INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL
2009/2010 CODE DEVELOPMENT CYCLE

2009/2010 REPORT OF THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE 2009 EDITIONS OF THE

ICC ADMINISTRATIVE CODE PROVISIONS
INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE®
INTERNATIONAL ENERGY CONSERVATION CODE®
INTERNATIONAL EXISTING BUILDING CODE®
INTERNATIONAL FIRE CODE®
INTERNATIONAL FUEL GAS CODE®
INTERNATIONAL MECHANICAL CODE®
INTERNATIONAL PLUMBING CODE®
INTERNATIONAL PRIVATE SEWAGE DISPOSAL CODE®
INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE®
INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL CODE®
INTERNATIONAL WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE CODE®
INTERNATIONAL ZONING CODE®

HELD IN BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
OCTOBER 24 – NOVEMBER 11, 2009

PUBLIC COMMENT DEADLINES:
FOR CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS HEARD IN
DALLAS, TX: FEBRUARY 8, 2010
CHARLOTTE, NC: JULY 1, 2010

First Printing

Publication Date: December 2009

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This publication contains the 2009/2010 Report of the Public Hearing on the proposed revisions to the *International Building Code, International Energy Conservation Code, International Existing Building Code, International Fire Code, International Fuel Gas Code, International Mechanical Code, International Plumbing Code, International Private Sewage Disposal Code, International Property Maintenance Code, International Residential Code, International Wildland-Urban Interface Code,* and *International Zoning Code* held in Baltimore, Maryland, October 24 – November 11, 2009.

This report includes the recommendation of the code development committee and the committee's reason on each proposed item. It also includes actions taken by the assembly in accordance with Section 5.7 of the *ICC Council Policy CP#28-05 Code Development (CP #28)*. 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 Where this report indicates Withdrawn by Proponent the proposed change was withdrawn by the proponent and is not subject to any further consideration.

The text of the original code change proposals is published in the monograph titled 2009/2010 Code Development Cycle Proposed Changes to the 2009 Editions of the *International Building Code, International Energy Conservation Code*, *International Existing Building Code*, *International Fire Code*, *International Fuel Gas Code*, *International Mechanical Code*~~,~~ *International Plumbing Code*, *International Private Sewage Disposal Code*, *International Property Maintenance Code*, *International Residential Code, International Wildland-Urban Interface Code,* and *International Zoning Code*.

There will be two Final Action Hearings held in 2010. On the following page, the codes or portions of codes to be considered at each Final Action Hearing are listed below the dates of their respective Final Action Hearing. For instance, the IFC Final Action Agenda will be heard during the hearings **May 14 – 23, 2010 at the Sheraton Dallas Hotel in Dallas, TX**. The IECC Final Action Agenda will be heard during the hearings **October 28 - November 1, 2010 at the Charlotte Convention Center in Charlotte, NC**.

Proposals on which there was a successful assembly action will be automatically included on the applicable final action agenda for individual consideration and voting by eligible voting members in accordance with Section 6.1.2 of CP #28.

Persons who wish to recommend an action other than that taken at the public hearing may submit a public comment in accordance with Section 6.0 of the *ICC CP#28-05 Code Development* (see page xii). **The deadline for receipt of public comments is February 8, 2010 for code change proposals to be heard in Dallas, TX and July 1, 2010 for code change proposals to be heard Charlotte, NC.** Proposals which receive a public comment will be included on the final action agenda for individual consideration and voting by eligible voting members in accordance with Section 6.1.1 of CP #28.

PUBLIC COMMENTS SHOULD BE SENT
TO THE FOLLOWING OFFICE VIA REGULAR MAIL OR EMAIL:

Send to:

Chicago District Office
4051 West Flossmoor Road
Country Club Hills, IL 60478-5795
Fax: 708/799-0320
publiccomments@iccsafe.org

Acronym ICC Code Name (Code change number prefix)

Public Comments Due February 8, 2010 for hearings in Dallas, TX (May 16-23, 2010)

IBC	International Building Code (E, FS, G, S)
IEBC	International Existing Building Code (EB)
IFC	International Fire Code (F)
IFGC	International Fuel Gas Code (FG)
IMC	International Mechanical Code (M)
IPC	International Plumbing Code (P)
IPSDC	International Private Sewage Disposal Code (PSD)
IRC	International Residential Code (RB, RM, RP)
IWUIC	International Wildland-Urban Interface Code (WUIC)

Public Comments Due July 1, 2010 for hearings in Charlotte, NC (October 28-November 1, 2010)

IADMIN	ICC Administrative Code Provisions (ADM)
IECC	International Energy Conservation Code (EC)
IPMC	International Property Maintenance Code (PM)
IRC (ENERGY)	International Residential Code (RE)
IZC	International Zoning Code (Z)

ICC WEBSITE - WWW.ICCSAFE.ORG

While great care has been exercised in the publication of this document, errata may occur. Errata will be posted on the ICC website at www.iccsafe.org. Users are encouraged to review the ICC Website for errata to the 2009/2010 Code Development Cycle Proposed Changes and the 2009/2010 Report of the Public Hearing.

REFERENCED STANDARDS UPDATES

In accordance with Section 4.5 of ICC Council Policy #CP28-05, referenced standards updates were included in a single code change proposal and heard at the Code Development Hearings by the ICC Administrative Code Development Committee (IADMIN). This single code change proposal is ADM39-09/10. Any public comments on ADM39-09/10 will be heard during the hearings in Charlotte, NC, October 28 – Nov. 1, 2010.

Code change proposal ADM39-09/10 provides a comprehensive list of all standards that the respective standards promulgators have indicated have been, or will be, updated from the listing in the 2009 Editions of the International Codes. According to Section 4.5 of ICC Council Policy #CP 28, Code Development Policy, the updating of standards referenced by the Codes shall be accomplished administratively by the Administrative Code Development Committee. Therefore, referenced standards that are to be updated for the 2012 edition of any of the I-Codes are listed in this single code change proposal. This is unlike the way these standards were updated in the past code change cycles, where updates for standards were dealt with by each committee for their respective codes. The code change includes standards that the promulgators have already updated or will have updated by December 1, 2011 in accordance with CP#28.

MODIFICATIONS BY PUBLIC COMMENT

Section 6.4.3 of CP #28 allows modifications to be proposed by a public comment to code changes for consideration at the Final Action Hearings. For the modification to be considered at the Final Action Hearings, the public comment must request Approval as Modified with the specific modification included in the public comment. The modification must be within the scope of the original proposed code change and relevant to the specific issue in the original code change.

FINAL ACTION CONSIDERATION

In summary, the items that will be on the agenda for individual consideration and action are:

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

CALL FOR ADOPTION INFORMATION

Please take a minute to visit the ICC Code Adoption Maps at www.iccsafe.org/gr/Pages/adoptions.aspx scroll to the bottom of the page and click on one of the jurisdiction maps and review the information as it relates to your jurisdiction. To see state/jurisdiction in chart form (PDF), go to Related Links (right side of screen) and choose the related file. If your jurisdiction is not listed, or is listed with incorrect information,

click on the Code Adoption Resources (left side of screen), and click on Submit Adoption Info and provide correct information.

CP# 28-05 CODE DEVELOPMENT

Approved: 9/24/05
Revised: 2/27/09

CP # 28-05 is an update to *ICC's Code Development Process for the International Codes* dated May 15, 2004.

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 proposals by all parties desiring to participate.
1.2.3 The final determination of Code text by officials representing code enforcement and regulatory agencies and by honorary members.

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. Where a given subject matter or code text could appear in more than one Code, the ICC Board shall determine which Code shall be the primary document, and therefore which code development committee shall be responsible for review and maintenance of the code text. 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 4.4.

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 ICC codes are developed embodies core principles of the organization. One of those principles is that the final content of ICC codes is determined by a majority vote of the governmental and honorary members. It is the policy of the 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.

1.6 Video Taping: Individuals requesting permission to video tape any meeting, or portion thereof, shall be required to provide the ICC with a release of responsibility disclaimer and shall acknowledge that they have insurance coverage for liability and misuse of video tape materials. Equipment and the process used to video tape 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 videotaping. An unedited copy of the video tape shall be forwarded to ICC within 30 days of the meeting.

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 final action on the code change proposals (see Section 7.6).

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 last edition.

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

2.4 Emergency Procedures: In the event that the ICC Board determines that an emergency amendment to any Code 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 ICC Governmental Member 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.

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 Final Action Consideration of that proposal. A withdrawn code change proposal shall not be subject to a public hearing, motions, or Final Action Consideration.

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.

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 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 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 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 proposal shall be in proper code format and terminology.
3.3.4.4 Each 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 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 proposed code change (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 provisi ons, stating why the proposal is superior to the current provisions of the Code. 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 proposals will improve the Code.
3.3.5.3 Substantiation: The proponent shall substantiate the proposed code change 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 proposed code change shall be identified as such. The proponent shall be notified that the 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.
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 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 modificatio ns 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. This information will be included in the published code change proposal.

3.4 Number: One copy of each code change proposal, two copies of each proposed new referenced standard and one copy of all substantiating information 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. A copy of the code change proposal in electronic form is preferred.

3.5 Submittal Deadline: Each code change proposal shall be received at the office of the Secretariat by the posted deadline. Such posting shall occur no later than 120 days prior to the code change deadline. The submitter of a proposed code change 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 shall comply with this section. The standard shall be completed and readily available prior to Final Action Consideration based on the cycle of code development which includes the proposed 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. Updating of standards without corresponding code text changes shall be accomplished administratively in accordance with Section 4.5.

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

4.0 Processing of 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 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.

4.3 Incomplete 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 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 proposal that incorporates a new referenced standard shall be processed with an analysis of referenced standard's compliance with the criteria set forth in Section 3.6.

4.4 Editorial: The Chief Executive Officer shall have the authority at all times to make editorial and format changes to the Code text, or any approved changes, consistent with the intent, provisions and style of the Code. An editorial or format change is a text change that does not affect the scope or application of the code requirements.

4.5 Updating Standards:

4.5.1 Standards referenced in the 2012 Edition of the I-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, 2011. The published version of the 2012 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.

4.5.2 Standards referenced in the 2015 Edition and following Editions of the I-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 multiple standards to be updated may be included in a single proposal. The standard shall be completed and readily available prior to Final Action Consideration of the Administrative code change proposal which includes the proposed update.

4.6 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.

4.7 Publication: All code change proposals shall be posted on the ICC website at least 30 days prior to the public hearing on those proposals and shall constitute the agenda forthe

public hearing. Code change proposals which have not been published shall not be considered.

5.0 Public Hearing

5.1 Intent: The intent of the public 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 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 Code Development Committees shall be appointed by the applicable ICC Council.

5.2.1 Chairman/Moderator: The Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall be appointed by the Steering Committee on Councils from the appointed members of the committee. The ICC President shall appoint one or more Moderators who shall act as presiding officer for the public 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 on the matter or any committee vote. Violation thereofshall result in the immediate removal of the committee member from the committee.A committee member who is a proponent of a 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 each public hearing shall be announced not less than 60 days prior to the date of the public hearing.

5.4 General Procedures: *The Robert's Rules of Order* shall be the formal procedure for the conduct of the public 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 Meetings: Public hearings of the Code Development Committees are open meetings. Any interested person may attend and participate in the Floor Discussion and Assembly Consideration portions of the hearing. Only eligible voters (see Section 5.7.4) are permitted to vote on Assembly Considerations. Only Code Development Committee members may participate in the Committee Action portion of the hearings (see Section 5.6).

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. Audio-visual presentations are not permitted. Substantiating material submitted in accordance with Section 3.3.4.4 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 an agenda for each public 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 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 proposed code change after it has been voted on by the committee in accordance with Section 5.6; or, in the case of assembly consideration, there shall be no reconsideration of a proposed code change after it has been voted on by the assembly in accordance with Section 5.7.

5.4.6 Time Limits: Time limits shall be established as part of the agenda for testimony on all proposed changes at the beginning of each hearing session. Each person requesting to testify on a change 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 cha nge 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 the eligible voters as determined in Section 5.7.4 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 proposal for their comments.
2. *Opponents.* After discussion by those in support of a 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. *Rerebuttal in opposition.* Opponents shall then have the opportunity to respond to the proponent's rebuttal.

5.5.2 Modifications: Modifications to 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 and Written Copies. All modifications must be written, unless determined by the Chairman to be either editorial or minor in nature. The modification proponent shall provide 20 copies to the Secretariat for distribution to the committee.

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 proposal; or
3. is not readily understood to allow a proper assessment of its impact on the original 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 public hearing shall be established by the committee's action. If a motion in accordance with Section 5.7.1 is brought forward and is sustained in accordance with Section 5.7.3, both the committee's action and the assemblies' action shall be reported as the results of the public hearing. Where a motion is sustained in accordance with Section 5.7.3, such action shall be the initial motion considered at Final Action Consideration in accordance with Section 7.3.8.2.

5.7.1 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 Discussion: On receipt of a second to the floor motion, the Moderator shall place the motion before the assembly for a vote. No additional testimony shall be permitted.

5.7.3 Assembly Action: The assembly action shall be in accordance with the following majorities based on the number of votes cast by eligible voters (See 5.7.4).

Committee Action	Desired Assembly Action		
	ASF	AMF	DF
AS	--	$^2/_3$ Majority	$^2/_3$ Majority
AM	$^2/_3$ Majority	$^2/_3$ Majority	$^2/_3$ Majority
D	$^2/_3$ Majority	$^2/_3$ Majority	--

5.7.4 Eligible Voters: All members of ICC in attendance at the public hearing shall be eligible to vote on floor motions. Only one vote authorized for each eligible attendee. Code Development Committee members shall be eligible to vote on floor motions. Application, whether new or updated, for ICC membership must be received by the Code Council ten days prior to the commencement of the first day of the public hearing.

5.8 Report of the Public Hearing: The results of the public hearing, including committee action and successful assembly action, shall be posted on the ICC website not less than 60 days prior to Final Action Consideration except as approved by the ICC Board.

6.0 Public Comments

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

6.1.1 Consideration of items for which a public comment has been submitted; and
6.1.2 Consideration of items which received a successful assembly action at the public hearing.

