



**ICC CODE TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
MEETING #18
September 8 - 9, 2009**

DRAFT MINUTES
Wyndham O'Hare
6810 North Manheim Road
Rosemont, IL 60018
(847) 297 - 1234

Tuesday, September 8: 1:00 pm – 5:00 pm
Wednesday, September 9: 8:00 am – 4:00 pm

1.0 Welcome and introductions - Chair Heilstedt

1.1 Call to order; introductions; welcoming remarks

Chair Heilstedt called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 pm on September 8th, welcoming those in attendance.

Members present (company/representation): Mike Ashley (Alliance for Fire & Smoke Containment & Control); Carl Baldassarra (The RJA Group - Vice Chair), Ron Clements (Chesterfield, VA), Dave Collins (AIA), Jimmy Deer (City of Fort Smith), Barry Gupton (North Carolina Department of Insurance), Paul Heilstedt (self- Chair), Wayne Jewell (Southfield, MI), Ray Kothe (NAHB), Ron Nickson (NMHC), William Schock (San Leandro, CA), Carl Wren (Austin, TX)

Alternates present: Richard Bukowski (The RJA Group, Alternate to Baldassarra)

Members absent: Erin Ashley (National Ready Mix Concrete Assoc), Bill Bell (City of Orem), Wade Hill (Metro Nashville, TN), Mike Love (Montgomery County, MD)

Staff liaison: Mike Pfeiffer

Attendees: A list of attendees is provided at the end of these minutes.

2.0 Approve agenda

Approved. Climbable guards (item 8.0) to be held no earlier than 9:30 am on Wednesday.

3.0 Approve minutes of CTC Meeting #17 April 9 – 10, 2009

Approved

4.0 Administration

4.1 2009 Baltimore Code Development Hearings

Staff noted the following:

Hearings to incorporate the new assembly vote provisions where-by a successful assembly motion at the Code Development Hearing becomes the initial motion at the Final Action Hearing

Technical modifications are permitted

The hearings will be split such that half the codes will be heard before the Annual Conference (AC) and the other half after the AC.

There will be two Final Action Hearings in 2010: May and October. Codes to be determined

5.0 Review of NIST WTC Recommendations

5.1 Working meeting – 2009/2010 cycle code changes (to be posted)

CTC code changes discussed first.

G3: CTC change. Support as is.

G41 (CTC change) & G42 (AISI change): AISI supports G41. G42 is a compromise proposal if G41 is not successful. Concern was noted that G42 undermines the technical basis for G41. G41 is preferred as it reflects the lack of technical basis for inclusion in the code in the first place. Support G41; oppose G42.

E1: CTC change. Support as is. It was noted that NASFM and the Joint Fire Service Review Committee will be meeting in a couple of weeks and hopefully CTC will receive their respective support on this proposal as it responds to concerns raised last cycle.

S86: CTC change. It was noted that the standard is not yet complete as an appeal has been filed. No support until standard is completed.

FS17 & FS 18: No position

G39: Added to the agenda. The code recently added new requirements for additional stairs and fire service elevators. The need for this in addition to these other safety features is not apparent. Oppose.

G40: This is similar to previous proposals last cycle that dealt with robustness of the stair enclosure. As with previous proposals, the “event” being designed for is not apparent. Oppose.

G44: It was questioned if these systems provide a benefit to fire department operations. This proposal requires a constantly attended location; 24/7. The cost impact seems optimistic in that it will not increase cost. Oppose.

G46: This proposal runs contrary to what CTC accomplished last cycle. Current text is an acceptable alternative in light of the new occupant egress and fire service elevators in the code. Oppose.

G47: No position

G48 & G49: These proposals deal with capacity and number of elevators, respectively. Based on the ASME hazard analysis, only one car should be required. Multiple elevators in small footprint buildings is not justified. Support G48 but need to get clarification as to capacity – 2500 pound should be the minimum standard size elevator, 4000 pound for stretchers. Oppose G49.

G84: An NFPA technical committee could not come to agreement on this other than as a guide. Major facilities see risk assessments being done even without a code mandate. Not a building code enforcement issue. Term “vulnerable” is too broad. Oppose.

G158: No position.

G159: It is preferred that the issue be dealt with in ASME A17.1 but the timing is such that it needs to be addressed now in the IBC. Support.

G160: The proposal deals with 120’ – 420’ buildings but the section referred to only deals with over 420’. The stairs do not require this level of protection. Oppose.

G161: There is a lack of consensus on the ASME task group on this issue. The issue is with existing non sprinklered high rises, it is not a contemporary issue with sprinklered new high rises. Oppose.

