliances and devices that handle or treat potable water to be supplied to the potable water distribution system shall be located to prevent contamination from entering the appliances and devices. Overflow, relief valve and waste discharge pipes from such appliances and devices shall terminate in accordance with the appliance or device manufacturer's installation instructions. ~~Where such instructions do not specify the termination arrangement, the termination shall be to through an air gap.~~

Committee Reason: For the Modification only:

Some manufacturer's installation instructions are inappropriate for providing the proper protection of the system.

For the proposal As Modified:

The section needed clarification to be clearer on exactly what needed to be protected and how.

Assembly Action :

None

P 150-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The current text was unclear about sanitary yard hydrants so this text is better.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Yard hydrants can have a vacuum breaker on the outlet or a backflow preventer supplying the hydrant. These requirements are already covered by Section P2902.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 52.35% (78) Oppose: 47.65% (71)

Assembly Action :

Approved as Submitted

P 151-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement. Closed valves in "off season" applications creates a water quality problem in potable water systems that are also used for heater systems.

Assembly Action :

None

P 152-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Tanks are part of the water system and they must be NSF 61 compliant just as piping is required to be.

Assembly Action :

None

P 153-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 154-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language might be too limiting for design purposes. A vacuum cannot lift water more than 35 feet.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 155-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The CSA standard is a viable standard for these products. The standard is already in the IRC plumbing code.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 156-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: One standard CSA B64.2.1.1 was left out of the list of standards. A public comment to fix this problem should be made to fix the error.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 157-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is a concern that these backflow preventer will not work in conjunction with fire pumps.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 158-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Why was ASSE 1055 removed from this section? No one could answer this question.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 159-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language provides appropriate backflow prevention options for coffee machines and non-carbonated drink dispensers.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 160-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 161-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P159-15. Section 608.16.10 needed to be deleted to complete the full intent of why committee approved P159-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 162-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Some humidifiers on the market do not have integral backflow protection for the water supply.

Assembly Action : **None**

Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language needs a little work. In the first section, "at an air gap" should be "through an air gap". Is it the overflow in the humidifier that needs the air gap or is an air gap needed for the water supply to the humidifier?

Assembly Action : **None**

P 163-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: A two week time span is too restrictive. This would be very hard to enforce especially in multi-family buildings where units might not be occupied for very long periods of time.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 164-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 165-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This are a very restrictive requiremts. Piping could be in fire-resistant rated shafts and no one would know that the gauages where in the shaft. Calibration of gauges is suspect. There would be a great increase in cost to supply and install all of these guages with no benefit for many, many buildings.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 166-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 167-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement. Ceilings for these areas should be addressed in the IBC.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 168-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P50-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 169-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Sanitary drainage pattern fittings are not available for this product except for wyes. Typically, flanged fittings are used above ground and mechanical fittings are used below ground.

Assembly Action :

None

P 170-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement. And for consistency with Section 717.4.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 171-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM F2736-13e1 and F22764/F2764M-11e2 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 172-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: ASME B16.50 should have been included in the list and the other fittings not deleted as they are used for pressurized drainage applications.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: These fittings are appropriate for pressurized sewer systems.

Assembly Action :

None

P 173-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This fitting's pattern is not suitable for vent piping applications.

Assembly Action :

None

P 174-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 175-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The term "recommended" is weak code language. The use of pipe and fittings for higher temperature service should be approved by the manufacturer,

Assembly Action :

None

P 176-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: It is important to verify that existing drainage systems are properly sized for the drainage load.

Assembly Action :

None

P 177-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

704.1 Slope of horizontal drainage piping. Horizontal drainage piping shall be installed in uniform alignment at uniform slopes. The slope of a horizontal drainage pipe shall be not less than that indicated in Table 704.1 except that where the drainage piping is upstream of a grease interceptor, the slope of the piping shall be ~~twice that indicated in Table 704.1~~ not less than 1/4 inch per foot (2 percent slope).

Committee Reason: For the Modification only:

A slope of 1/4 inch per foot is all that is necessary to keep grease laden waste flowing.

For the proposal As Modified:

There needs to be a greater minimum pipe slope to keep grease-laden waste flowing.

Assembly Action :

None

P 178-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Requiring offset closet flanges be approved (by the code official) puts the responsibility onto the code official without providing him any guidance as to how to decide what is acceptable.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Item 3 requires offset closet flanges to be approved by the code official but there is not any criteria for the code official to use for making that approval. There are many different types of offset closet flanges that would not be appropriate.

Assembly Action :

None

P 179-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P50-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 180-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P50-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 181-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC OCMMITTEE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P50-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 182-15

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : **None**

P 183-15

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : **None**

P 184-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM D3138-04 (2011) with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM D3138 -04 (2011) with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 185-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P50-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 186-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 187-15

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : **None**

P 188-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed table changes are much harder to read and understand than the current table layout.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 189-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no evidence to indicates that there is a problem with the use fo these fittings at the standard slopes for piping.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 190-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

The following is errata that was not posted on the ICC website:

REFERENCE STANDARDS

ASTM D3138 - 04(2011) Standard Specification for Solvent Cements for Transition Joints Between Acrylonitrile-Butadiene-Styrene (ABS) and Poly(Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Non-Pressure Piping Components

(The balance of the proposal is not modified.)
(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the langauge of P184-15 Part I.

Assembly Action : **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM D3138 - 04(2011) with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal appears to limit the use of the pipe in certain applications.