6.2 Deadline: The deadline for receipt of a public comment to the results of the public hearing shall be announced at the public hearing but shall not be less than 30 days from the availability of the report of the results of the public 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 Final Action Consideration of that comment. A withdrawn public comment shall not be subject to Final Action 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 7.3.4, 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 7.3.4, the proposal shall continue as part of the individual consent agenda in accordance with Section 7.3.5, however the public comment shall not be subject to Final Action 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 public 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. If 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 3.3.4.5 shall be provided with the public comment.

6.4.2 Code Reference: Each public comment shall include the code change proposal number and the results of the public hearing, including successful assembly actions, on the code change proposal to which the public comment is directed.

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: 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 (AM) by one or more specific modifications published in the Results of the Public Hearing or published in a public comment, or
3. Disapprove the code change proposal (D)

6.4.5 Supporting Information: The public comment shall include in 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 6.4 and determined as not germane to the technical issues addressed in the code change proposal or committee 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. 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 Final Action Hearing.

6.4.6 Number: One copy of each public comment and one copy of all substantiating information shall be submitted. Additional copies may be requested when determined necessary by the Secretariat. A copy of the public comment in electronic form is preferred.

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 Final Action 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 Final Action Consideration.

6.6 Publication: The public hearing results on code change proposals that have not been public commented and the code change proposals with public commented public hearing results and successful assembly actions shall constitute the Final Action Agenda. The Final Action Agenda shall be posted on the ICC website at least 30 days prior to Final Action consideration.

7.0 Final Action Consideration

7.1 Intent: The purpose of Final Action Consideration is to make a final determination of all code change proposals which have been considered in a code development cycle by a vote cast by eligible voters (see Section 7.4).

7.2 Agenda: The final action consent agenda shall be comprised of proposals which have neither an 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 Sections 5.7 and 6.0).

7.3 Procedure: *The Robert's Rules of Order* shall be the formal procedure for the conduct of the Final Action Consideration except as these Rules of Procedure may otherwise dictate.

7.3.1 Open Meetings: Public hearings for Final Action Consideration are open meetings. Any interested person may attend and participate in the Floor Discussion.

7.3.2 Agenda Order: The Secretariat shall publish an agenda for Final Action Consideration, placing individual code change proposals and public comments in a logical order to facilitate the hearing. The proponents or opponents of any 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.

7.3.3 Presentation of Material at the Public Hearing: Information to be provided at the hearing shall be limited to verbal presentations. Audio-visual presentations are not permitted. Substantiating material submitted in accordance with Section 6.4.4 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.

7.3.4 Final Action Consent Agenda: The final action consent agenda (see Section 7.2) shall be placed before the assembly with a single motion for final action in accordance with the results of the public 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.

7.3.5 Individual Consideration Agenda: Upon completion of the final action consent vote, all proposed changes not on the final action consent agenda shall be placed before the assembly for individual consideration of each item (see Section 7.2).

7.3.6 Reconsideration: There shall be no reconsideration of a proposed code change after it has been voted on in accordance with Section 7.3.8.

7.3.7 Time Limits: Time limits shall be established as part of the agenda for testimony on all proposed changes at the beginning of each hearing session. Each person requesting to testify on a change 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.

7.3.7.1 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.

7.3.8 Discussion and Voting: Discussion and voting on proposals being individually considered shall be in accordance with the following procedures:

7.3.8.1 Allowable Final Action Motions: The only allowable motions for final action are Approval as Submitted, Approval as Modified by one or more modifications published in the Final Action Agenda, and Disapproval.

7.3.8.2 Initial Motion: The Code Development Committee action shall be the initial motion considered, unless there was a successful assembly action in accordance with Section 5.7.3. If there was a successful assembly action, it shall be the initial motion considered. If the assembly action motion fails, the code development committee action shall become the next motion considered.

7.3.8.3 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 Final Action Agenda may be made (see Section 6.4.3). 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.

7.3.8.4 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. If the motion fails to receive the majority required in Section 7.5, the Moderator shall ask for a new motion.

7.3.8.5 Subsequent Motion: If the initial motion is unsuccessful, a motion for one of the other allowable final actions shall be made (see Section 7.3.8.1) and dispensed with until a successful final action is achieved. If a successful final action is not achieved, Section 7.5.1 shall apply.

7.3.9 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.

7.3.10 Points of Order: Any person participating in the public hearing may challenge a procedural ruling of the Moderator. A majority vote of the eligible voters as determined in Section 5.7.4 shall determine the decision.

7.4 Eligible voters: ICC Governmental Member Representatives and Honorary Members in attendance at the Final Action Hearing shall have one vote per eligible attendee on all International Codes. Applications, whether new or updated, for governmental member voting representative status must be received by the Code Council ten days prior to the commencement of the first day of the Final Action Hearing in order for any designated representative to be eligible to vote.

7.5 Majorities for Final Action: The required voting majority based on the number of votes cast of eligible voters shall be in accordance with the following table:

Public Hearing Action (see note)	**Desired Final Action**		
	AS	**AM**	**D**
AS	Simple Majority	$^2/_3$ Majority	Simple Majority
AM	$^2/_3$ Majority	Simple Majority to sustain the Public Hearing Action or; 2/3 Majority on additional modifications and 2/3 on overall AM	Simple Majority
D	$^2/_3$ Majority	$^2/_3$ Majority	Simple Majority

Note: The Public Hearing Action includes the committee action and successful assembly action.

7.5.1 Failure to Achieve Majority Vote: In the event that a code change proposal does not receive any of the required majorities for final action in Section 7.5, final action on the code change proposal in question shall be disapproval.

7.6 Publication: The Final action on all proposed code changes shall be published as soon as practicable after the determination of final action. The exact wording of any resulting text modifications shall be made available to any interested party.

8.0 Appeals

8.1 Right to Appeal: Any person may appeal an action or inaction in accordance with CP-1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS FOR FINAL ACTION MAY 14 – 23, 2010 IN DALLAS, TX

CODE **PAGE**

CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS FOR FINAL ACTION OCTOBER 28 – NOVEMER 1, 2010 IN CHARLOTTE, NC

CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS FOR FINAL ACTION:

MAY 14 – 23, 2010
DALLAS, TEXAS

The following group of code change proposals will be considered for Final Action during the Final Action Hearings at the **Sheraton Dallas Hotel in Dallas, TX**, **May 14 – 23, 2010**.

The deadline for public comments is **February 8, 2010**.

Code changes that will be placed on the agenda for *individual consideration* include:

1. Proposed changes that receive a public comment by **February 8, 2010**. (See Section 6.0 of CP#28-05.)
2. Proposed changes that received a successful Assembly Action. (See Section 5.7 of CP#28-05.)

All other code changes will be ratified in a vote on the Final Action Consent Agenda, which will be placed before the assembly during each separate portion of the Final Action Hearings with a single motion for final action in accordance with the results of the public hearing in Baltimore. (See Section 7.3.4 of CP28.)

- *International Building Code*®
  - Fire Safety (FS)
  - General (G)
  - Means of Egress (E)
  - Structural (S)
- *International Existing Building Code*® (EB)
- *International Fire Code*® (F)
- *International Fuel Gas Code*® (FG)
- *International Mechanical Code*® (M)
- *International Plumbing Code*® (P)
- *International Residential Code*®
  - Building (RB)
  - Mechanical (RM)
  - Plumbing (RP)
- *International Wildland-Urban Interface Code*® (IWUIC)

CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS FOR FINAL ACTION:

October 28 – November 1, 2010
CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA

The following group of code change proposals will be considered for Final Action during the Final Action Hearings at the **Charlotte Convention Center in Charlotte, North Carolina October 28 – November 1, 2010**.

The deadline for public comments is **July 1, 2010**.

Code changes that will be placed on the agenda for *individual consideration* include:

1. Proposed changes that receive a public comment by **July 1, 2010**. (See Section 6.0 of CP#28-05.)
2. Proposed changes that received a successful Assembly Action. (See Section 5.7 of CP#28-05.)

All other code changes will be ratified in a vote on the Final Action Consent Agenda, which will be placed before the assembly during each separate portion of the Final Action Hearings with a single motion for final action in accordance with the results of the public hearing in Baltimore. (See Section 7.3.4 of CP28.)

- *ICC Administrative Code Provisions*® (ADM)
- *International Energy Conservation Code*® (EC)
- *International Property Maintenance Code*® (PM)
- *International Residential Code*®
  Energy (RE)
- *International Zoning Code*® (Z)

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL ICC ADMINISTRATIVE CODE COMMITTEE

Rebecca Baker, CBO – *Chair*
Director of Building Safety
Jefferson County
Golden, CO

Richard Thomson – *Vice Chair*
Code Compliance Specialist
New York State Department of State
Rose, NY

David Adams
Fire Protection Engineer
Sandy Springs Fire Rescue
Sandy Springs, GA

Mark Berg, CBO
Building Official
City of Norco
Norco, CA

Charles Bloomberg
Plans Examiner
City of Southlake, TX
Southlake, TX

Lawrence Brown, CBO
Director, Codes and Standards
National Association of Home Builders
Washington, DC

James Burton
Manager - Compliance Services
FRA Engineering - A TY LIN International Company
Henrietta, NY

Dale Engebretson, CBO
Building Commissioner
Village of Round Lake
Carol Stream, IL

John Hitch, AIA
Partner
Smith Sinnett Architecture, PA
Raleigh, NC

Craig Johnson
Building Official
Culver City Building Safety Division
Culver City, CA

Dennis Martinelli
Supervising Combination Inspector
Fairfax County Government
Fairfax, VA

Roxanne Michael, CBO, AICP
Instructor & Sr. Plans Examiner
Whatcom County
Bellingham, WA

Michael O'Brian
Fire Marshal
Brighton Area Fire Authority
Brighton, MI

Andrea Lanier Papageorge, JD
Specialist, Codes and Standards
AGL Resources
Atlanta, GA

Wilma Jean Stanley
Inspections Supervisor
Chesterfield County
Chesterfield, VA

Committee Secretary
David Bowman, PE
Manager of Codes
International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS

ADM1-09/10

PART I-IBC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

Committee Action: **Disapproved***

Committee Reason: The proponent's intent was to pull provisions from all codes to create a uniform chapter 1 for all codes. In doing so, the proponent included provisions in all codes that appeared in only a single code. These single provisions are somewhat controversial and require more discussion and technical justification for inclusion in all of the codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

***Note:** Subsequent to committee action on Parts I and XII, the proponent withdrew all parts of this code change proposal.

PART II- IEBC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART III-IECC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART IV-IFC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART V-IFGC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART VI- IMC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART VII-IPC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART VIII-IPMC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART IX-IPSDC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART X-IWUIC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART XI-IZC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART XII-IRC B/E **Withdrawn by Proponent**

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proponent has re-organized the administrative provisions of chapter 1 in a logical manner that will prevent the loss of provisions if the local authority having jurisdiction makes modifications to the administrative provisions of the IRC. In addition, the proposed re-organization provides a more uniform set of administrative provisions for all of the I-Codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

***Note:** Subsequent to committee actions on Parts I and XII, the proponent withdrew all parts of this code change proposal.

ADM2-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Relocation of buildings are certainly a construction activity with the scope of the IBC and IEBC; therefore, it is appropriate to include this term in the scope statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM3-09/10

PART I-IBC, IMC; IFGC; IPC; IPSDC; IECC; IEBC; IPMC; IWUIC; IZC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee's disapproval is based upon the portion that would add sustainability to the intent statement of all I-Codes. The committee disapproved this code change proposal because at the present time, sustainability is not within the purview of the I-Codes. Further, sustainability is not yet clearly understood or established, so it would be a vague provision that could cause confusion in understanding the I-Codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II-IRC B/E

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There are several terms undefined such as "durability" and "sustainable practices". The committee feels the issue of sustainability would be more appropriately addressed in other standards or codes. The ICC Sustainable Building Technology Committee (SBTC) is working on this and the development of the *International Green Building Code* is in process.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM4-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

102.4.1 ~~Differences~~ Conflicts. Where ~~differences~~ conflicts occur between provisions of this code and referenced codes and standards, the provisions of this code shall apply.

102.4.2 Conflicting provisions ~~scopes~~. Where the extent of the reference to……
(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The code change proposal provides a higher degree of specificity with regard to the code provisions for the applicability of referenced standards in the I-Codes. The modification simply uses more accurate terminology for the provision proposed.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC-B/E

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a needed clarification for what is required as regard to differences and conflicts between referenced standards and the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM5-09/10

Errata: For errata to this code change proposal, please see the errata posted at www.iccsafe.org

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

104.10.1 Flood hazard areas. The building official shall not grant modifications to any provision required in flood hazard areas as established by Section 1612.2 ~~without the granting of a variance to such provision by the board of appeals.~~ unless a determination has been made that:

1. A showing of good and sufficient cause that the unique characteristics of the size, configuration or topography of the site render the elevation standards of Section 1612 inappropriate.
2. A determination that failure to grant the variance would result in exceptional hardship by rendering the lot undevelopable.

3. A determination that the granting of a variance will not result in increased flood heights, additional threats to public safety, extraordinary public expense, cause fraud on or victimization of the public, or conflict with existing laws or ordinances.
4. A determination that the variance is the minimum necessary to afford relief, considering the flood hazard.
5. Submission to the applicant of written notice specifying the difference between the design flood elevation and the elevation to which the building is to be built, stating that the cost of flood insurance will be commensurate with the increased risk resulting from the reduced floor elevation, and stating that construction below the design flood elevation increases risks to life and property.