G162 – G164, G166, G171: Practical solutions. Support.

G165: Similar change last cycle. Lacks justification. Is wiring in a 2 hour shaft adequate or is that prohibited

in the NEC? Oppose.

G167 & G168: No position. G168 covered under alternative methods and materials in Ch 1.

G169: Creates possible barriers to adoption. If the system works as a code requirement, no need for additional burden placed on the AHJ to investigate and determine viability. Oppose.

G170: The issue is one of the need for a possible revision to 1003.7 to reflect the use of occupant egress elevators in the code. A simple reference is not the solution. Oppose.

G172: The ASME A17.1 task group is developing language that differs from this proposal. There is no activation criteria in the IBC. Oppose.

G173: Oppose (see G160)

G174 & G175: G174 is preferred as it is performance orientated vs the detailed prescriptive requirements in G175. There is a lack of justification/rationale for some of the detailed provisions in G175. Support G174, oppose G175.

G176: No position

G177: The IBC lacks evacuation procedures. Signage needs to be coordinated with automated voice commands. Oppose.

E131: The standards cited are applicable to electrically charged markings. Oppose.

F23 & F24: No position

F25: Laundry list of required information is cumbersome. Can it be provided in electronic form? Is this covered in building pre-planning stages? No position.

F27: Prefer in the appendix as it may vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Oppose.

F28: Too much detail. Let the AHJ decide. Oppose.

F29: Covered under alternative methods and materials in Ch 1.

5.2 ASME update: Egress/evacuation elevators

It was reported that ASME is working on these issues. Time frame uncertain.

6.0 Balanced Fire Protection (BFP)

6.1 Vertical openings

a. Working meeting – 2009/2010 cycle code changes (to be posted)

FS3: No position

FS56, 78, 79: Support CTC change FS 56. Sarah Rice and Vickie Lovell to work on correlating modifications between FS56 and FS78 and FS79.

6.2 Features

a. Features report

Final report dated April/2008 approved and to be posted.

6.3 Roof vents

a. Working meeting – 2009/2010 cycle code changes (to be posted)

F143 (NASFM) & F144 (CTC): F143 retains roof vents for sprinklered buildings. Considerable discussion as to whether or not NFPA 204 provides ample criteria to design such systems in sprinklered buildings and whether or not such systems are fire fighter tools or for post fire fighting operations. It is preferred that CTC and NASFM work together on a modification to one or both that can be supported by both groups.

F145: No position

F146: References NFPA 204 for maintenance of systems. Support.

F239: This code change added to the agenda. Expands the use of roof vents to multi-story buildings. The exception provides a reference to 910.4 which allows for the AHJ to decide the application which is unnecessary. Support this proposal if F144 is AS and the exception is deleted.

F242: This code change added to the agenda. Proponent has noted that the proposal needs work. The proposal should be to 910.1 and the exception revised to state that roof vents and mechanical smoke removal is not required with ESFR sprinklers.

6.4 Modeling (follow-up to April/2009 new business item)

Discussion:

As far as use in the code development process, the process allows any and all testimony to support or oppose a code change. Models can be one such form.

Even models have limitations and caveats. There are many models out there.

Its not just fire modeling – there are egress and structural models

ICC can not limit what can be submitted relative to a code change in terms of supporting documentation

Balanced fire protection (BFP) effort started off with a discussion on methodology considerations which did not get any traction which led to identified code issues (ie roof vents and vertical openings) being the mechanism to look at BFP

This may be an issue for ICC Evaluation Services

The discussion concluded. CTC will not be considering the issue of modeling.

7.0 Carbon Monoxide Detectors

7.1 a. Working meeting – 2009/2010 cycle code changes (to be posted)

F132 & F133: No additional information has been provided on this issue to support a mandatory code requirement. Part 2 to FS 132 cleans up the language but still requires CO alarms. Oppose.

RB60: Consistent with CTC conclusion that CO alarms should not be mandatory. Support.

8.0 Climbable Guards

8.1 Working meeting – 2009/2010 cycle code changes (to be posted)

E100 (CTC change): Support

E101: Creates a potential inconsistency with the IRC. Questions as to the guard height in common use areas – 36” or 42”?. Oppose.

E102: 8” between successive flights is too large. A child may fall through the opening. Oppose.

E147: Work with the proponent to resolve the guard height issues in assembly seating.

E148: Prefer E100. Oppose.

RB51: The issue is adequately covered in E100. Work with proponent to garner support for E100. Oppose.

RB52: The pictures with the code change do not indicate the spacing of the guard. A 4” max spacing should provide 98% coverage of children not being able to pass through the opening. Oppose.