Assembly Action : **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM D3138-04 (2011) with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 191-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P50-15.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 192-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal eliminates the confusion about the terms continuous and semi-continuous.

Assembly Action :

None

P 193-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is such a fixture as an "indirect waste receptor" so this proposal is inappropriate.

Assembly Action :

None

P 194-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 195-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 196-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P50-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 197-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement. Smaller pumps are needed for limited applications.

Assembly Action : **None**

Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 198-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : **None**

Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 199-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The food separation section is unenforceable. This proposal seems to force the installation of a food waste disposer.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 200-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This corrects the code text to refer to vacuum inlets and not vacuum receptacles.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 201-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: NFPA 99 is a more definitive document as compared to the requirements of the current code text.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 202-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The plumbing industry has used normally closed backwater valves for decades where protection against backwater events was necessary. This proposal no requires that normally open tpye have to be used in some applications but again, normally closed valves have worked fine before this. This requirement seems overly restrictive and possibly requiring proprietary products.

Assembly Action :**None****Part II****Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :**None****P 203-15**

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :**None****Part II****Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :**None****P 204-15**

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :**None****Part II****Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :**None****P 205-15**

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The size of 4 to 6 inches should be corrected to what the standard indicates as the capability. Installation of the products need to be better addressed.

Assembly Action :**None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM F1871-2011, ASTM F1504-2014, ASTM F1947-2010 and ASTM F1867-2012 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

Part II**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified**

P3011.2 Applicability. The replacement of building sewer piping by PVC Fold and Form methods shall be limited to gravity drainage piping in sizes 64 inches (452102 mm) and smaller to 18 inches (457 mm). The replacement piping shall be of the same nominal size as the existing piping.

P3011.5 Installation. ~~Piping complying with ASTM F1504~~The piping sections to be replaced shall be installed in accordance with ASTM F1947cleaned and flushed. ~~Piping complying with ASTM ASTM F1F1871~~ Remediation shall be installed in accordance with ASTM F1867performed where there is groundwater infiltration, roots, collapsed pipe, dropped joints, offsets more than 12 percent of the inside pipe diameter or other obstructions.

Reference Standards:

ASTM F1871 - 2011 Standard Specification for Folded/Formed Poly (Vinyl Chloride) Pipe Type A for Existing Sewer and Conduit Rehabilitation
ASTM F1504 - 2014 Standard Specification for Folded Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Pipe for Existing Sewer and Conduit Rehabilitation
~~ASTM F1947 - 2010 Standard Practice for Installation of Folded Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Pipe into Existing Sewers and Conduits~~
~~ASTM F1867 - 2012 Standard Practice for Installation of Folded/Formed Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Pipe Type A for Existing Sewer and Conduit Rehabilitation~~

Committee Reason: For the Modification only:

The size of piping that this process can be used on was corrected to allow its use for larger piping systems that could exist for IRC buildings.

For the proposal As Modified:

The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM F1871-2011, ASTM F1504-2014, ASTM F1947-2010 and ASTM F1867-2012 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 206-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal brings Section 802.1 in line with the requirements of Section 301.6 for hydraulic elevator shafts.

Assembly Action :

None

P 207-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 208-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 209-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Cuspidors and drinking fountains need to be direct connected.

Assembly Action :

None

P 210-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Requiring an indirect connected hand sink to be though an air gap is too stringent. An air break would be more reasonable.

Assembly Action :

None

P 211-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Service sinks are often located in a janitor's closet with a toilet facility. Requiring the janitor's closet (with service sink) to always be outside of toilet facilities is too rigid of a requirement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 212-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 213-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 214-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Not all of these piping materials are suitable for any type of chemical waste. This section needs to indicate that the manufacturer of the piping materials needs to provide guidance on what type of material should be chosen for each application.

Assembly Action :

None

P 215-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is concern about airflow over a covered vent pipe. Too short of vent pipe above the roof could invite entry by rodents. Vent piping is sometimes used for drain clearing so have covered vents would be a big problem for that type of operation. too short of vent might cause problems with roof flashing replacement.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 216-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Lead is a natural element in the environment. There is no benefit to eliminating lead in roof flashings.

Assembly Action :

None

P 217-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: A "t-wye" designated fitting was introduced in this table but these fittings are not addressed in the code.

Assembly Action :

None

P 218-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal would eliminate the use of air admittance valves on sinks yet this application is where they are most commonly used.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Section P3107.3 doesn't cover a air admittance valve arrangement where the AAV is just at one fixture.

Assembly Action :

None

P 219-15

Part I

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

P 220-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

The following is errata (the reason was omitted in publication). This was not posted on the ICC website :

Reason: The American Society of Plumbing Engineers supports the efforts of the American Society of Plumbing Engineer Research Foundation (ASPE RF) regarding plumbing research to justify plumbing code requirements. The ASPE Legislative Committee reviewed the ASPE RF research regarding the impact of food waste disposers on combination waste and vent systems. Based on the technical findings of this research, there is no technical justification for placing a limitation on the discharge of food waste disposers to combination waste and vent systems. The Research Report of the findings has been published and is available for review on the ASPE website,

http://aspe.org/sites/default/files/webfm/ASPERF/rf_report_foodwaste.pdf

The report is found under the Research Foundation heading. It would appear that the original limitation on food waste disposers was based on a perceived problem. Having researched the original code change, there was no research nor field problems identified to support the limitation. Without proper research or field experience, the limitation should not have been included in the code.