~~**113.2.1 Criteria for issuance of a variance for flood hazard areas.** If an application for a modification to a provision required in flood hazard areas is received, the board of appeals shall issue a variance only upon:~~

~~1. A showing of good and sufficient cause that the unique characteristics of the size, configuration or topography of the site render the elevation standards of Section 1612 inappropriate.~~
~~2. A determination that failure to grant the variance would result in exceptional hardship by rendering the lot undevelopable.~~
~~3. A determination that the granting of a variance will not result in increased flood heights, additional threats to public safety, extraordinary public expense, cause fraud on or victimization of the public, or conflict with existing laws or ordinances.~~
~~4. A determination that the variance is the minimum necessary to afford relief, considering the flood hazard.~~
~~5. Submission to the applicant of written notice specifying the difference between the design flood elevation and the elevation to which the building is to be built, stating that the cost of flood insurance will be commensurate with the increased risk resulting from the reduced floor elevation, and stating that construction below the design flood elevation increases risks to life and property.~~

Committee Reason: The granting of modifications to the code in relation to flood hazard areas have some significant ramifications, as reflected in the National Flood Insurance Program. The NFIP provides specific criteria for the building official to use in consideration of such modifications. In addition, the authority having jurisdiction can grant modifications without consulting a board of appeals. The modification simply utilizes the format and organization of the IEBC. The modification is a reformat of the provisions that places the criteria in Section 104.10.1 rather than later in the code, and eliminates the unnecessary step of referral to a board of appeals.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM6-09/10

PART I-IBC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

2. ~~Fences not over 7 feet (2134 mm) high.~~ 6 foot (1829 mm) fences with no parts more than 7 feet (2134 mm) above grade.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's point about the practical matter of building a 6 foot fence with dimensions commonly higher than 6 feet. The modification addresses the issue in terms of height of the fence above grade, which is the true intent of the code, to limit the height of the fence above grade.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: This change provides a more reasonable fence height that reflects what is actually being built as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM7-09/10

PART I-IBC; IEBC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code addresses moved buildings. There is no justification for singling out modular buildings except for the practical matter of modular construction site office buildings. The proposal would also include modular buildings use for other purposes, such as for school classrooms. This would also give an exception for modular buildings moved to areas with higher snow loads or wind loads that would require some

re-analysis and possible re-design.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that there is no reason or justification provided that this is needed. Also, it is not in the appropriate section even if it were needed. It would be more appropriate in Section R102.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM8-09/10

PART I- IMC; IPC; IFGC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Putting a hard limit on the amount of time to conduct an inspection could place an unnecessary hardship on some communities. In all communities it is important to be responsive to contractors and provide timely inspection services. However, the amount of time needed could vary greatly in different communities.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II- IBC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Putting a hard limit on the amount of time to conduct an inspection could place an unnecessary hardship on some communities. In all communities it is important to be responsive to contractors and provide timely inspection services. However, the amount of time needed could vary greatly in different communities.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this change would cause undue delay in construction. This change would significantly increase cost and time in construction.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM9-09/10

PART I-IBC; IEBC; IECC; IFC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code already allows the use of electronic documents.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: The electronic media is already addressed in the code. The added list of information is all energy related and does not cover other items.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM10-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is vague, unenforceable language. The type of credentials are not defined. Normally the expectation is that drawings be provided by a registered design professional. This would subvert state laws on registered design professionals.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM11-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This provision would provide an emphasis on the need to make sure that the path of egress has been adequately addressed.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM12-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no reason to single out opening protectives as items to review prior to installation. All details of construction should be provided in the construction documents for approval by the building official.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM13-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: A 24 month period for temporary structures permitting is too long for temporary structures. In some areas, this would allow a temporary structure to go through as many as 3 frost cycles. The proponent makes this applicable to modular buildings, which could include temporary school classrooms. The committee felt that temporary structures such as these are in need of a frequent review to ensure the safety of the occupants.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM14-09/10

Errata: For errata to this code change proposal, please see the errata posted at www.iccsafe.org

PART I-IBC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides for a necessary as-built verification of the building floors with relation to flood elevations.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: The committee agrees that this information is needed prior to the final inspection as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM15-09/10

PART I-IBC; IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The need to approve glazing goes far beyond just the need to deal with energy use.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This change would effectively exempt all glazing from the glazing requirements in the code and CPSC 16 CFR 1201.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM16-09/10

PART I-IBC; IFC; IMC; IPC; IFGC; IWUIC; IECC; IEBC; IPMC; IZC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This provision is an oversimplified approach tolerances. Tolerances depend upon the particular type of installation and cannot be addressed in this way, across the board.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that this would have the effect of limiting the Building Official to allow normal construction tolerances.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM17-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**
Committee Reason: The code intends that the code official have approval authority for building construction. Compliance with any state laws for any particular aspect of construction would be the responsibility of the permit applicant. Invoking another authority for a particular aspect of a building would cause confusion and delays in the enforcement of the adopted codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM18-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee believes that requiring a building information model would be an unnecessary expense for many communities who can ill afford additional expenses.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM19-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed items for inclusion in the scope of the IFC are not directly within the purview of the IFC. Therefore it is not appropriate to include them.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM20-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language proposed for deletion from the IFC was language just installed by the IFC Committee in the last code change cycle. This was carefully crafted language that several groups worked out to clarify the intent of the IFC with regard to the premises of residences. It is an important clarification to allow code users to understand the relationship of the fire code to residential construction.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM21-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM22-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

IPMC 102.3 Application of other codes. Repairs, additions or alterations to a structure, or changes of occupancy, shall be done in accordance with the procedures and provisions of the *International Building Code, International Energy Conservation Code, Internation Fire Code, International Residential Code, International Fuel Gas Code, International Mechanical Code, International Plumbing Code,* and NFPA 70. Nothing in this code shall be construed to cancel, modify or set aside any provision of the *International Zoning Code.*

Committee Reason: The committee agrees that the IPMC covers installations also address by the IRC and IPC. In addition, the modification acknowledges the same issue exists for the IFC and IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM23-09/10

PART I-IBC FIRE SAFETY **Withdrawn by Proponent**
Committee Action:

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action:

PART II-IEBC **Withdrawn by Proponent**
Committee Action:

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM24-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The energy conservation issues dealt with in this code must logically be intended to apply throughout the life of a building. Therefore, it is appropriate to amend the intent statement to make this included.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM25-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Presently, there is no misunderstanding in the application of the code for residential construction. This revision is unnecessary, and it could also confuse the intent of the IECC and other I-Codes, by changing the application of mixed uses that are traditionally applied and understood in the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM26-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The IECC is intended to regulate energy conservation, regardless of the source of the energy. This proposed change could open the door for gamesmanship in applying the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM27-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason:. The proposed language would change the entire intent of the code, to require application of the code for lighting only.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM28-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is not necessary in understanding the intent of the code with regard to above code programs.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM29-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The standard relies upon the 2003 International Energy Conservation Code, which contains energy conservation stringency far short of the present edition of the IECC.

Assembly Action: None

ADM30-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed energy usage levels are too aggressive and would severely limit the available options in building design.

Assembly Action: None

ADM31-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The mandatory requirements of the IECC reflect absolute minimums for individual components of the building envelope or energy consuming elements. Any above code program should logically meet these mandatory minimums.

Assembly Action: None

ADM32-09/10

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

ERRATA:

IEBC 101.5.4.2 Compliance with reduced IBC level seismic forces. Where seismic evaluation and design is permitted to meet reduced *International Building Code* seismic force levels, the procedures used shall be in accordance with one of the following:

1. The *International Building Code* using 75 percent of the prescribed forces. Values of R,Ω_0 and C_d used for analysis shall be as specified in Section 101.5.4.1 of this code.
2. Structures or portions of structures that comply with the requirements of the applicable chapter in Appendix A as specified in Items 2.1 through 2.5 and subject to the limitations of the respective Appendix A chapters shall be deemed to comply with this section.
   - 2.1. The seismic evaluation and design of unreinforced masonry bearing wall buildings in Occupancy Category I or II are permitted to be based on the procedures specified in Appendix Chapter A1.
   - 2.2. Seismic evaluation and design of the wall anchorage system inreinforced concrete and reinforced masonry wall buildings with flexible diaphragms in Occupancy Category I or II are permitted to be based on the procedures specified in Appendix Chapter A2.
   - 2.3. Seismic evaluation and design of cripple walls and sill plate anchorage in residential buildings of light-frame wood construction in Occupancy Category ~~I or~~ II are permitted to be based on the procedures specified in Chapter A3.
   - 2.4. Seismic evaluation and design of soft, weak, or open-front wall conditions in multiunit residential buildings of wood construction in Occupancy Category ~~I or~~ II are permitted to be based on the procedures specified in Chapter A4.
   - 2.5. Seismic evaluation and design of concrete buildings in all occupancy categories are permitted to be based on the procedures specified in Chapter A5.

Committee Action: **Approved As Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change is necessary to all attention to the limits on applicability in each of the IEBC Appendix chapters.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM33-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: At this time it is appropriate to retain Appendix Chapter A5 in the IEBC, so that jurisdictions can continue using it, before requiring them to transition to newer seismic rehabilitation standards.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM34-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

105.6.27 LP-gas. An operational permit is required for:

1. Storage and use of LP-gas.

   Exceptions:

   1. A permit is not required for individual containers with a 500-gallon (1893 L) water capacity or less or multiple container systems having an aggregate quantity not exceeding 500 gallons (1893) L, serving occupancies in Group R-3.
   2. A permit is not required for LP-gas containers having a water capacity not exceeding 48 pounds [nominal 20 pounds (9 kg) LP-gas] connected to a LP-gas grill unless at a public assembly or on or serving a public way.

2. Operation of cargo tankers that transport LP-gas.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal provides a reasonable exception to the permit requirement for residential occupancies. The modification reflects the committee's concern over the number and type of operations that could be exempt and that the term 'public way' could even include a private driveway, which was not the intent.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM35-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal was unclear as to whether it would apply to all devices or only required devices. The proposal also does not take into account the requirements of other agencies that might require testing which could lead to inter-agency conflict. The committee also felt that this lack of clarity could lead to varying application throughout the jurisdiction resulting in inconsistent enforcement.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM36-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IMC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

IMC 102.3 Maintenance. Mechanical systems, both existing and new, and parts thereof shall be maintained in proper operating condition in accordance with the original design and in a safe and sanitary condition. ~~The inspection for maintenance of HVAC systems shall be done in accordance with ASHRAE/ACCA/ANSI Standard 180.~~ Devices or safeguards which are required by this code shall be maintained in compliance with the code edition under which they were installed. The owner or the owner's designated agent shall be responsible for maintenance of mechanical systems. To determine compliance with this provision, the code official shall have the authority to require a mechanical system to be reinspected. The inspection for maintenance of HVAC systems shall be done in accordance with ASHRAE/ACCA/ANSI Standard 180.

Committee Reason: A standard practice needs to be prescribed by the code to provide consistent inspection and maintenance of HVAC systems and to improve energy efficiency, thermal comfort and indoor air quality. Current practice often allows HVAC systems to simply run until they fail or allows them to operate outside of their design performance parameters. The modification relocates the new sentence to the end of the paragraph to place it nearer to the current reinspection text.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM37-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IMC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Maintenance is not a code issue. Operation permits are not appropriate for this code. Jurisdictions have no manpower to perform the inspections required by the proposed text.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM38-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IPMC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Although mold is a sanitary issue, referencing it in the definition is not appropriate because the code does not give any direction for the mitigation of mold. Further, the last sentence in the proposed definition of sanitary contains requirements, which is not appropriate as part of a definition.

Assembly Action: **None**

ADM39-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

Add ANSI Standard as follows:
A137.1 – ~~88~~ 2008 Standard Specifications for Ceramic Tile (Referenced in IBC)

Committee Reason: The update of standards is necessary to keep the I-Codes current with industry.

Assembly Action: **None**

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL ENERGY CONSERVATION CODE COMMITTEE

Dale Greiner—Chair
Building Official
Lake County
Tavares, FL

Robert Austin—Vice Chair
Code Specialist
New Jersey Dept. of Community Affairs,
Division of Codes and Standards
Trenton, NJ

Joseph Andre
Western Field Representative
National Electrical Manufacturers Assoc.
Bothell, WA

Misti Bruceri, CEM
Rep: Pacific Gas/Electric Co.
Principal
Misti Bruceri & Associates, LLC
Napa, CA

Lynn Chamberlin
Architect II
Nebraska Energy Office
Lincoln, NE

Medard Kopczynski
Assistant City Manager
City of Keene
Keene, NH

Marjorie Meares
President
Meares Environmental Consulting
Asheville, NC

Ron Nickson
Vice President of Building Codes
National Multi Housing Council
Washington, DC

Keith Peetz, PE
Engineer Supervisor
City & County of Denver - Community
Planning & Development
Denver, CO

Gary Pringey, CBO
Plan Analyst
Colorado Code Consulting LLC
Denver, CO

Robert Ross
Rep: National Assoc. of Home Builders
G&R Construction Services LLC
Austin, TX

Deborah Taylor, AIA, LEED, AP
Chief Sustainability Officer
NY City Department of Buildings
New York, NY

David Weitz
Director, Applied Building Science Div.
Conservation Services Group
Westborough, MA

Donald White
Rep: Southern Nevada Inter-jurisdictional
Energy Code Committee
Architectural Plans Examiner
City of Las Vegas Dept. of Bldg/Safety
Las Vegas, NV

Howard Wiig, MA
Institutional Energy Analyst
State of Hawaii Strategic Industries Div.
Honolulu, HI

Staff Secretariat:
David Bowman, PE
Manager of Codes
International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL ENERGY CONSERVATION CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS

EC1-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested changes in a technical map based upon administrative issues in a local state. Maps should not be changed based upon administrative issues.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent suggests changing a map that is based upon technical information based upon the local politics in a particular state. Maps should not be revised based upon politics.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC2-09/10

PART I-IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed requirements are redundant. The code already requires the installed insulated sheathing R-value to be provided.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II-IRC B/E

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

N1101.4.2.1 Insulated sheathing R-value mark. ~~Where R-values for multiple sheathing thicknesses are printed on insulated sheathing, the actual R-value shall be printed on the insulated sheathing board in lettering at least two times the height of any other R-value or thickness. Alternately,~~ The installed insulated sheathing R-value shall be listed on the insulation certification required in section N1101.4.2.

Committee Reason: The code change proposal provides for easy verification of the insulation that is installed. This will help building inspectors, and facilitate enforcement of the code. The modification addresses the committees desire to only deal with providing information on the certificate. The requirements for lettering R-values on the insulation itself could create unnecessary conflicts with industry practice.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC3-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Add new definition as follows:

VISIBLE TRANSMITTANCE (VT). The ratio of visible light entering the space through the fenestration product assembly to the incident visible light. VT includes the effects of glazing material and frame and is expressed as a number between 0 and 1.