9.0 Child Window Safety

9.1 Working meeting – 2009/2010 cycle code changes (to be posted)

FS152, RB 122, RB123: CTC changes. Support

FS153/RB124: It has been noted that AAMA has received some negative ballots on the proposed new standard concerning control device activation and the force necessary to operate the devices. Oppose for now - until the standard is complete and CTC can review. Possible opportunity to reference AAMA 909 in comment to RB 123.

FS154/RB121/RB120 Part 2: IBC and IRC proposals to relocate provisions to ensure uniform application. Problem with reference to 1013 is there are other requirements in 1013 not related to window falls. CTC to contact proponents and attempt a coordination.

RB125: Deletes mandatory fall prevention criteria. Oppose.

RB126: Lowers minimum sill height and deletes mandatory fall prevention criteria. Oppose.

10.0 Care Facilities

10.1 Working meeting – 2009/2010 cycle code changes (to be posted)

G15, G16, G20, G65, G113, E104: CTC changes. Support. Need a modification to G16 to clarify the reference to the IRC is when there are five or fewer “receiving such care”. It was noted that the fire service supports proposals that reference the IRC provided the language “provided such buildings are sprinklered” is added (in the event that the IRC sprinkler requirement is removed).

G17: No position.

G21: CTC favors the CTC proposal G20 over G21. This proposal has the net effect of revising I-1 occupancies to I-2 due to the assistance parameters. Oppose.

G22: Oppose (favor G20).

G23: The CTC study group looked at the concept of evacuation time and concluded it is was more related to licensing and evacuation levels (impractical, slow, prompt). Favor G20. Oppose.

G24: The term “housing” does not clarify that the threshold should be the number of occupants receiving care. Oppose.

F68 & F106: G15 covers these issues. Oppose.

11.0 Labeling of Fire Rated Glazing

11.1 Working meeting – 2009/2010 cycle code changes (to be posted)

FS6: No position

FS107: CTC change. Support.

12.0 Unenclosed exit stairs

12.1 Working meeting – 2009/2010 cycle code changes (to be posted)

E5: CTC change. Need modification to definition of exit per E3.

E2 & E3: Support.

E4: Prefer modified definition in E5. Oppose.

E6: It is unclear as to what a reference point does for the code in terms of application. What code problem is being addressed? Oppose.

E108: The proposed language changes are appropriate. However, the reason statement causes a bit of confusion which may lead to interpretive issues with the resulting text. Support the proposal provided the reason statement is clarified at the hearings.

13.0 New business

The issue of PV arrays on building roofs was brought up and how such systems should be dealt with in the code in terms of loadings on the roofs and the need for disconnects as it relates to fire fighting operations. It was noted that there are proposals in the current cycle that should be monitored as to outcome.

14.0 Old business

A follow-up presentation from the Congress for New Urbanism (see CTC Meeting #16, Item 13) was presented entitled "Emergency Response and Street Design". *Staff note: Code change F237-09/10 to add a new appendix to the IFC was considered at the Baltimore Code Development Hearings and was approved as submitted.. A public comment has been filed and will be considered at the May/2010 Final Action Hearings.*

15.0 Future Meetings

15.1 CTC Meeting # 19

The CTC will meet via conference call on October 6th in order to finalize positions and see who will be in attendance at the hearings to testify. The next meeting is slated for January 11 – 12, 2010 if it is determined that there is a need for a face to face meeting prior to the public comment deadline of February 8th.

16.0 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:00 pm on September 9th.

CTC website for posted materials: <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/cc/ctc/index.html>

**ICC CODE TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
MEETING #18**

DRAFT MINUTES

List of Attendees

Larry Perry	BOMA
Richard Schulte	Schulte Assoc.
Richard Roberts	Honeywell
Robert Davidson	Davidson Code Concepts/NASFM
Farid Alfawakhiri	AISI
Tom Zuzik	NOMMA/Artistic Railing
Kris Owen	Arch Wood Protection
Steve Orłowski	NAHB
Ray Norton	Village of Hoffman Estates
Patrick Kelly	NOMMA/Décor Cable
Tony Leto	Wagner/NAAMM/NOMMA
John Woestman	The Kellen Co
Julie Ruth	AAMA
Sarah Rice	SRice Consulting
Bill McHugh	FCIA
Thom Zaremba	Roetzel & Andress
Vickie Lovell	Intercode Inc.
Jon Davis	Congress for the New Urbanism
John Valiulis	Hilti, Inc
Stephen Engebrect	Wagner/NAAMM/NOMMA
David Cooper	Stairways Manufacturer's Assoc.
Jeffrey Inks	WDMA