(The remainder of the proposal is unchanged.)
(Errata already incorporated into cdpACCESS.)

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal did not have a reason statement and there was not a link to the study provided.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 221-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee prefers the current code text. The proposed version doesn't add anything to the code.

Assembly Action :

None

Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : None

P 222-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no substantiation that pressure fluctuations will exist in a system to cause a problem with the fixture.

Assembly Action : None

P 223-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no substantiation or testing data to indicate that pressure fluctuations will exist in a system to cause a problem with the fixture.

Assembly Action : None

P 224-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The types of materials used inside of a product is best addressed by the product standard for the product.

Assembly Action : None

Part II

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is an issue that should be dealt with in the product standards, not in the code. Appears to limit products that already comply with the standard.

Assembly Action : None

P 225-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no substantiation or testing provided to indicate that a relief vent is needed for an AAV vented fixture.

Assembly Action : None

P 226-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Ventilation system air intakes and plumbing system vent terminals must be separated by the required distance.

Assembly Action : None

Part II

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : None

P 227-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Correlation with the 2015 IRC and allows for use of an AAV on a tank or sump where an engineer takes responsibility for the design.

Assembly Action : None

P 228-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Part I

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The intent of this proposal can't be enforced by code language. If an AAV is removed for whatever reason, it needs to be replaced when the fixture is replaced.

Assembly Action : None

Part II

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: If someone removes the AAV for whatever reason, they need to do the right thing and put it back.

Assembly Action : None

P 229-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Some committee members were not sure of what this product is. The product seems to violate the prohibited trap type no.1. Ribs on the bottom of the product sounds specific to one manufacturer and as such, the code would be requiring a proprietary product. The flow path of the product is very restrictive.

Assembly Action : None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASME A112.18.8-2009 (R2014) with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 230-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : None

P 231-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Solids are a larger source of of fats, oils and greases and routing this flow around the grease interceptor would be in violation of EPA mandates. Lack of maintenance of a solids interceptor is not a sufficient reason for routing food waste disposer flow around a grease interceptor.

Assembly Action : None

P 232-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Laundry lists within code text are not always appropriate. Routing the drains from dishwashers, floor drains and some floor sinks through grease interceptors is not really necessary.

Assembly Action : None

P 233-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Motion: Disapprove

Online Vote Results: Failed - Support: 46.1% (71) Oppose: 53.9% (83)

Assembly Action : None

P 234-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This treatment protocol exists in the standard and is being used in the California area.

Assembly Motion:
Online Vote Results:
Assembly Action :

Disapprove
Successful - Support: 61.59% (93) Oppose: 38.41% (58)
Disapproved

P 235-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Local vents for oil separators have not been required for some time and there is not any indication that there is any hazard such that the local vents need to be put back on oil separator systems.

Assembly Action :

None

P 236-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 237-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM F667-12 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 238-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Online Floor Modification:

The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM F2648/F2648M-13 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 239-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM F2881-11 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 240-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 241-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASTM F667-12 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 242-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of APSE/IAPMO Z1034-15 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 243-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal will severely restrict the selection of drains that can be used as only a few manufacturers have starting testing. ASME A112.6.4 is being revised and will include performance testing requirements so all manufacturers will have to comply as part of the compliance to this drain standard.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASPE/IAPMO Z1034 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 244-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

P 245-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is a significant deviation from the flow rates that were put into the 2015 IPC. The committee is not sure why this new set of flow rates is necessary.

Assembly Action :

None

P 246-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Scuppers are an acceptable means for primary roof drainage. This proposal provides appropriate sizing for scuppers.

Assembly Action :

None

P 247-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Chapter 13 was all new for the 2015 IPC. It is necessary for this new section to be added to coordinate with the IFC.

Assembly Action :

None

P 248-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Removing the required disinfection level may create a hazardous condition.

Assembly Action :

None

P 249-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Permits are needed for jurisdictional oversight.

Assembly Action :

None

P 250-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: A scope that includes operations of systems is not appropriate for the plumbing code.

Assembly Action :

None

P 251-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 252-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee preferred P251-15.

Assembly Action :

None

P 253-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 254-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee approved P253-15 so this proposal is not needed.

Assembly Action :

None

P 255-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 256-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The section language was changed by approval of P255-15 so this proposal is not necessary.

Assembly Action :

None

P 257-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: A tank overflow the same size as the tank inlet could result in the tank becoming pressurized.

Assembly Action :

None

P 258-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 259-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 260-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee's approval of P259-15 makes this proposal unnecessary.

Assembly Action :

None

P 261-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 262-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed text expands the use of available nonpotable water provide that the use is approved by the code official.

Assembly Action :

None

P 263-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Allowing the use of blackwater puts the code official in a difficult situation to determine approval of the treatment methods.

Assembly Action :

None

P 264-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P263-15.

Assembly Action :

None

P 265-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Removal of filtering requirements could lead to problems downstream.

Assembly Action :

None

P 266-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Removing NSF 350 from the code puts the problem of deciding what is appropriate technology on code official without any guidance.

Assembly Action :

None

P 267-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This section only covers some types of tanks, Tanks are already covered in the general part of Chapter 13 (Section 1302.7).

Assembly Action :

None

P 268-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This language in the code would eliminate the need for sections of the code about rainwater re-use. Those sections were just added for 2015.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ARCA/ASPE/ANSI 63-2013 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

P 269-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 270-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed language eliminates the confusion about whether a mechanical (roof washer) device is required.