2. Revise as follows:
303.1.3 Fenestration product rating. *U*-factors of fenestration products (windows, doors and skylights) shall be determined in accordance with NFRC 100 by an accredited, independent laboratory, and labeled and certified by the manufacturer. Products lacking such a labeled *U*-factor shall be assigned a default *U*-factor from Table 303.1.3(1) or 303.1.3(2). The solar heat gain coefficient (SHGC) and *visible transmittance* (VT) of glazed fenestration products (windows, glazed doors and skylights) shall be determined in accordance with NFRC 200 by an accredited, independent laboratory, and labeled and certified by the manufacturer. Products lacking such a labeled SHGC or VT shall be assigned a default SHGC or VT from Table 303.1.3(3).

Committee Reason: The change provides a useful mechanism for measuring how much light is going through the windows. It will encourage the use of daylighting in designs.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC4-09/10

PART I-IECC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would add language from Federal law. This is unnecessary in the text of the code. Manufacturers are required to meet Federal law. Therefore this is essentially a redundant requirement.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: The proposal would add language from Federal law. This is unnecessary in the text of the code. Manufacturers are required to meet Federal law. Therefore this is essentially a redundant requirement.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC5-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

EC6-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The energy conservation code does not distinguish what source of energy is being conserved. Therefore this change in the definition of building envelope to refer to fossil fuels is inappropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC7-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The definition conflicts with the IBC and therefore could cause confusion in the enforcement of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC8-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The definition excludes slabs on grade. Therefore this appears to be a definition that changes the scope of the code requirements, or, at best, confuses the understanding of the code requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC9-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code change proposal tries to close a loophole that the committee believes does not exist. The relationship of the IECC and the IRC are clear.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC10-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would create an inconsistency with ASHRAE 90.1 for R-2 buildings above 4 stories.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC11-09/10

Part I – IECC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change because it needed more work to refine various elements. The committee was concerned about the overall complexity and encouraged this to be moved in the direction of the contents of EC13-09/10. It appears that some energy saving measures have been reduced. Finally, the standard referenced in the proposal does not comply with ICC policy for referenced documents.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: This proposal provides aggressive energy conservation measures that would limit the flexibility in the design of the building in all areas. The committee prefers the flexibility provided by EC16.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC12-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**
Committee Reason: Consistent with action taken on ADM28 and ADM31.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC13-09/10

PART I-IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal accomplishes a needed increase in stringency. The proposal is the result of work done with many stakeholders to accomplish a reasonable and workable approach to reaching a necessary level of energy conservation.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: This proposal provides aggressive energy conservation measures that would limit the flexibility in the design of the building in all areas. The committee prefers the flexibility provided by EC16.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC14-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard ASHRAE 62.2-2007 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would revise requirements in EC13 to exempt testing of duct leakage for ducts contained within conditioned spaces. The committee did not agree that the testing of these ducts is unnecessary. Tight ducts are needed to ensure the efficient delivery of conditioned air to the intended space in the building.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC15-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Blower door testing is an important aspect of energy conservation for all dwellings. The fact that there are practical difficulties for multi-family dwellings is not a compelling argument for providing an exception.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC16-09/10

PART I-IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee prefers the approach taken in EC13. These proposed provisions would conflict with EC13.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Modify proposal as follows:

f. First value is cavity insulation, second is continuous insulation, so "xx+yy" means R-xx cavity insulation plus R-yy continuous insulation ~~insulated sheathing~~. "13+5" means R-13 cavity insulation plus R-5 insulated sheathing. If structural sheathing covers 25 percent or less of the exterior, insulating sheathing is not required where structural sheathing is used. If structural sheathing covers more than 25 percent of exterior, structural sheathing shall be supplemented with continuous insulation ~~insulated sheathing~~ of at least R-2.

(Portions of code change proposal not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The code change proposal provides aggressive energy savings with 4 options that provide different trade-offs to allow a homeowner some flexibility in the design of the energy conservation methods that will allow flexibility in the design of the remainder of the home.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC17-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

INSULATED SIDING. A cladding system with integral insulating material, having a minimum thermal resistance of R-2 attached directly over a water resistive barrier and sheathing

Committee Reason: This is a type of material that requires separate attention in the code. See Code Change Proposal EC54-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: Insulated siding is a unique product that requires separate attention in code text.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC18-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Continuously burning pilots on gas burning appliances waste energy. Technology is readily available for lighting fuel gas lighting systems. This is an obvious energy conservation measure.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: Continuously burning pilots on gas burning appliances waste energy. Technology is readily available for lighting fuel gas lighting systems. This is an obvious energy conservation measure.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC19-09/10

PART I-IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would have the effect of eliminating the use of an entire group of appliances in cold climate zones. This proposal reaches an unreasonable level of stringency. The committee prefers the approach taken in EC13.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal provides aggressive energy conservation measures that would limit the flexibility in the design of the building in all areas. The committee prefers the flexibility provided by EC16.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC20-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This fixes an incorrect trade-off for lighting. The lighting provisions of Section 404 have always been intended to be mandatory.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC21-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal does not contain specific information as to how the homes that need to be tested are selected. The proposed provisions could lead to unfair practices, or place the code official in a difficult situation in defending the choices made of the house that requires testing.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is vague regarding the meaning of "random sampling." This could lead to unfair application of the requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC22-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

401.3 Certificate. A permanent certificate shall be completed and posted on or in the electrical distribution panel by the builder or registered design professional. The certificate shall not cover or obstruct the visibility of the circuit directory label, service disconnect label or other required labels. The certificate shall list the predominant *R*-values of insulation installed in or on ceiling/roof, walls, foundation (slab, *basement wall*, crawlspace wall and/or floor) and ducts outside conditioned spaces; *U*-factors for fenestration and the solar heat gain coefficient (SHGC) of fenestration, and the results from any <u>required</u> duct system and building envelope air leakage testing . Where there is more than one value for each component, the certificate shall list the value covering the largest area. The certificate shall list the types and efficiencies of heating, cooling and service water heating equipment. Where a gas-fired unvented room heater, electric furnace, or baseboard electric heater is installed in the residence, the certificate shall list "gas-fired unvented room heater," "electric furnace" or "baseboard electric heater," as appropriate. An efficiency shall not be *listed* for gas-fired unvented room heaters, electric furnaces or electric baseboard heaters.

Committee Reason: The certificate is a useful place to record air leakage testing information. The modification is important in that the only information that needs to be memorialized is the required testing.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Modify proposal as follows:

1101.9 Certificate. A permanent certificate shall be completed and posted on or in the electrical distribution panel by the builder or registered design professional. The certificate shall not cover or obstruct the visibility of the circuit directory label, service disconnect label or other required labels. The certificate shall list the predominant *R*-values of insulation installed in or on ceiling/roof, walls, foundation (slab, *basement wall*, crawlspace wall and/or floor) and ducts outside conditioned spaces; *U*-factors for fenestration and the solar heat gain coefficient (SHGC) of fenestration, and the results from any <u>required</u> duct system and building envelope air leakage testing . Where there is more than one value for each component, the certificate shall list the value

covering the largest area. The certificate shall list the types and efficiencies of heating, cooling and service water heating equipment. Where a gas-fired unvented room heater, electric furnace, or baseboard electric heater is installed in the residence, the certificate shall list "gas-fired unvented room heater," "electric furnace" or "baseboard electric heater," as appropriate. An efficiency shall not be *listed* for gas-fired unvented room heaters, electric furnaces or electric baseboard heaters.

Committee Reason: The certificate is a useful place to record air leakage testing information. The modification is important in that the only information that needs to be memorialized is the required testing.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC23-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal requires too much information to be placed on the certificate. It is impractical to require details of all lamps installed. These could change quickly and often. Therefore, the information on the certificate would be cluttered with incorrect information.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal requires too much information to be placed on the certificate. It is impractical to require details of all lamps installed. These could change quickly and often. Therefore, the information on the certificate would be cluttered with incorrect information.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC24-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent that the certificate has little benefit and no impact on energy conservation.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC25-09/10

PART I-IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal takes an aggressive approach to increasing the stringency of the code well beyond the levels given in EC13. At the present time, EC13 provides a reasonable approach. This code change would be too restrictive and limit the options to house design. A particular concern was that the glazing values become so restrictive that an excessive amount of light is blocked.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: This proposal provides aggressive energy conservation measures that would limit the flexibility in the design of the building in all areas. The committee prefers the flexibility provided by EC16.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC26-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the additional definitions could confuse the users of the code rather than clarify the code. The terminology presently in the code is generally what code users are accustomed with.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The addition of definitions to clarify the code are not needed to fix any known problems with application of the code requirements. In addition, the definition contains technical requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC27-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

h. First value is cavity insulation, second is continuous insulation, so "13+5" means R-13 cavity insulation plus R-5 continuous insulation or insulating sheathing. If structural sheathing covers 25 percent or less of the exterior, continuous insulation or insulating sheathing is not required in the locations where structural sheathing is used. If structural sheathing covers more than 25 percent of exterior, structural sheathing shall be supplemented with continous insulation or insulating sheathing of at least R-2.

Committee Reason: This is a companion change with EC13 that adds to the energy conservation stringency of the IECC. The modification is simply to use correct terminology in the footnote.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason:. The proposed change would be inconsistent with EC16, which the committee prefers.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC28-09/10

PART I - IECC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal implies that some additional fastening or construction needs to be used in the circumstances noted. The code is clear in the requirements for structural sheathing.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC29-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would erode the energy conservation levels of the 2009 code.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: The proposal would provide for a more reasonable SHGC requirement for skylights and sunrooms to allow better supply of natural light.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC30-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed revised footnote appropriately addresses the original intent of the code to require that the actual R-Value such as the R-Value of compressed insulation, is the R-Value required to meet the code. Presently, the code only addresses R-19 insulation. This could also occur with other types of insulation.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The revised footnote confuses the issue more, as it does not specifically describe what it means by "actual" r-values.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC31-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: As stated, glazing is an inferior performer to opaque walls as a thermal building envelope element. Therefore, it makes sense to limit the amount of glazing.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No technical justification was provided to support the choice of 20% for the limit on glazing. Therefore, the proposal is providing an arbitrary number.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC32-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The trade-off of a high SHGC rating for glazing with a low U-Factor could have the unintended consequence of causing peak demand problems in summer. This creates an undesirable situation of inefficient energy production. In addition, the committee felt that the limitations on available product and the cost was too high a price for this aggressive change in stringency.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no data supplied on return on investment to justify this code change proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC33-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed decrease in Fenestration U-Factor in Climate Zone 1 is not cost effective.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC34-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal represents an increase in stringency and therefore energy savings that is reasonably easy and cost effective to achieve.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal is not supported by cost data to demonstrate reasonable return on investment for such an aggressive change in stringency.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC35-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: More product is available that can meet impact requirements and still have the low E values desired. The market will only advance to provide more products.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee believes that availability of low E products with minimum required impact resistance is limited, and therefore this is still a necessary exception.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC36-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal erodes the energy conservation level of the code. This would represent a rollback from the 2009 levels.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: This is a reasonable exception to allow skylights to function to supply natural light.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC37-09/10

Errata: Revise table to reflect the proponent's intention to change Skylight SHGC values only.

TABLE 402.1.1
INSULATION AND FENESTRATION REQUIREMENTS BY COMPONENT[a]

CLIMATE ZONE	FENESTRATION				CEILING R-VALUE	WOOD FRAME WALL R-VALUE	MASS WALL R-VALUE[i]	FLOOR R-VALUE	BASEMENT[c] WALL R-VALUE	SLAB[d] R-VALUE & DEPTH	CRAWL SPACE[c] WALL R-VALUE
	WINDOW AND DOOR U-FACTOR	WINDOW AND DOOR SHGC[e]	SKYLIGHT[b] U-FACTOR	SKYLIGHT[b] SHGC[e]							
1	1.2	0.30	0.75	~~0.30~~ 0.35	30	13	3/4	13	0	0	0
2	0.65[j]	0.30	0.75	~~0.30~~ 0.35	30	13	4/6	13	0	0	0
3	0.50[j]	0.30	0.65	~~0.30~~ 0.35	30	13	5/8	19	5/13f	0	5/13
4 except Marine	0.35	NR	0.60	NR	38	13	5/10	19	10/13	10, 2 ft	10/13
5 and Marine 4	0.35	NR	0.60	NR	38	20 or 13+5[h]	13/17	30[g]	10/13	10, 2 ft	10/13
6	0.35	NR	0.60	NR	49	20 or 13+5[h]	15/19	30[g]	15/19	10, 4 ft	10/13
7 and 8	0.35	NR	0.60	NR	49	21	19/21	38[g]	15/19	10, 4 ft	10/13

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal erodes the energy conservation level of the code. This would represent a rollback from the 2009 levels.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC38-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This could have the impact of lowering energy conservation in some circumstances. The committee was also concerned over the claims that Energy Star stated that this is not cost effective without a tax credit.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was persuaded by the fact that Energy Star admits that this is not cost effective without tax credits. Therefore this has limited utility for energy conservation.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC39-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is compatible with EC13 and provides a reasonably achievable level of energy conservation.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would be inconsistent with EC16.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC40-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would provide requirements inconsistent with EC13.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This decision is consistent with committee's action to ease sky light SHGC values in EC36.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC41-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would cause an undesirable decrease in visual transmittance for skylights, thus would in all probability cause an increase in use of lighting.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would cause an undesirable decrease in visual transmittance for skylights, thus would in all probability cause an increase in use of lighting.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that this limitation is justified for Climate Zone 4 because of the possibility that this could increase the heating load in some parts of the zone. Therefore, it is not apparent whether this would really save energy.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that this limitation is justified for Climate Zone 4 because of the possibility that this could increase the heating load in some parts of the zone. Therefore, it is not apparent whether this would really save energy.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC43-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The use of SHGC rating as a standard for glazing in the north is not appropriate, given that in summer, this could cause an increase in peak demand during cooling days. Also, the proposal makes no reference to orientation of the walls with glazing; therefore, the high SHGC glazing could cause a problem for rooms with south facing windows.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would have the effect of prohibiting the best low E windows available for very cold areas where they are needed.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC44-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code change proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC45-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is not a cost effective change to insulation values. Opponents provided specific data that the return on investment would be 40 to 50 years.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal does not provide a cost effective change to insulation values. In addition, this would be inconsistent with EC16.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC46-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee believes that there might be unintended consequences related to this proposal that were not considered. First, extra protection will need to be provided for the insulation to allow storage in the attics. Second, this could result in a greater amount of snow accumulation on roofs.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The values would be inconsistent with the approach taken in EC16.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC47-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

h. First value is cavity insulation, second is continuous insulation, so "13+5" means R-13 cavity insulation plus R-5 continuous insulation or insulating sheathing. If structural sheathing covers 25 percent or less of the exterior, continuous insulation or insulating sheathing is not required in the locations where structural sheathing is used. If structural sheathing covers more than 25 percent of exterior, structural sheathing shall be supplemented with continous insulation or insulating sheathing of at least R-2.