Assembly Action :

None

P 271-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee action on P270-15.

Assembly Action :

None

P 272-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee action on P270-15 and P271-15.

Assembly Action :

None

P 273-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee didn't understand what is meant by "partially full piping" but then says determined by generally accepted engineering practices. It seems that Chapter 11 already has all the necessary information to size the piping for rainwater flow.

Assembly Action :

None

P 274-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There are situations where separation distances must be maintained to avoid contamination issues.

Assembly Action :

None

P 275-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

P 276-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The addition of "rain" is an appropriate clarification for this section.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 277-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistency with the committee's action on P275-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 278-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Only nonpotable water piping is required to be marked as nonpotable water. Rainwater distribution piping does not have to be marked.

Assembly Action : **None**

P 279-15

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WILL BE HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WILL BE HEARD BY THE IRC PLUMBING COMMITTEE. SEE THE TENTATIVE HEARING ORDERS FOR THESE COMMITTEES.

Part I

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

INTERNATIONAL PRIVATE SEWAGE DISPOSAL CODE

2015 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

PSD 1-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Consistency with committee's action on P50-15.

Assembly Action :

None

2015 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE/ZONING CODE

PROPERTY MAINTENANCE/ZONING CODE COMMITTEE

Richard G. Lambert, CBO, Chair
Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer
City of Saco
Saco, ME

Sean P. Farrell, CBO, CZA, Vice Chair
Rep: Virginia Building and Code Officials
Association
Code Compliance Supervisor
Prince William County
Prince William, VA

Tana Bryant, CCEA, CCEO
Rep: American Association of Code
Enforcement
Sr. Code Enforcement Officer
City of Anniston
Anniston, AL

Ted Bush, CBO
Plans Examiner
The City of Helena Montana
Helena, MT

Thomas D. Culp, Ph.D.
President
Birch Point Consulting LLC
La Crosse, WI

Joseph F. Day III, BCO
Land Use Administrator
New Castle County
New Castle, DE

Michael Garrity
Owner
Michael Garrity Home Inspections
Cortlandt, NY

Christopher McWhite
Plans Examiner
City of Lowell
Lowell, MA

Teresa Gerber
Building Inspector I
Chesterfield County
Chesterfield, VA

Steve Mills, CBO
Director of Building & Codes
City of Hendersonville
Hendersonville, TN

Laura Rouse-Devore, CCEO
Rep: American Association of Code
Enforcement
Deputy Building Official
City of Taylor, TX
Taylor, TX

James P. Snyder
Quality Manager
C & C Millwright
Greeneville, TN

Staff Secretariat:
Larry Franks, P.E., CBO
Senior Staff Engineer
International Code Council
Eastern Regional Office
Birmingham, AL

INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE

2015 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

PM 1-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt this change would create a conflict with the IBC and IEBC with regard to the proposed definitions. Also, the definition of substantial improvement is not used as a trigger for any requirements it is only mentioned when calculating costs. The committee also has concerns about the limiting language that would require the property to be boarded up rather than secured against unlawful entry.

Assembly Action :

None

PM 2-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal would limit the scope of the IPMC by specifying certain insects. It should address all insects. Accumulation of stagnant water is not defined and would be difficult to enforce. Also, Section 302.5.1 will prohibit grass or a lawn from growing within six inches of a dwelling and is too restrictive and difficult to enforce.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 12.05% (20) Oppose: 87.95% (146)

Assembly Action :

None

PM 3-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this proposal would remove useful tools for enforcement such as elimination of the term structurally sound. The scope and intent of the IPMC is for the whole building and does not exclude structural components. Therefore assessment and citation for structurally sound, hazardous and potential failure is within the scope and should remain.

Assembly Action :

None

PM 4-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Similar to PM3, the committee felt that the proposal would remove a useful tool for enforcement to remedy unsafe conditions. The IEBC is not triggered until the items on the list are discovered. The committee feels the list needs to be revised to eliminate any conflicts with the IEBC, but the list need to remain. Also, this proposal will limit repairs to the IEBC and would not permit repairs by the IBC.

Assembly Action :

None

PM 5-15

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt this proposal would place retroactive requirements into the code. Also, Section 505.5, Item 2 specifies a maximum temperature of 120 degrees Fahrenheit which conflicts with the IPC and ASHRE 90.1 for a maximum temperature of 110 degrees Fahrenheit from lavatory faucets in public facility restrooms.

Assembly Action :**None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASSE 1016/ASME A112.1016/CSA B125,1611, ASSE 1017-2010, ASSE 1062-2006 and ASSE 1070-04 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>.

PM 6-15**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed this is a needed addition to the IPMC. These systems are becoming more prevalent and need to be maintained or properly abandoned to assure cross connection with potable water systems are prevented.

Assembly Action :**None****PM 7-15****Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that Section 704.1.1 properly addresses this issue and there is not a need to add this to the code. Also, the code requires occupied buildings to be heated but this change would be overly restrictive and require unoccupied buildings to be heated.

Assembly Action :**None****PM 8-15****Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal based on the proponents published reason statement. This is a needed change and better defines that items associated with the appliance must also be maintained. The definition of equipment in the IMC includes all components associated with an appliance.

Assembly Action :**None****PM 9-15****Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee has concerns about the cost impact of implementation for jurisdictions based on the cost necessary for the required tools and training to provide enforcement. This change may cause conflict with state and local health and environmental codes and operations and too broadly increases the scope of the IPMC. Also, the proposed CFR's are Federal Regulations and do not comply with ICC's criteria for referenced standards.

Assembly Motion:**As Submitted****Online Vote Results:****Failed** - Support: 17.42% (31) Oppose: 82.58% (147)**Assembly Action :****None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of 40 CFR 746.65 and 40 CFR 763 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>.

2015 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL CODE – PLUMBING/MECHANICAL

PLUMBING/MECHANICAL CODE COMMITTEE

Travis Lindsey, MCP, Chair

Senior Plans Examiner
City of Scottsdale
Scottsdale, AZ

Clarence Lee Milligan, MCP, Vice Chair

Assistant Township Manager
Upper Providence Township
Oaks, PA

Charles “Chuck” Atkinson, CBO

Building Codes Director
Beaufort County, South Carolina (IAS Accredited)
Beaufort, SC

Marguerite Carroll

Regional Regulatory Services Manager
Underwriters Laboratories
San Jose, CA

Carl Chretien, CGP, CGB, CAPS

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
President
Chretien Construction
Saco, ME

Michael Cudahy

Codes and Training Specialist
Plastic Pipe and Fittings Association
Glen Ellyn, IL

Tim Cunningham

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
President
Cunningham Electrical Svc Inc
Elkview, WV

Pennie L. Feehan, CPI & CMI

Rep: Copper Development Association
Owner
Pennie L. Feehan Consulting
Palm Springs, CA

Thomas Polino

Plumbing Subcode Official
West Windsor Township
West Windsor, NJ

Stanley Richardson

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Richardson Construction
Dalton, GA

Paul W. Roebuck, Sr.

Rep: Texas Professional Real Estate Inspectors
Assoc.
President and Inspector
TexaSpec Inspections and Building Consultants
Montgomery, TX

Loren Swanson

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Southern Michigan Co.
Jackson, MI

Staff Secretariat:

Fred Grable, PE

Senior Staff Engineer - Plumbing
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hills, IL

Gregg Gress

Senior Technical Staff
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hills, IL

INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL CODE - MECHANICAL

2015 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

RM 1-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

M1305.1.4.2 Pit locations. Appliances installed in pits or excavations shall not come in direct contact with the surrounding soil and shall be installed not less than ~~6 3~~ inches (152 mm) above the pit floor. The sides of the pit or excavation shall be held back not less than 12 inches (305 mm) from the appliance. Where the depth exceeds 12 inches (305 mm) below adjoining grade, the walls of the pit or excavation shall be lined with concrete or masonry. Such concrete or masonry shall extend not less than 4 inches (102 mm) above adjoining grade and shall have sufficient lateral load-bearing capacity to resist collapse. Excavation on the control side of the appliance shall extend horizontally not less than 30 inches (762 mm). The appliance shall be protected from flooding in an approved manner.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification changes an archaic 6 inch dimension to the more commonly required 3 inch dimension.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 2-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the action taken on RM1-15.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 3-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 4-15

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action :

None

RM 5-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

M1411.6.1 Refrigerant line insulation protection. Refrigerant piping insulation shall be protected in accordance with Section N1103.4.1. ~~exposed to weather shall be protected from damage, including that caused by sunlight, moisture, equipment maintenance and wind. Adhesive tape shall not be considered as a means of protection.~~

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification provides guidance on the protection required and refers back to current code text to avoid redundant text.

Assembly Action : **None**

RM 6-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed requirements are addressed in the equipment manufacturer's instructions and in ASHRAE standards. This is a workmanship issue that need not be addressed in the code.

Assembly Action : **None**

RM 7-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal conflicts with Sections M1403.1 and M2105. The proposal is too restrictive regarding the design of such systems.

Assembly Action : **None**

RM 8-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There are too many variables to apply such a requirement. Kitchen hoods don't need makeup air until they exceed an exhaust rate of 399 cfm. This is too restrictive and would apply to electric dryers.

Assembly Action : **None**

RM 9-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This subject is already covered in the IECC. How does one interpret "air tight"? This is a workmanship issue, not a code issue. All wall and roof penetrations need to be sealed anyway.

Assembly Action : **None**

RM 10-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is a maintenance issue that the homeowners need to address. Approved exhaust terminals will already allow access for cleaning.

Assembly Action : **None**

RM 11-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The proposal provides criteria for homemade terminals.

Assembly Action : **None**

RM 12-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

M1502.4.2 Duct installation. Exhaust ducts shall be supported at intervals not to exceed 12 feet (3658 mm) and shall be secured in place. The insert end of the duct shall extend into the adjoining duct or fitting in the direction of airflow. Exhaust duct joints shall be sealed in accordance with Section M1601.4.1 and shall be mechanically fastened. Ducts shall not be joined with screws or similar fasteners that protrude more than 1 /8 inch (3.2 mm) into the inside of the duct. Where dryer exhaust ducts are enclosed in wall or ceiling cavities, such cavities ~~shall have a least dimension allow the installation of not less than 4.25 inches (108 mm). Round ducts shall not be deformed. the duct without deformation.~~

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification deletes the specification in inches to allow all manufacturer's products to be installed in 2 x 6 walls and clearly states the requirement to have ample room for round ducts. Duct deformation impedes air flow.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 13-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal does not address ells. No one makes a 5 inch ell. The "terminal pathway" sounds like it describes the entire duct system. The code already contains a table for duct fittings. The percentage calculation is complicated.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 14-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

M1503.3 Exhaust discharge. Domestic cooking exhaust equipment shall discharge to the outdoors through a duct. The duct shall have a smooth interior surface, shall be air tight, shall be equipped with a back-draft damper and shall be independent of all other exhaust systems. Ducts serving ~~range hoods~~ domestic cooking exhaust equipment shall not terminate in an attic or crawl space or areas inside the building.