Committee Reason: This represents a reasonable level of energy conservation. The modification is to provide correct terminology in the footnote.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is not a cost effective requirement for other than electrically heated homes. Also, the provisions would be inconsistent with EC16.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC48-09/10

Errata: The intended U-Factor for Frame Wall U-Factor is .048 in Zones 7 and 8.

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

h. First value is cavity insulation, second is continuous insulation, so "13+5" means R-13 cavity insulation plus R-5 continuous insulation or insulating sheathing. If structural sheathing covers 25 percent or less of the exterior, continuous insulation or insulating sheathing is not required in the locations where structural sheathing is used. If structural sheathing covers more than 25 percent of exterior, structural sheathing shall be supplemented with continous insulation or insulating sheathing of at least R-2.

Committee Reason: This will provide for energy conservation levels consistent with EC13. The modification is intended to provide corrections to terminology in the footnote.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would be inconsistent with the approach taken in EC16.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC49-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC50-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is an achievable increase in stringency that will provide significant energy savings in northern climates.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would not be cost effective for all types of fuel sources.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC51-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC52-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The values would be inconsistent with the values in EC13.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC53-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**
Committee Reason: This proposal would have the effect of increasing energy use.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IBC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: See Part I.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was no technical justification provided to allow increase in the amount of glazing.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC54-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This provides builders with additional options to achieve the insulation values required by the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Modify proposal as follows:

h. First value is cavity insulation, second is continuous insulation, so "13+5" means R-13 cavity insulation plus R-5 insulating sheathing, ~~or~~ insulated siding, or other continuous insulation. If structural sheathing covers less 25 percent or less of the exterior, ~~insulated sheathing~~ continuous insulation is not required where structural sheathing is used. If structural sheathing covers more than 25 percent of exterior, structural sheathing shall be supplemented with insulating sheathing, ~~or~~ insulated siding, or other continuous insulation of at least R-2.

Committee Reason: This provides builders with additional options to achieve the insulation values required by the code. The modification simply clarifies the footnote by succinctly stating the meaning of "13 + 5."

Assembly Action: **None**

EC55-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This has the effect of reducing the stringency of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: This is an appropriate correlation for mass wall values with R-Values in Table N1102.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC56-09/10

PART I-IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides alternative load paths that, in some cases, represent a possible regression in stringency. In addition, the committee was unsure whether this could be compatible with EC13.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II-IRC B/E
Committee Action: **Disapproved**
Committee Reason: The proposal will conflict with the provisions of the code proposed in EC16. The committee prefers EC16.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC57-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This information does not need to be included in the code. It could be provided in commentary, some type of design guide, or in an informational appendix.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This information does not need to be included in the code. The proper application is not clear. It could be provided in commentary, some type of design guide, or in an informational appendix.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC58-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would provide an unenforceable requirement.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC59-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Winter design conditions are not defined, so, as written this proposal would require different testing in every jurisdiction. In addition, this deals exclusively with one type of insulation and assumes that similar problems do not exist with other types of insulation.

Assembly Action: **None**
PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The intent of the proponent was to deal with the issue of changes in performance of insulation on very cold days. The opponents provided information that this is only a problem on very cold winter days that occur over a short time in northern climate zones.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC60-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: These proposed changes in R-Values and U-Factors are not cost effective.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC61-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC62-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would increase a loophole in the code. For very small houses, 500 sq. ft. is a significant percentage of the ceiling area.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC63-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Baffles serve to keep vents open, insulation in place, and keep wind from blowing through the insulation and reducing the effectiveness.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Modify the proposal as follows:

N1102.2.3 ~~Wind wash~~ Eave baffle. For air permeable insulations in vented attics, a baffle shall be installed adjacent to soffit and eave vents. Baffles shall maintain an opening equal or greater than the size of the vent. The baffle shall extend over the top of the attic insulation ~~inward until it is at least 4 inches vertically above the insulation at full height.~~ The baffle shall be permitted to be any solid material ~~such as cardboard or thin rigid insulating sheathing~~.

Committee Reason: Baffles serve to keep vents open, insulation in place, and keep wind from blowing through the insulation and reducing the effectiveness. The modification removes unnecessary and technically unsupported restrictions on dimensional characteristics.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC64-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that the approach would not correctly address condensation problems as intended.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that the approach would not correctly address condensation problems as intended.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC65-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed code change would allow ICC400 to be used for energy conservation in log homes. Since ICC400 references the 2003 IECC, this would allow lowering of stringency for log homes. Based upon the statements made by proponent representatives, the UA alternative in the 2009 code is available as a way to allow compliance of log buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC66-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that the proposal would actually resolve conflicts with ASHRAE 90.1 as it appears that there would still be conflicts.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that the proposal would actually resolve conflicts with ASHRAE 90.1 as it appears that there would still be conflicts.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC67-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Definitions in the I-Codes should be consistent in the I-Codes. In this context, consistency with ASHRAE 90.1 is not a concern.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC68-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

402.2.11 ~~Thermally isolated~~ Sunroom insulation. All *sunrooms* shall meet the insulation requirements of this code.
Exception: For *sunrooms* with *thermal isolation*, the following exceptions to the insulation *requirements* of this code shall apply: (1) The minimum ceiling insulation R-values shall be R-19~~24~~ in Zones 1 through 4 and R-24~~30~~ in Zones 5 through 8.; and (2) The minimum wall R-value shall be R-13 in all zones. New wall(s) separating a *sunroom* with *thermal isolation* from *conditioned space* shall meet the *building thermal envelope* requirements of this code.

402.3.5 ~~Thermally isolated~~ Sunroom U-factor. All *sunrooms* shall meet the fenestration requirements of this code.

Exception: For *sunrooms* with *thermal isolation* in Zones 4 through 8, the following exceptions to the fenestration requirements of this code shall apply: (1) the maximum fenestration U-factor shall be 0.50 0.45; and (2) the maximum skylight U-factor shall be 0.705. New fenestration separating the *sunroom* with *thermal isolation* from *conditioned space* shall meet the *building thermal envelope* requirements of this code.

Committee Reason: The code change revises the language to accurately reflect the code requirements and therefore eliminate confusion. The modification revises the R values in the exception back to the present code values.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal raises the R values for thermally isolated sunrooms without any cost justification, or technical justification. For thermally isolated sunrooms the committee questions whether raising R-values would have a significant impact on energy usage.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC69-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language is confusing in that the location of the required insulation is not clear. In addition, this does not consider the impact or correlation with IBC requirements for fireblocking at fire walls.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent failed to consider the possible impact this could have on other code requirements for fire resistance rated assemblies.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC70-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal would provide consistency in terminology with ASHRAE 90.1. In this context, for the application of the energy code, consistency with ASHRAE is useful.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC71-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The logical construct of the language to allow determination of solar absorptance is confusing. The proposed language is not consistent and not enforceable.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The definition of "white" in the default table is unknown. The default tables should contain more options.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC72-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would create confusion in enforcement. Each building would be a distinctly separate entity require a customized approach. The low SHGC values tend to co me along with low U factors. Therefore, o ne would also be using w indows with higher U f actors. This is an undesirable unintended consequence. Finally, the reliability of this app roach depends upon variables relat ed to climate an d day-to-day conditions that could cause considerably different energy conservation results than anticipated and desired.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no information provided that correlates the SHGC equivalent values to the orientation of the building.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC73-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Rea son: Using a minimum SHGC rating for south faci ng w alls in n orthern climate zones could possibly create a problem with peak cooling load demands in summer. This would increase ener gy consumption during those peri ods. There is not any data to substantiate w hether this w ould be a net loss or gain in energy consumption.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would have the unintended consequence of preventing the use of triple glazed windows in parts of homes in northern climates, therefore discouraging the best low-E window. The code allows adjustment to U-factors in those cases where a homeowner desires to take advantage of a southern exposure. It is undesirable to regulate this further.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC74-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The use o f projection facto rs are not as reli able as SHGC values gi ven variables in the local climate. In addition, the te chnical support for proj ection factors ignore the impac t of reflectance of light from the ground.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: This is similar to the approach taken in Chapter 5. The committee felt that there is no reason why this should not be able to be applied for residential construction.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC75-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would provide exemption for more doors than intended by the code at present.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC76-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would decrease the energy conservation levels of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned over the intention of the proponent regarding "assemblies". Does that include sidelights? Also, the proposal eliminates the area restriction on this exemption, which makes the code open ended, and could lead to significant reductions in the integrity of the thermal envelope.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC77-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would add a undesirable dimension to the code that would set a dangerous precedent for future code development. The scope of the code is energy conservation for buildings, not sustainability. At this time, the committee would be remiss in introducing opportunities to reduce energy conservation in favor of green trade-offs given that the true equivalency and true impact on energy conservation has not been established.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC78-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal will create problems with flexibility in development design, and possibly have an impact on property values.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would put limitations on townhouses that could be a disadvantage to the desirability of middle units facing west. This would also reduce flexibility in development design and house design.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC79-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal is consistent with EC13. The energy performance of a building is enhanced by tightening air leakage rates.
Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal is inconsistent with portions of EC16. The language of the proposal uses the phrase "durably sealed"; however, that phrase is not easily defined. This would create an additional expense that is not necessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC80-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed provision would be difficult to apply in situations where sampling is used. The committee believes that this would also be inconsistent with EC13.
Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC **PART II Removed. See Errata posted at www.iccsafe.org.**

EC81-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The approach taken and language used in EC13 is preferred. For instance EC13 uses the ACH metric rather than SLA. EC13 takes a different approach for sampling that is preferred. This proposal would allow air permeable insulation outside of the air barrier, which is undesirable.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code change proposal regarding sampling would require some discretion on the part of the building official that could lead to accusations of impartial application of the code. Terminology changes (SLA instead of ACH) could cause confusion.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC82-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval, given that the issue is covered in EC79.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal reorganizes the code but the committee did not see any advantage to doing so. In addition, the terminology SLA instead of ACH will confuse users of the IECC who are accustomed to working with the concept of ACH.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC83-09/10

PART I - IECC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC84-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would eliminate the use of certain types of heating products. If this is an issue that needs to be dealt with, the issue should be dealt with in the mechanical code by people that have the expertise to provide input regarding safety issues.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed change would require fireplaces to be placed in separate rooms, rather than the room in which it is to be used. This should be dealt with in the mechanical chapters of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC85-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The need for an air barrier in common walls between dwelling units is questionable. This is a reasonable change to omit unnecessary expense to buildings.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC86-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: See the proponent's reason statement. The present code text contains a provision that limits how to use an air barrier that was really never intended.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: See the proponent's reason statement. The present code text contains a provision that limits how to use an air barrier that was really never intended.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC87-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard ASHRAE 62.2-2007 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal relates to minimum ventilation requirements that should be a mechanical code issue. Further, the provisions are not clear on what would be done when sampling is used for air tightness.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal relates to minimum ventilation requirements that should be a mechanical code issue. Further, the provisions are not clear on what would be done when sampling is used for air tightness.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC88-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

a. In addition, inspection of log walls ~~structures~~ shall be in accordance with the provisions of ICC-400.

Committee Reason: Log walls have unique construction that require attention to assure that the construction is tight and the building thermal envelope is properly constructed. Therefore, it is appropriate to remind the code use that a separate standard exists for these buildings. The modification simply changes the footnote to state that the inspection provisions of the IECC must also apply.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC89-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed provision would be difficult to apply in situations where sampling is used. The committee believes that this would also be inconsistent with EC13.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal could create potential conflicts with safety issues that the mechanical provisions of the code deal with.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC90-09/10

PART I - IECC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The existing standards referenced adequately provide necessary information for application of the code requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC91-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code presently uses the correct terminology (air leakage), consistent with the test standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: The fact that a product is listed has no bearing on the technical requirements of the code. In addition this will clean up inconsistent terminology.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC92-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed change reorganizes the section appropriately and logically to make the code easier to understand.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: The proposed change reorganizes the section appropriately and logically to make the code easier to understand.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC93-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The present requirements are not applicable to interior luminaires as the proponent claims. The provisions apply only to luminaires installed in the building thermal envelope.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC94-09/10 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

Note: EC94 and 97 are duplicate code change proposals that were inadvertently installed in this monograph. Proponent of EC94 will be listed as a co-proponent on EC97. The reason statement supplied by the proponent will be installed with the reason statement from proponent for EC97.

EC95-09/10 (Number not used)

EC96-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal makes the area weighted average approach unnecessarily restricted. This limits the flexibility of the code. The technical support provided is insufficient to allow a positive action.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The provisions are unnecessarily restrictive.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC97-09/10

Errata: Add Craig Conner as a co-proponent for EC97. Mr. Conner's reason statement for EC94 applies. See note on EC94.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The provisions given in this section are artificial constraints on design flexibility. Trade-offs are limited. The proponents claim that the building occupants will always turn up the thermostat are overstated.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC98-09/10

Part I IECC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on its approval of EC147-09/10, and at the request of the proponent, the committee disapproved this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It is undesirable code format to include technical requirements in the definition.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC99-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

WHOLE HOUSE MECHANICAL VENTILATION SYSTEM. An exhaust system, supply system, or combination thereof that is designed to mechanically exchange indoor air with outdoor air ~~for the purpose of diluting and removing indoor air contaminants. The system shall be designed to provide ventilation air~~ when operating continuously or through a programmed intermittent schedule to satisfy the whole house ventilation rates. ~~required for the whole house. Local exhaust or supply fans are permitted to serve as such a system.~~

(Portions of code change not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent's reason statement, this proposal will bring significant energy savings.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This provides for controls on fans when installed as whole house ventilators. The committee felt that this was limiting. Control of fans that are not installed for whole house ventilation could be controlled as well. In addition, the definition contains technical requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC100-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no evidence provided that heating and cooling zones save energy. This provision would be too far reaching in regulating building heating and cooling system design.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no evidence provided that heating and cooling zones save energy. This provisions would be too far reaching in regulating building heating and cooling system design.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC101-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The thermostat settings do not represent any significant energy savings. We have different lifestyles, with widely varying times that we need the thermostat settings at different levels. This does not address that, and seems to assume that we all sleep, eat, play, and work at the same times.