Exception: Where installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions, and where mechanical or natural ventilation is otherwise provided, listed and labeled ductless range hoods shall not be required to discharge to the outdoors.

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. The proposal is a logical reorganization of text. The modification provides consistency within the proposal regarding terminology.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 15-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 16-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 17-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text is too restrictive in that it eliminates gravity dampers. An option is needed for both types of dampers, gravity and motorized.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 29.57% (55) Oppose: 70.43% (131)

Assembly Action :

None

RM 18-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text is confusing. The term "air barrier" is not defined. Disapproval is based on the prior approval of RM15-15.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 22.28% (41) Oppose: 77.72% (143)

Assembly Action :

None

RM 19-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 20-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would allow any two ducts to be combined under Exception # 4.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 21-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 22-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 23-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. Fans don't always perform as purported.

Assembly Action : None

RM 24-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

M1507.3.4 Ventilation quality adjustment. The required whole house ventilation rate from Section M1507.3.3 shall be adjusted by the system coefficient in Table 1507.3.4 based on the system type using Equation 15-2.

$Q_v = Q_r \times C_{\text{system}}$ (Equation 15-2)

where:

Q_r = ventilation rate in cubic feet per minute from Equation 15-1 or Table 1507.3.3

C_{system} = system coefficient from Table 1507.3.4

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification adds the option for the table calculation.

Assembly Action : None

RM 25-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal won't stop homeowners from shutting off the systems. It is not clear what is required to indicate control function.

Assembly Action : None

RM 26-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

RM 27-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The intent of the proposal is unclear. Would the proposal allow natural draft appliances?

Assembly Action : None

RM 28-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

M1507.4 Local exhaust system. Local exhaust systems shall be designed to have the capacity to exhaust the minimum air flow rate determined in accordance with Table M1507.4. Except where functioning as a component of a whole house ventilation system, exhaust fans in bathrooms with a shower or bathtub shall be controlled by provided with a delay timer or humidity sensor control. ~~Humidity controls shall be capable of adjustment between a relative humidity range of 50 to 80 percent. A humidity control shall utilize manual or automatic means of adjustment and shall be a separate component or an integral component of the exhaust fan.~~

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification adds a timer option to the humidity controller.

Assembly Action : None

RM 29-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The current code text is preferred because it refers to the manufacturer's instructions.

Assembly Action : None

RM 30-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

RM 31-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

RM 32-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Floor joist cavities should be allowed for conveying return air.

Assembly Action : None

RM 33-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the action taken on M30-15.

Assembly Action : None

RM 34-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

M1601.1.2 Underground duct systems. Underground duct systems shall be constructed of approved concrete, clay, metal or plastic. The maximum design temperature for systems utilizing plastic duct and fittings shall be 150° F (66° C). Metal ducts shall be protected from corrosion in an approved manner or shall be completely encased in concrete not less than 2 inches (51 mm) thick. Nonmetallic ducts shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. Plastic pipe and fitting materials shall conform to cell classification 12454-B of ASTM D 1248 or ASTM D 1784 and external loading properties of ASTM D 2412. Ducts shall slope to an accessible point for drainage. Ducts shall be sealed, secured and tested with air at a pressure of not less than 2 inches of W.C. for not less than 5 minutes in the presence of the code official prior to encasing the ducts in concrete or direct burial. Duct tightness shall be verified as required by Section 1103.3. Metallic ducts having an approved protective coating and nonmetallic ducts shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification substitutes the preferred testing method from Chapter 11.

Assembly Action : None

RM 35-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text is confusing. The proposed standard is not developed by a consensus process.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 36-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 37-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Motion:

Disapprove

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 34.59% (55) Oppose: 65.41% (104)

Assembly Action :

None

RM 38-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The "space" referred to in the proposal could be very large.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 39-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

M2006.1 General. Pool and spa heaters shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions. Oil-fired pool heaters shall comply with UL 726. Electric pool and spa heaters shall comply with ~~UL 1261, UL 1563 or CSA C22.2 No. 218.1.~~ Gas-fired pool heaters shall comply with ~~ANSI Z21.56/CSA 4.7.~~ Pool and spa heat pump water heaters shall comply with UL 1995, ~~AHRI 1160,~~ or CSA C22.2 No. 236.

Exception: Portable residential spas and portable residential exercise spas shall comply with UL 1563 or CSA C22.2 No. 218.1.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modifications update the standards to be current with industry.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 40-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

TABLE M2101.1
HYDRONIC PIPING AND FITTING MATERIALS

(No change to Table)

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification corrects the the table title.

Assembly Action : None

RM 41-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

RM 42-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

RM 43-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

RM 44-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

RM 45-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

M2101.10 Tests. Hydronic piping systems shall be tested hydrostatically at a pressure of one and one-half times the maximum system design pressure, but not less than 100 pounds per square inch (689 kPa). The duration of each test shall be not less than 15 minutes and not more than 20 minutes.

Exception: For plastic PEX piping systems, testing with a compressed gas shall be an alternative to hydrostatic testing where compressed air or other gas pressure testing is specifically authorized by all of the manufacturer's instructions for the plastic PEX pipe and fittings products installed at the time the system is being tested, and compressed air or other gas testing is not otherwise prohibited by applicable codes, laws, or regulations outside of this code.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification limits the exception to PEX because it is appropriate such material.

Assembly Action : None

RM 46-15

Committee Action: Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : None

RM 47-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

RM 48-15

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

M2103.2 Thermal barrier required. Radiant floor heating systems shall have a thermal barrier in accordance with Sections M2103.2.1 through M2103.2.4. Insulation R-values for slab-on-grade and suspended floor installations shall be in accordance with the ~~International Energy Conservation Code Chapter 11~~.

Exception: Insulation shall not be required in engineered systems where it can be demonstrated that the insulation will decrease the efficiency or have a negative effect on the installation.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements. The modification keeps the text within the IRC for user convenience.

Assembly Action : None

RM 49-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The standard needs to be modified to include the tinning flux products.

Assembly Action : None

RM 50-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed standard is still under development..

Assembly Action : None

RM 51-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

RM 52-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statements.

Assembly Action : None

RM 53-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text belongs in the IECC. The proposal addresses electrical components not within the scope of the code. The proposed labeling is unnecessary.

Assembly Action :

None

RM 54-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

SECTION 202 DEFINITIONS

~~FOOD-GRADE FLUID. Potable water or a fluid containing additives listed in accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 21, Food and Drugs, Chapter 1, Food and Drug Administration, Parts 174-186~~

SECTION 202 DEFINITIONS

~~NON-FOOD-GRADE FLUID. Any fluid that is not designated as a food grade fluid.~~

Committee Reason: It is important to inform mechanical contractors about cross contamination prevention, as they are informed by the IPC and IMC. The modification deletes the proposed definitions because there is no need to reference federal law regarding food safety which is not within the scope of the code.

Assembly Action :

None

INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL CODE - PLUMBING

2015 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

RP 1-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The phrase "highest point thereof" seems ambiguous. The committee would like to see consistency with the 5 feet of water head test for building drains.

Assembly Motion: As Submitted
Online Vote Results: Failed - Support: 21.77% (32) Oppose: 78.23% (115)
Assembly Action : None

RP 2-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: A 5 foot of water head test is safer to perform and many contractors have never had a problem when using this test pressure. There is no need to change the test pressure back to 10 feet of water head.

Assembly Action : None

RP 3-15

Committee Action: Withdrawn

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action : None

RP 4-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The added language is unenforceable. Adequate protections already exist.

Assembly Action : None

RP 5-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : None

RP 6-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The distances chosen are arbitrary and do not take into account the volume of the piping between the water heater and the point of delivery. These requirements might cause multiple water heaters to need to be installed. There are hot water circulation systems available that can be used to reduce the time to obtain hot water and to reduce water waste when waiting for hot water to arrive.

Assembly Action : **None**

RP 7-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Relief valve discharge is almost always a minimal flow. Removing this allowance would be a cost impact for many designs.

Assembly Action : **None**

RP 8-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

RP 9-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would limit options for solving thermal expansion issues. Options are needed.

Assembly Action : **None**

RP 10-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

RP 11-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the language of RP8.

Assembly Action : **None**

RP 12-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASSE 1062-2011 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A->

RP 13-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

RP 14-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

RP 15-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

RP 16-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: More options for pipe and joints provides for greater flexibility.

Assembly Action : **None**

Analysis.

For staff analysis of the content of CSA B137.18 - 2013 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

RP 17-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's published reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

RP 18-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the language of P204-15.

Assembly Action : **None**

RP 19-15

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement in that this device is a viable option to use.

Assembly Motion:**Disapprove****Online Vote Results:****Successful** - Support: 62.5% (95) Oppose: 37.5% (57)**Assembly Action :****Disapproved**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ASME A112.18.8-2009 (R2014) with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

2015 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL SWIMMING POOL AND SPA CODE

SWIMMING POOL AND SPA CODE COMMITTEE

Edward Kulik, Chair

Chief Building Official
City of Goodyear
Goodyear, AZ

Donald Leas, Vice Chair

Rep: Association of Pool & Spa Professionals
Consultant
United States Of America Diving
Mayport, PA

Jeffrey H. Anderson

Residential Combination Inspector
Chesterfield County Building Inspections
Chesterfield, VA

Steve Barnes, CPO

Rep: Association of Pool & Spa Professionals
Director of Science and Compliance
AquaStar Pool Products, Inc.
Maricopa, AZ

Larry W. Brock

Building Inspector III
Chesterfield County
Chesterfield, VA

Joseph R. Crum, CBO

Building Official
City of Winter Springs Florida
Winter Springs, FL

Dale Engebretson, MCP

Rep: Village of Hampshire, IL
Building Official
B&F Construction Code Services
Elgin, IL

Bruce Grogg

Rep: Association of Pool & Spa Professionals
CEO/President
Pool Cover Specialists National, Inc.
West Jordan, UT

Lee Hovis

Rep: World Waterpark Association
Director of Operations and Recreation
Tolomato Community Development District
Ponte Vedra, FL

Dan Johnson, CBP

Rep: Association of Pool & Spa Professionals
Owner/President
Swim Incorporated
Sarasota, FL

Jasen Kunz, MPH

Environmental Health Officer
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Atlanta, GA

Eugene “Gene” Novak, Jr., CBO

Rep: Metro West Building Officials of MA
District State Building Inspector
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Framingham, MA

Darris Ritenour

Owner
Uncle D's Pools & Spas LLC
Luray, VA

Rick Root

President
World Waterpark Association
Overland Park, KS

Shajee Siddiqui

Rep: Association of Pool & Spa Professionals
Director, Global Product Safety & Compliance
Zodiac Pool Systems, Inc.
Vista, CA

Staff Secretariat:**Fred Grable, PE**

Senior Staff Engineer - Plumbing
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hills, IL

INTERNATIONAL SWIMMING POOL AND SPA CODE

2015 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

SP 1-15

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The application of pool and spa codes to flotation tanks is often questioned. This proposal solidifies the answer to this question as flotation tanks are not within the scope of this code.