Assembly Action: **Approved as Submitted**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It is unreasonable to assume that certain temperature set back setting will help save energy given the fact that people have varying life styles and therefore different needs for setting the thermostat. In addition, the definition of heat pump recovery is vague and therefore does not provide useful information as to what the code really requires.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC102-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agrees with the proponent that factoring in the ground for the basement wall U-Factor provides confusion to those using this table for prescriptive applications.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disagreed that this code change would be less confusing. Quite to the contrary, the committee believes that the application of the table is more often needed for the UA alternative and therefore the interpretation of the code is more confusing with the proposed change.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC103-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no standard for the particular test proposed. In addition, this could conflict with the mechanical code by not allowing building cavities to be used as ducts. Finally, it is impractical to conduct a test such as this after completion of the building.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It is impractical to wait until the completion of the building to perform the leakage test. In addition, there is no test standard. Finally, no technical justification was provided for increasing insulation to R-4.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC104-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed referenced standard is not available.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed referenced standard is not available.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC105-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed referenced standard does not comply with ICC criteria.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC106-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Proponent requested disapproval given that the referenced standard proposed is not available.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed referenced standard is not available.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC107-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed revisions are compatible with (and included in) EC13.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The tighter leakage rate for testing a rough-in is not supported by any statistics regarding expected differences in performance and is therefore arbitrary.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC108-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee had some concerns with technical issues in ACCA Manual J.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC109-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This represents good practice to deal with air leakage. The return air should be regulated the same way as supply air.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This type of requirement dealing with plenums is better placed in the mechanical section of the IRC. In addition, the committee was concerned that this text could be interpreted to mean that crawl spaces cannot be used for supply air.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC110-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

403.3.1 Protection of piping insulation. Piping insulation exposed to weather shall be protected from damage, including that due to sunlight, moisture, equipment maintenance, ~~and~~ wind, ~~by means including, aluminum, sheet metal, painted canvas, or plastic cover or other protection suitable for outdoor service. Cellular foam insulation shall be protected as above or painted with a coating that is water retardant~~ and shall provide shielding from solar radiation that can cause degradation of the material. Adhesives tape shall not be permitted.

Committee Reason: Protection of outside piping insulation is necessary to assure durable materials to meet the energy code requirements. The modification simply removes the laundry list of possible protections, as the committee felt this was unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC111-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Prefe r other code change proposals that better address this, and use more appropriat e nomenclature.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC112-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal is consistent with EC13.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed text should be in the plumbing section of the IRC.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC113-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Rea son: Propone nt requested disapproval. In addi tion the committee believes tha t action on EC112 and EC110 deal with most of the issues in this code change proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC114-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The issues in this proposal have already been dealt with in EC112 and EC13.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is an issue that should be dealt with in the plumbing section of the IRC.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC115-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Insulation of circulating service hot water piping is covered in EC13. The committee was not sure that, given EC13, this proposed increase is necessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: See the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC116-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Insulation of circulating service hot water piping is covered in EC13. The committee was not sure that, given EC13, this proposed increase is necessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: See action taken on EC115. The committee agrees with the increase in R value but maintains that the section should be applicable to circulating hot water systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC117-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This change is already covered by previous actions. See EC112.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The change is already covered in previous actions. See EC115.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC118-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code contains requirements for insulation on hot water piping and circulating hot water piping. The need for a 1" thick insulation is not supported by technical data. This could provide some level exclusivity for certain types of insulation, without justification as to why others cannot be used.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IPC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: See part I.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III - IRC Building & Energy
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The installation in some cases will look like an electrical installation. This could become a safety issue for repairs.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART IV - IRC Plumbing
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: See part III.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC119-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard AHRI 470-06 ndicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Proponent requested disapproval to allow him to clean up t he language and work with industry on the requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Propo nent requested disapproval to allo w him to clean up t he language and work with industry on the requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC120-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the approach taken in EC99.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The langu age is such that the requirements for testing and listing are not really stated. In addition, requirement for listing is unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC121-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: ACCA Manual J is not the correct standard for the purpose intended in the code change proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent seeks to reference ACCA Manual J; however, Manual S is the appropriate standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC122-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Re ason: This would put an unre asonable burden on the design o f plumbing for multi-family housing, with minimal returns on energy savings.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC-P
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The 8 foot distance would be impossible to comply with in the majority of homes.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC123-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

403.7 Space heating equipment (Mandatory). Electric resistance heating shall not be used for space heating. This includes but is not limited to: electric space heaters, electric furnaces, electric baseboard heaters, electric wall heaters, and electric thermal storage.

Exceptions:

2. Where electric resistance heating is used for <u>ground source or</u> air-to-air heat pump supplementary heat.

(*Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged.)*

Committee Rea son: This prop osal w ould limit the use of the inefficient resistant heating pro ducts and therefore save energy. The modification is t o res pond to c oncerns from th e HVAC industr y r egarding supplementary heating for heat pumps.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would limit a product that is used often in home additions.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC124-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The present code intends that hot tubs be regulated by this code section. Therefore, this is essentially an editorial fix to the code that will prevent abuse of the code requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: This proposal makes the code clearer in specifying its original intent that hot tubs are part of the products that need to be regulated.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC125-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: At this time, there are sufficient products available to allow the code to require pilotless lighters for fireplace systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that, in some cases, pilots are safety devices, and therefore the proposal would severely hurt some product manufacturers. In addition, this represents minimal savings.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC126-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would provide a conflict with EC13. The energy recovery ventilator would not be cost effective in cold climates.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The structure of the code would be confusing, given that there are exceptions to other exceptions. The reference to specific leakage area is confusing, as it is not an accepted term in the IECC vernacular.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC127-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent has misinterpreted the intent of the code, which is to require 50 percent of lighting fixtures to use high efficiency lamps, not to limit the type of luminaire. By doing this, the proposal limits the opportunity to provide energy savings with all types of fixtures and therefore drives up the cost of providing high-efficiency lighting.
Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee believes that energy savings could actually be reduced by only specifying that luminaires be required to be high efficiency type.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC128-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Changing the requirement from Prescriptive to Mandatory reflects the original intent of the code when this provision was installed.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC129-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed change in percentage of high efficiency lamps is consistent with the provisions of EC13.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: This is a reasonable step toward energy savings.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC130-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on prior actions on EC128 and EC129.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based upon prior action on EC129.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC131-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard AHRI 470-06 ndicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Bans unvented gas heating appliances in northern climates. In addition the proposal would be in violation of Federal law by specifying higher efficiency appliances in building codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Proponent requested disapproval based on Federal laws that have not yet changed as given in the proponents reason statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC132-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: See EC140.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC133-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The code change will provide better data regarding relative cost of different fuel sources, which will lead to more accurate application of energy conservation requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC134-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The use of carbon emissions as a basis for comparison of energy conservation in the performance path needs detailed study before it can be incorporated into this code. While this seems to be a logical approach, there needs to be a determination that using this option will truly be coordinated with

Assembly Action: **None**

EC135-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Site energy was removed from the code as an option in the 2007/2008 Code Change Cycle because it does not provide a meaningful comparison when more than one fuel source is used in a building. The committee does not want to re-introduce site energy into the code for the same reasons it was removed.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC136-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

EC137-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proponent provided compelling data that showed that the impact of shade on the SHGC of the fenestration is dependent on the type of glazing used. Therefore, this code change makes sense in relating the two.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC138-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

Footnote i:

i. For a proposed design without a proposed heating system, a heating system with the prevailing federal minimum efficiency shall be assumed for both the standard reference design and the proposed design. ~~For electric resistance heating systems, the prevailing federal minimum efficiency air source heat pump shall be used for the standard reference design.~~

(Portions of code change proposal not shown do not change.)

Committee Reason: The committee agrees that this was an inadvertent deletion in the last code change process, and restoring the reference to electric heating resistance systems will improve the use of the performance path. The modification is simply to remove the same reference from footnote I, as it is not needed in footnotes.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC139-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is a simple clarification of the performance table, to place duct insulation reference in the proposed design.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC140-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposed change could possibly reduce the energy conservation levels using the performance path. High efficiency appliances are the norm. Therefore, to take a credit for these in the performance path as an improvement would lower the bar of the standard design.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC141-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: For the same reasons that the committee disapproved EC140.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC142-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason:. This is an unnecessary complication to the determination of the requirements that will yield very little difference in stringency.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC143-09/10 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

EC144-09/10 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

EC145-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee dealt with this issue in their action on EC137.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC146-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Although also a comprehensive approach to increasing the energy conservation in commercial and highrise residential construction as regulated by Chapter 5, EC 147-09/10 was preferred by the committee. The committee was also concerned that portions of the proposal may violate the copyright of other publications.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC147-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal is a broad revision to Chapter 5 addressing all systems of a building including the building envelop, HVAC systems and lighting and power systems. The change will provide a significant increase in energy savings estimated to be approaching 30 percent over energy usage resulting in buildings built under the 2009 IECC. Although the committee acknowledged many provisions of the proposal could be improved, it was hoped that those deficiencies will be improved through the public comment process.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC148-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent's concern with the standard should be resolved through the working with ASHRAE to revise the standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC149-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The referenced standards provide an avenue for alternative to compliance with Chapter 5 and the balance of the IECC. The committee felt that the options should be retained for use by designers as well as the code official.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC150-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: For consistency with the action taken to disapprove EC 149-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC151-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Change is unnecessary as the space by space method is already allowed as part of the existing reference to the complete standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC152-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal because it would have eliminated the option of designing a building to comply with ASHRAE 90.1. The committee believes both options should be retained.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC153-09/1

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the ASME standard should address the allowing escalators and moving walkways to discontinue operation when people are not present. This requirement may be out of places in the IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC154-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change will improve the code's provisions, encouraging more consistent understanding and interpretation.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC155-09/10 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

EC156-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal contained errors and it was inconsistent with EC157-09/10 which was preferred by the committee. Any technical merit contained in this change could be incorporated into EC 157 by public comment.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC157-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change will significantly improve the energy efficiency of the building envelop requirements for commercial buildings. The standards provided are easy to comply with and can be built. The changes are consistent with ASHRAE standards.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC158-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because it was based on a preliminary ASHRAE draft which has already been revised.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC159-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change allows for better installation practices for multi-layer insulation.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC160-09/10 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

EC161-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change at the proponent's request. The action of approving EC157-09/10 was preferred.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC162-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval in order to work on improving the proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC163-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee concluded that this change was not material neutral. It includes some increases in U-factors, thus lessening the energy savings found in the current edition of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC164-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would result in the exclusion of too many materials that would be needed in order for the windows to meet structural standards. The proposal needs to be balanced with requirements of other codes for window installation.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC165-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change provides a good increase in energy savings from improved fenestration standards. More savings can be easily achieved. The committee felt this change would encourage the use of daylighting controls.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC166-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change because they felt that it put too many restrictions on design flexibility, that the U-values were too onerous; and that the projection requirement particularly difficult to understand and implement.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC167-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the change represented by EC165 at this time.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC168-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was unconvinced that the weighted average included in the table would achieve the same level of energy savings across the various materials contained in the table.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC169-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the reduction is SGC factors were not acceptable. ASHRAE studies and information do not support the values in the proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC170-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred change approved by the committee in EC174-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC171-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

Note: EC171 and 172 are duplicate code change proposals that were inadvertently installed in this monograph. Proponent of EC171 will be listed as a co-proponent on EC172. The reason statement supplied by the proponent will be installed with the reason statement from proponent for EC172.

EC172-09/10

Errata: Add Craig Conner as a co-proponent for EC172. Mr. Conner's reason statement for EC171 applies. See note on EC171.

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The provisions of Section 303.1.3 on the labeling of fenestration products do not allow the procedure included in this proposal. The proposal may be headed in a good direction to increase the number of fenestration rating agencies and this would appear to be setting up an alternative process, however the proposal still needs improvements. Of concern is determining the appropriate person or professional who would be able to sign the proposed certificates.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC173-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

502.3.2 Minimum *Skylight* Fenestration Area. In *enclosed spaces* greater than 10,000 square feet, (900 m^2), directly under a roof with ceiling heights greater than 15 feet (4.6 m), and used as an office, lobby, atrium, concourse, corridor, storage, gymnasium/exercise center, convention center, automotive service, manufacturing, non-refrigerated warehouse, retail store, distribution/sorting area, transportation, or workshop, the total *daylight zone under skylights* shall be a minimum of half the floor area and provide a minimum *skylight* area to *daylight zone under skylights* of 3 percent with a skylight VLT of at least 0.40 or provide a minimum skylight effective aperture (net translucent skylight area) of at least 1 percent.

Skylights shall have a glazing material or diffuser with a measured haze value greater than 90% when tested according to ASTM D1003. General lighting in the daylight area shall be controlled as described in Section 505.2.2.3.

Exceptions:

1. In climate zones 6 through 8.
2. Where the designed *general lighting* power densities less than 0.5 W/ft2 (5.4 W/m2)
3. Areas where it is documented that existing structures or natural objects block direct beam sunlight on at least half of the roof over the enclosed area for more than 1,500 daytime hours per year between 8 am and 4 pm.
4. ~~Where the daylight area under rooftop monitors is greater than 50% of the~~ enclosed ~~space floor area.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged).

Committee Reason: The change coordinates with progress in the ASHRAE standard as contained in Addenda AL. It provides a great opportunity to save energy by using skylights in these types of facilities.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC174-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved the change because they felt it was a reasonable approach to incorporating projection factors into the envelop design.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC175-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change because it move a prescriptive standard over to being predominately a performance standard. A prescriptive standard is important to maintain.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC176-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee felt the proposal clarified determination of energy equivalency and corrected an oversight in previous changes to the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC177-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal conflicts with the building code and it is likely to impinge on property line setback requirements. As written it will discriminate against certain existing properties which will be unable to meet the prescriptive requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC178-09/10 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

EC179-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Add new definitions as follows:

GENERAL LIGHTING: Lighting that provides a uniform level of illumination throughout an area. General lighting shall not include emergency lighting; decorative lighting or lighting that provides a dissimilar level of illumination to serve a specialized application or feature within such area.
MULTI-LEVEL LIGHTING CONTROLS. Systems that automatically reduce the lighting power draw in a series of at least two levels or by continuous dimming in response to availability of daylight within the interior space (sometimes referred to as "photo control").

~~**HAZE VALUE.** The ratio of diffusely transmitted light to total light transmitted.~~

~~**502.3.3 Minimum daylighting.** In spaces enclosed by walls or floor-to-ceiling partitions that are greater than 25,000 square feet (2000 m2) in area and directly under a roof with ceiling heights greater than 15 feet (4.6 m),~~

~~in single story buildings of Group E, F-1, F-2, M, S-1 or S-2 occupancies, a minimum of 50 percent of the floor area shall be in a daylight zone. The maximum percentage of gross roof assembly area that is permitted to be roof mounted fenestration (including but not limited to skylights, tubular daylighting devices, light transmitting smoke vents, and roof windows) in these spaces shall be 6 percent. All lighting in this daylight zone shall be controlled by multi-level lighting controls that comply with Section 505.2.5.~~

~~Roof mounted fenestration in these spaces shall meet the following criteria:~~

1. ~~The haze value of the combined glazing materials or diffuser in the assembly shall be identified by a manufacturer's designation that indicates manufacturer, testing laboratory, haze value and test method used. The haze shall be 90 percent or greater when tested according to ASTM D1003.~~
2. ~~The minimum fenestration VT shall be 0.60 when determined in accordance with ASTM E972 or NFRC 200.~~

3. ~~The maximum U-factor of the fenestration shall meet the requirements of Table 502.3. The maximum SHGC shall be 0.60.~~

~~Exceptions:~~

1. ~~Spaces in climate zones 6 through 8.~~
2. ~~Auditoriums, theaters, museums, places of worship, and refrigerated~~
w ~~arehouses.~~
3. ~~Spaces with general lighting power densities less than 0.5 W/ft2 (5.4 W/m2).~~

505.2.5 Multi-level lighting controls. When multi-level lighting controls are required by this code, the general lighting in the daylight zone shall be separately controlled by at least one multi-level lighting control that reduces the lighting power in response to daylight available in the space. When the daylit illuminance in the space is greater than the rated illuminance of the general lighting of daylight zones, the general lighting shall be automatically controlled so that its power draw is no greater than 35 percent of its rated power. The multi-level lighting control shall be located so that calibration and set point adjustment controls are readily accessible and separate from the light sensor.

~~3. Add new standards to Chapter 6 as follows:~~

~~ASTM~~
~~D1003-00 *Standard Test Method for Haze and Luminous Transmittance of Transparent Plastics*~~
~~E972-96(2002) *Standard Test Method for Solar Photometric Transmittance of Sheet Materials Using Sunlight*~~

Committee Rea son: The modi fication w as to simplify the pro posal to ju st ad dress providing the controls systems; the pro posed Section 5 02.3.3 conflicted w ith the appr oved provisions of EC173. The pr ovision of the controls is esse ntial to making t he ener gy savings in corporated in EC173 -09/10 achievable. The committee expects this approval to blend with EC 173.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC180-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Rea son: At the request of th e p roponent, th e committee disapprov ed this change based on approvals by the committee of related proposals.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC181-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Rea son: Based o n its approval o f EC147-09/1 0, and at the requ est of the prop onent, th e committee disapproved this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC182-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt the proposal would move the code in a good direction, but there remains too many flaws in the proposal as written. Among the concerns was the difficulty in calculating the 5 % of the energy of the building.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC183-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee approved EC147-09/10 which addresses the same issues in a different format. The proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC184-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The content of this proposal were not consistent with EC147-09/10. Proponent anticipates resolving the differences by a public comment.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC185-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

502.4.7 Vestibules. All *building entrances* shall be protected with an enclosed vestibule, with all doors opening into and out of the vestibule equipped with self-closing devices. Vestibules shall be designed so that in passing through the vestibule it is not necessary for the interior and exterior doors to open at the same time. The installation of one or more revolving doors in the building entrance shall not eliminate the requirement that a vestibule be provided for any doors adjacent to revolving doors.

Exceptions:

1. Buildings in climate Zones 1 and 2 as indicated in Figure 301.1 and Table 301.1.
2. Doors not intended to be used by the public, such as doors to mechanical or electrical equipment rooms or intended solely for employee use.
3. Doors opening directly from a *sleeping unit* or dwelling unit.
4. Doors that open directly from a space less than 3,000 square feet (298 m2) in area.
5. Revolving doors.
~~5~~6. Doors used primarily to facilitate vehicular movement or material handling and adjacent personnel doors.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged).

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because it provides clarity to the vestibule requirement. Although the intent of the section is to not require a vestibule on revolving doors, the committee felt that retaining the exception of revolving doors provided clarify. The definition of building entrance will improve consistency of enforcement.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC186-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal coordinates with EC147-09/10 and further enhances energy conservation radiant heating systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC187-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Provides definitions of terms already used on the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC188-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal is consistent with the approved EC147-09/10. It provides similar improvements in energy savings. If EC147 proved to be fatally flawed and were disapproved at final action hearings, this change will serve the goal of significant energy savings for the 2012 IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC189-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Other proposals which were approved are preferred to this proposal. The proponent requested this change be disapproved.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC190-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal embodied in EC217-09/10 better addressed the topic of motor efficiency. Although this proposal uses the NEMA standard as the context, it doesn't propose actually including it as a referenced standard. The committee believes that the NEMA standard does not comply with ICC policy regarding referenced standards.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC191-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The standards referenced by the change do not comply with ICC policy regarding such references.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC192-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal is another step in increasing the efficiency standards of the IECC. The changes reflected in this item are consistent with other codes and standards.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC193-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal deletes equipment types that should remain included in the IECC requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC194-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.1 and 3.6.2.11.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The standards referenced in the proposal do not meet ICC policy for referenced documents. The action taken was consistent with the disapproval of EC191-09/10 and was requested by the proponent.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC195-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal adds new categories of equipment, although there are few examples of such equipment being manufactured. These provisions allow the code to anticipate the growth in these equipment markets.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC196-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Revises equipment efficiencies consistent with the efficiencies found in ASHRAE 90.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC197-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The concerns raised by the code change are already addressed in Section 101.3 of the code. This change is unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC198-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Although the proposal would have been consistent with related ASHRAE standards, the text was not coordinated with the requirements of the International Mechanical Code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC199-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

Note: EC199 and 200 are duplicate code change proposals that were inadvertently installed in this monograph. Proponent of EC199 will be listed as a co-proponent on EC200. The reason statement supplied by the proponent will be installed with the reason statement from proponent for EC200.

EC200-09/10

Errata: Add Guy McMann as a co-proponent for EC200. Mr. McMann's reason statement for EC199 applies. See note on EC199.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The code change represents an improved efficiency and will use materials that are readily available on the market.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC201-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is not a simple editorial change to the code and was found by the committee to be less clear than the existing code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC202-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved the change because it corrected the formula to be consistent with the SMACNA source document.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC203-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee understood that the proposal was coordinated with the IMC and would increase energy savings, but they were unconvinced that real costs of the change were not clear and may not be justified based on the savings. The committee felt this was a niche issue that didn't need to be addressed in the code at this time.

Assembly Action: **Approved as Submitted**

EC204-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for a variety of reasons. The first issue was that the proposed text, including the table footnotes, was unclear which will not result in consistent enforcement. There were numerous corrections needed to clarify the text. Also of concern was the larger sizes would not fit inside many wall cavities as is now done in the market.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC205-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because it would actually reduce the energy efficiency standards already in the code and would result in energy loss to the soils. In addition the proposal includes permissive language which is inappropriate in the codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC206-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change because it represents a significant reduction in energy savings in comparison to the 2006 IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC207-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

503.2.8.1 Protection of piping insulation. Piping Insulation exposed to weather shall be protected from damage, including that due to sunlight, moisture, equipment maintenance, wind and shall provide ~~provides~~ shielding from solar radiation that can cause degradation of the material. ~~Adhesives~~ Adhesive tape shall not be permitted.

Committee Reason: The committee approved this change to be consistent with its actions on EC110-09/10. The modification was to improve the grammar of the sentences. The provision provides appropriate protection for piping insulation exposed in exterior installations.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC208-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change because there was no technical information provide which supported the change.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC209-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistent with the committee action to disapprove EC206-09/10, this item was also disapproved. It was estimated that the change would actually increase energy usage by 27%.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC210-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the version of this topic that is included and approved in EC147-09/10. Some of the language included in this change would be more suitable to commentary than to code requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC211-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change expands and clarifies use of economizers. It is consistent with revisions to ASHRAE 90.1 and allows better use of 'free' cooling.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC212-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

504.5 Pipe insulation. For automatic-circulating hot water ~~and~~ or heat traced systems, piping shall be insulated with 1 inch (25 mm) of insulation having a conductivity not exceeding 0.27 Btu per inch/h x ft^2 ' °F (1.53 W per 25 mm/m^2 x K). The first 8 feet (2438 mm) of piping in non-hot-water-supply temperature maintenance systems served by equipment without integral heat traps shall be insulated with 0.5 inch (12.7 mm) of material having a conductivity not exceeding 0.27 Btu per inch/h x ft^2 ' °F (1.53 W per 25 mm/m^2 x K).

Committee Reason: The change brings under the IECC standards heat traced systems. Without the change, uninsulated heat trace systems can be installed. The modification more accurately states the intended meaning of the proponent.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC213-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal to be consistent with previous actions on EC208-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC214-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal to be consistent with action taken on EC 206-09/10. The committee prefers that this requirement remain one based on size of the insulating material, not R-value. The changes do not represent a cost effective strategy.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC215-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistent with the action taken to disapprove EC214-09/10 the committee disapproved this item. Change from inches of insulation to R-value not needed.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC216-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Consistent with the action taken on EC124-09/10, the committee approved this change. The committee expressed concern about the use of renewable energy sources and whether any exception should be provided.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC217-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.11 and 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the change was not clearly enforceable as currently written. In addition they felt that energy used for fire pumps should not be regulated by the code. Finally, the proposed referenced standard does not comply with ICC policy for referenced documents.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC218-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

505.5.3 Lighting within dwelling units. (Mandatory). Lighting within dwelling units shall have a minimum of ~~50~~ 75 percent of the permanently installed interior light fixtures fitted with *high-efficacy lamps*.

Committee Reason: The change was approved because it clarifies the code and improves the efficiency of lighting systems built to the IECC. The modification of 50 percent to 75 percent was to provide consistency with the action taken on EC 13.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC219-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee found the proposal would be difficult to enforce and would create a penalty of requiring significant retrofit of a lighting system when only part of it is being remodeled. The change would act to discourage upgrades rather the encourage them.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC220-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change exempts equipment rooms from having to have light reduction controls. As these rooms require ample light for staff to be able to adequately see the equipment they are attending, the change exempts rooms where such reductions are rarely used for safety and operation concerns.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC221-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The language improves the clarity of the provision. Adding the text concern having these things at read y access is a good reminder of other provisions in the International Mechanical Code and this code.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC222-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the action taken on EC147-09/10 which contains preferred code provisions.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC223-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: As the section only applies to larger spaces and buildings, there is going to be independent circuitry for different spaces, therefore the proposed exception should not be usable for a complete building, but just to areas which have continuous operation. While the committee expressed concern regarding the wording of the new exception, but approved the change as appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC224-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee found the text of the proposal to be unclear. There were discrepancies in the text. The application of the 50% reduction was not well coordinated. It would require lighting controls in inappropriate locations. The committee was concerned that here may not be much equipment available that can accomplish the 10% level.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC225-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal because it opened a series of issues, including one of safety in these areas. Parts of the proposal included unclear text. There was a concern regarding the term 'undeveloped areas' and whether such 'areas' were appropriate to include in the IECC which addresses building construction.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC226-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistent with the decision on EC225, the committee disapproved this proposal. Many of the areas mentioned in the list of standards are not governed by the IECC. Yet, it doesn't clearly address a common exterior area which is provided with lighting: landscaping on a building site.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC227-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal actually reduces energy savings compared to the existing IECC. The proponent acknowledged that changes are being made to the source document of this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC228-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change at the request of the proponent.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC229-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change because the requirement would not be consistently applied as it is only required when a building official requests compliance. It is also proposed for the wrong location in the code, it should be in Chapter 1.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC230-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal references a standard without actually including a correct reference for Chapter 6 of the code. The standard was said not to comply with ICC policy regarding referenced documents.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC231-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is only presented as a definition, but within the proposed definition are technical code requirements that should be placed in the body of a regulatory chapter, not in Chapter 2.

Assembly Action: **None**

EC232-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While understanding of the intent and goals of the proposal, the committee disapproved the change. Among the concerns are that the values contained in the proposal would need additional vetting by a larger group. The goal probably could not be achieved in an appendix format because the minimum

requirements of the code – which the appendix would 'stretch' beyond, wouldn't be finalized until the final public action hearing, at which point it is too late to then incorporate the final standards which the appendix would be pushing past.