Assembly Action : None

SP 2-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: These definitions conflict with how these terms are used in the National Electric Code and in APSP-15.

Assembly Motion: As Submitted

Online Vote Results: Successful - Support: 53.57% (75) Oppose: 46.43% (65)

Assembly Action : Approved as Submitted

SP 3-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Five feet and under is considered "shallow" by public health department codes. Changing to 4 feet would cause lifeguards to be needed for many more pools. This would also conflict with APSP standards for what is considered to be shallow water.

Assembly Action : None

SP 4-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The form of the diving water envelope allows elements such as swimouts to be anywhere in a pool including the deep end , just as long as the element does not encroach on the diving water envelope.

Assembly Action : None

SP 5-15

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: An underwater ledge is different than an underwater seat. The definition needs to stay in the code for that reason.

Assembly Action : None

SP 6-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 7-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 8-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 9-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The intent of these proposals is good but the language needs improved to make it clear that the mesh fence is a baby fence and not the type of temporary mesh fence that a contractor might use for protecting a work area.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 10-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The term "netting" could be confusing. This proposal should be coordinated with what proposal SP9 was trying to accomplish and brought back in Public Comment.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 11-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: With where this section is placed, the new language would apply to both residential and public pools. These requirements are only necessary for public pools. The new language seems to imply that only gates could be used for egress purposes. What about doors? All this might already be covered by the IBC.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 12-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The introduction of "residential" and "public" in this section adds confusion as to the required latch height for gates for pools and spas. Some pools are "residential" such as a pool at an apartment complex. Accessibility requirements really need to be covered in the public pools chapter.

Assembly Motion:
Online Vote Results:
Assembly Action :

As Submitted
Failed - Support: 42.66% (61) Oppose: 57.34% (82)
None

SP 13-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

SP 14-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**

SP 15-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The standard is not finished so this proposal has to be disapproved so that the completed standard can be brought to the Public Comment hearing for approval.

Assembly Action : **None**

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of ANSI/APSP/NPC/ICC - 12 2015 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

SP 16-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The International Residential Code doesn't require accessibility features for IRC buildings so the pools and spas in conjunction with an IRC building don't need accessibility features.

Assembly Action : **None**

SP 17-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal makes the section too focused on only suction entrapment. Adequate water circulation is important to all areas.

Assembly Action : **None**

SP 18-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed text would make the code inconsistent with what the APSP standard indicates for maximum flow velocity through grates.

SP 19-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Exterior (outdoor) switches used for this purpose typically have a protective cover that could be construed as not providing ready access. The new definition indicates that a "panel door" cannot be in the way of the switch. Also, the definition was already disapproved in SP2.

Assembly Motion:

As Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Failed - Support: 29.66% (43) Oppose: 70.34% (102)

Assembly Action :

None

SP 20-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Photovoltaic systems have nothing to do with standard NSF50.

Assembly Action :

None

Analysis. For staff analysis of the content of AHRI 400-01, SRC 100 - 13 and SRCC 300 - 13 with regard to the ICC criteria for referenced standards (Section 3.6 of CP #28), please visit: <http://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Proposed-Standards-Group-A-Final.pdf>

SP 21-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 22-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: It is necessary to include Class F pools (wading pools) in the coverage of public pools.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 23-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 24-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 25-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent wanted to present a floor modification to eliminate much of the proposal, however, the modification was ruled out of order by the committee chair. Therefore, the committee did not want to consider the proposal as submitted as the proponent wanted to make major changes.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 26-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 27-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

322.6 Location of pool features in a diving pool. Where a pool is designed for use with diving equipment, the location of steps, pool stairs, ladders, underwater benches, underwater ledges, special features and other accessory items shall be outside of the minimum diving water envelope. ~~See shape of the design water line as depicted in Figure 322.2.~~

Committee Reason: For the Modification only:

Underwater ledges could be below the design water line shape of the diving envelope. All that is required is that the underwater features not encroach on the three-dimensional shape of the diving water envelope. The shape of the envelope at the waterline is only part of the requirements.

For the proposal As Modified:

Underwater ledges are part of some pools and they should not be left out of the list of underwater items that should not encroach on the diving water envelope.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 28-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Toilet facilities are something specific that needs to be handled by other I-codes.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 29-15

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action :

None

SP 30-15

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Play areas such as these might be covered under amusement device regulations. Having a minimum surge tank size of the 4000 gallons might be excessive for a small spray pad area. However, this proposal is heading in the right direction.

Assembly Action : **None**

SP 31-15

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language of SP32 was preferred.

Assembly Action : **None**

SP 32-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The language aligns the code with the APSP 5 standard.

Assembly Action : **None**

SP 33-15

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action : **None**