Assembly Action: **None**

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE/ZONING CODE COMMITTEE

Thomas Hall, CBO - *Chair*
Code Administrator
City of Wauseon, Ohio
Wauseon, OH

Richard Lambert – *Vice Chair*
Building Inspector
City of Saco
Saco, ME

Richard Crawford
President
Mercer Sign Consultants
Doylestown, PA

Dr. Thomas Culp
President
Birch Point Consulting LLC
La Crosse, WI

Teresa Deitz
Property Maintenance Inspector
City of Columbus
Columbus, GA

Sean Farrell
Chief Property Code Enforcement Inspector
Prince William county
Woodbridge, VA

Roy Fyffe
Chief Building Official
City of Burnet
Burnet, TX

Kirk Nagle
Permit Coordinator
City of Arvada
Arvada, CO

Brant Pitchford
Housing Supervisor
City of Tulsa
Tulsa, OK

Ronald Reynolds, CBO, CFO
Chief Deputy, VA State Fire Marshal's Office
Virginia State Fire Marshal's Office
Glen Allen, VA

Peter Tantala, PE
Principal
Tantala Associates
Philadelphia, PA

Jeffrey Tennill
Building Official/Chief Code Enforcement
Officer
City of Shelbyville
Shelbyville, KY

Staff Secretariat:
Ed Wirtschoreck, LA
Manager, Standards
International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS- PROPERTY MAINTENACE PORTION

PM1-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

201.3 Terms defined in other codes. Where terms are not defined in this code and are defined in the *International Building Code, International Fire Code, International Existing Building Code, International Residential Code, International Fuel Gas Code, International Zoning Code, International Plumbing Code, International Mechanical Code* or NFPA 70, such terms shall have the meanings ascribed to them as stated in those codes.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the *International Property Maintenance Code* covers installations also addressed by the *International Residential Code*, the *International Fuel Gas Code* and the *International Existing Building Code* and therefore the defined terms in those codes would be appropriate. The *International Existing Building Code* was added as a modification as it is also related to the IPMC.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM2-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3(1), readily available.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that code officials are typically not qualified to determine when plants are healthy or what constitutes a minimum amount of dry foliage. Further, the proposed language, such as "nominally" and "healthy" are vague and unenforceable. Lastly, these requirements may be better placed in a green code or standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM3-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that although the requirements may be appropriate, they are in the wrong section and would perhaps be better located in Section 304.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM4-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that requiring door operator systems to be maintained was appropriate and enhanced public safety. Further, this language affords greater authority to the code official to cite these conditions where maintenance is required. Lastly, this change was preferred over PM3-09/10 based on its location.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM5-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

304.19 Gates. All exterior gates, gate assemblies, operator systems if provided, and hardware shall be maintained in good condition. ~~Locks~~ Latches at all entrances shall tightly secure the gates.

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this proposed language provided a good description of what should be inspected and maintained with respect to gates. The modification is to incorporate more appropriate code language.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM6-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent

PM7-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that much of the proposal was unenforceable. The committee also felt the concerns that the proponent was trying to address are currently addressed by Section 702 and 108 of the code related to egress and structural concerns. Lastly, it appears that the IRC should have been addressed in the proposal to bring in structures under the scope of that code.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM8-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the committee preference for PM 9-09/10 as it maintains the requirements for minimum living room area.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM9-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this change was appropriate because it replaces the current ambiguous language with clear enforceable language. Further, this change was preferred to PM8-090/10 as it maintains the requirements for minimum living room area.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM10-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this based on their action on PM9-09/10, which put these requirements in the body of the code rather than in an appendix. Appendices are rarely adopted, so these requirements are better in the body of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM11-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that addressing a single-occupant efficiency unit is logical and the proposed minimum square footage is appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM12-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Approved As Submitted**

Committee Reason: Scalding is a real concern and the proposal provides reasonable options for safety.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM13-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Approved As Modified**

506.3 Grease interceptors. Grease interceptors~~, grease traps~~ and automatic grease removal devices shall be maintained in accordance with this code and the manufacturer's installation instructions. Grease interceptors~~, grease traps~~ and automatic grease removal devices shall be regularly serviced and cleaned to prevent the discharge of oil, grease, and other substances harmful or hazardous to the building drainage system, the public sewer, the private sewage disposal system or the sewage treatment plant or processes. All records of maintenance, cleaning and repairs shall be available for inspection by the code official.

Committee Reason: Modification made because previous cycle committee action removed grease "trap" terminology from code. Proponent's reason statement that routine on-going maintenance is required and that records of maintenance need to be available for inspection by the code official.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM14-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

603.7 Existing HVAC systems. Air conditioning units with a refrigerant circuit access ports located outdoors shall be provided with locking-type tamper-resistant caps or shall be otherwise secured to prevent unauthorized access whenever the system is recharged ~~modified~~, serviced, or repaired.

Committee Reason: The committee argeed that providing safety caps for these outdoor access ports was justified and relatively inexpensive. Further, it was felt that owners and contractors would install these items as a liability measure. The modification clarifies that the concern is only air conditioning units with refrigerant ports and allows methods other than the safety cap to be utilized.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM15-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal was too broad in scope and could be interpreted as including washers, dryers, dish washers, etc… Further, if these items were to be considered, they should have been listed in the exception to allow for possible repair.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM16-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the added electrical requirements for outlet covers, pool and spa luminaries and flexible cords are appropriate and bring this code in line with the requirements of the National Electrical Code (NFPA 70).

Assembly Action: **None**

PM17-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the provisions for emergency planning should remain in the *International Fire Code* only. Placing them in this code could lead to ongoing coordination issues between the two codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM18-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this proposal goes far beyond the scope and intent of this code with respect to health provisions. Health departments and social services departments currently deal with many of these issues and they should not be part of a property maintenance code. Lastly, many of the issues can be dealt with thorough the current provisions of Chapter 3.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM19-09/10

Part II of this code change was heard by the IEBC Code Development Committee.

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

PART I- IPMC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that typically a code official would not have the knowledge and experience necessary to enforce the proposed requirements. Further, if testing were required to verify whether or not mold was present, the cost of these tests may fall to the jurisdiction.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: The committee felt that maintenance provisions did not belong in the alterations portions of this code and perhaps be located in the repairs section. Further, there should be a standard provided to describe the remediation methods that should be followed.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM20-09/10

Part II of this code change was heard by the IEBC Code Development Committee.

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.2.11, consensus process.

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

PART I- IPMC
Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the requirements and methods within the EPS 40 CFR 745 were appropriate and did not place undue burden on code officials or inspectors. Further, no certifications or testing are required to enforce these provisions. Lastly, repainting projects are not affected by these provisions.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this proposal was too broad in scope and appeared to regulate labor issues, which is not in the scope of this code. Further, there were concerns that this could create a conflict with Chapter 34 of the *International Building Code*. Lastly, if these provisions are considered, they should also be in other chapters of this code to be applicable to other than repairs.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM21-09/10

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the language was not needed and that the determination of the qualifications to perform pest management should remain at the state level rather than in a model code. Also, the affects related to costs and inspections, due to multiple treatments by an authorized company being required, should be part of the requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM22-09/10

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

602.2 Residential occupancies. Dwellings shall be provided with heating facilities capable of maintaining a room temperature of 68°F (20°C) in all habitable rooms, *bathrooms* and *toilet rooms* based on the winter outdoor design temperature for the locality indicated in Appendix D of the *International Plumbing Code*. Cooking appliances shall not be used, nor shall portable unvented fuel-burning space heaters be used ~~as the primary~~ a means, to provide ~~comfort~~ required heating.

Exception: In areas where the average monthly temperature is above 30°F(-1°C), a minimum temperature of 65°F(18°C) shall be maintained.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that space heaters should not be used for required heating, recognizing the hazards associated with the sustained use of these appliances. The modification clarifies that the concern is that these appliances not be use for any code-required heat, rather than as the primary means.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM23-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: This standard is currently referenced in the *International Residential Code*.

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

PART I- IPMC
Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

SECTION 705 CARBON MONOXIDE ALARMS

705.1 Carbon monoxide alarms. An approved carbon monoxide alarm shall be installed outside of every separate sleeping area in the immediate vicinity of the bedrooms in dwelling units within which a fuel-fired appliance, including a portable fuel burning space heater, exists and in dwelling units that have an attached garage.

Exceptions:

1. Dwelling units in which the fuel fired appliance is located outside of the dwelling unit.
2. Dwelling units in which the attached garage is an open parking garage complying with Section 406.3.3.1 of the *International Building Code*
3. Dwelling units in which the attached garage is ventilated in accordance with Section 406.4.2 of the *International Building Code* and Section 404 of the *International Mechanical Code*.

705.2 Alarm requirements. Single station carbon monoxide alarms shall be listed as complying with UL 2034 and shall be installed in accordance with this code and the manufacturer's installation instructions.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that requiring carbon monoxide alarms for existing residential structures was appropriate at this time and was consistent with recent provisions in the *International Residential Code*. The modification provides consistency with actions taken on a similar change to the *International Fire Code*.

Assembly Action: **None**

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

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that requiring carbon monoxide alarms for existing structures undergoing alterations in the *International Existing Building Code* was appropriate at this time and was consistent with recent provisions in the *International Residential Code*. Further it was felt to be a cost effective remedy in the interest of life safety.

Assembly Action: **None**

PM24-09/10

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Section 108.1.5.9 already gives the code official the tools to deal with these hazards. Further, this proposal actually puts limits on the code official's ability to take action on unsafe conditions by providing specific thresholds in Section 802.5. Lastly, the exception in 802.2 is permissive as it appears to allow building owners to repair elements or components that may otherwise have specific requirements in other codes, simply because it does not pose a threat to public health or safety.

Assembly Action: **None**

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL BUILDING/ENERGY CODE COMMITTEE

Thomas Meyers, CBO - *Chair*
Building Official
City of Central, CO

Donald LeBrun, CBO – *Vice Chair*
Assistant Director, Code Enforcement;
State of Indiana-Indiana Dept. of Homeland Security
Indianapolis, IN

Eric Borsting
Rep: National Association of Home Builders
President
ESB Professional Consulting
Stockton, CA

Anthony Bumbalis, PE
President
Anthony Bumbalis
Cleveland, OH

Michael Christoffersen, CPBD
Rep: National Association of Home Builders
President
Architectural Designs, Inc.
Fort Wayne, IN

Chip Dence
Rep: National Association of Home Builders
East End Builders
Victoria, TX

Helen Kessler DiFate, AIA
President
DIFATE GROUP, PC
St. Louis, MO

Robert Eugene
Senior Staff Engineer
Underwriters Laboratories
Spokane, WA

Kathleen Osmonson
Building Official/Fire Marshal
City of Mounds View
Mounds View, MN

Roger Robertson
Chief of Inspections
Chesterfield County Department of Building Inspections
Chesterfield, VA

Alan Steinle, PE
Rep: NCSEA (National Council of Structural Engineers Association)
President
Steinle Construction Engineers Inc.
Wilmington, DE

Jim Zengel
Rep: National Association of Home Builders
President
Zengel Construction Co.
Dayton, OH

Staff Secretary:
Larry Franks, PE
Senior Staff Engineer
International Code Council

David Bowman, PE
Manager of Codes
International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL BUILDING/ENERGY CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS – ENERGY PORTION

RE1-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent's intent with this code change proposal is to utilize the provisions of the International Energy Conservation Code and remove the present provisions of Chapter 11 of the IRC. The committee feels that the energy provisions of the IRC should be decided upon by a committee composed of people that understand the unique characteristics of light-frame residential construction. Therefore, the provisions of Chapter 11 should stay and remain under the control of the IRC B/E Committee.

Assembly Action: **None**

RE2-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent's intent with this code change proposal is to utilize the provisions of the International Energy Conservation Code and remove the present provisions of Chapter 11 of the IRC. The committee feels that the energy provisions of the IRC should be decided upon by a committee composed of people that understand the unique characteristics of light-frame residential construction. Therefore, the provisions of Chapter 11 should stay and remain under the control of the IRC B/E Committee.

Assembly Action: **None**

RE3-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent's intent with this code change proposal is to utilize the provisions of the International Energy Conservation Code and remove the present provisions of Chapter 11 of the IRC. The committee feels that the energy provisions of the IRC should be decided upon by a committee composed of people that understand the unique characteristics of light-frame residential construction. Therefore, the provisions of Chapter 11 should stay and remain under the control of the IRC B/E Committee.

Assembly Action: **None**

RE4-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent's intent with this code change proposal is to utilize the provisions of the International Energy Conservation Code and remove the present provisions of Chapter 11 of the IRC. The committee feels that the energy provisions of the IRC should be decided upon by a committee composed of people that understand the unique characteristics of light-frame residential construction. Therefore, the provisions of Chapter 11 should stay and remain under the control of the IRC B/E Committee.

Assembly Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

N1101.2 Requirements. Buildings shall be designed and constructed in accordance with ~~Chapter 4 of~~ the *International Energy Conservation Code*.

Reason for Modification: Replacing Chapter 11 with a reference to only Chapter 4 of the IECC would make it difficult to include the provisions of Chapter 3 that should be applicable as well.

Assembly Action: **None**

RE5-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Maximum fenestration U-factors and SHGC values are an unnecessary restriction on energy conservation design. Such an approach limits the flexibility the designer should be given through the UA alternative. The argument that this deals with minimum comfort levels is spurious. The homeowner will remedy that issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

RE6-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal to be consistent with action taken on EC92-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

RE7-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that reference to a heat trace system would introduce a system that has not been carefully defined.

Assembly Action: **None**

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE/ZONING CODE COMMITTEE

Thomas Hall, CBO - *Chair*
Code Administrator
City of Wauseon, Ohio
Wauseon, OH

Richard Lambert – *Vice Chair*
Building Inspector
City of Saco
Saco, ME

Richard Crawford
President
Mercer Sign Consultants
Doylestown, PA

Dr. Thomas Culp
President
Birch Point Consulting LLC
La Crosse, WI

Teresa Deitz
Property Maintenance Inspector
City of Columbus
Columbus, GA

Sean Farrell
Chief Property Code Enforcement Inspector
Prince William county
Woodbridge, VA

Roy Fyffe
Chief Building Official
City of Burnet
Burnet, TX

Kirk Nagle
Permit Coordinator
City of Arvada
Arvada, CO

Brant Pitchford
Housing Supervisor
City of Tulsa
Tulsa, OK

Ronald Reynolds, CBO, CFO
Chief Deputy, VA State Fire Marshal's Office
Virginia State Fire Marshal's Office
Glen Allen, VA

Peter Tantala, PE
Principal
Tantala Associates
Philadelphia, PA

Jeffrey Tennill
Building Official/Chief Code Enforcement
Officer
City of Shelbyville
Shelbyville, KY

Staff Secretariat:
Ed Wirtschoreck, LA
Manager, Standards
International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL ZONING CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS-

IZC1-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The provisions for lot orientation would be more appropriate in other codes such as the *International Energy Conservation Code* and *International Residential Code* in order to coordinate with other energy requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

IZC2-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis ACI 330-08: Standard was not received by ICC.
Analysis AI IS-181-81: Standard was not received by ICC.
Analysis ASTM D1833-87 (2007): Standard was not received by ICC.
Analysis ASTM D2844-07: Standard was not received by ICC.
Analysis ASTM D2940-03: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that specifications on pavement design and construction were beyond the scope of this code.

Assembly Action: **None**