



INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL

2018 – 2019 CODE
DEVELOPMENT CYCLE
Group A (2018)

2018 REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION
HEARINGS ON THE 2018 EDITIONS OF THE
GROUP A INTERNATIONAL CODES

HELD IN COLUMBUS, OH
APRIL 14 – 23, 2018

PUBLIC COMMENT DEADLINE:
JULY 16, 2018

**INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL
2018-2019 CODE DEVELOPMENT CYCLE**

**2018 REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING
ON THE 2018 EDITIONS OF THE**

INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE®

Egress

Fire Safety

General

Structural (heard by IBC – FS or IBC – G)

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®

Building (heard by IRC – M or IRC – P)

Mechanical

Plumbing

INTERNATIONAL SWIMMING POOL AND SPA CODE®

INTERNATIONAL WILDLAND AND URBAN INTERFACE CODE®

HELD IN COLUMBUS, OHIO

APRIL 15 – APRIL 23, 2018

PUBLIC COMMENT DEADLINE:

JULY 16, 2018



First Printing

Publication Date: May 2018

Copyright © 2018

By

International Code Council, Inc.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. This 2018-2019 Code Development Cycle 2018 Report of the Committee Action Hearing on the 2018 Editions of the *International Codes* is a copyrighted work owned by the International Code Council, Inc. Without advanced written permission from the copyright owner, no part of this book may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including, without limitations, electronic, optical or mechanical means (by way of example and not limitation, photocopying, or recording by or in an information storage retrieval system). For information on permission to copy material exceeding fair use, please contact: Publications, 4051 West Flossmoor Road, Country Club Hills, IL 60478 (Phone 1-888-422-7233).

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

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	i
Public Comment Deadline July 16, 2018	i
Submit Public Comments Online	i
ICC Website	i
Errata to the Committee Action Hearing Results	i
Modifications by Public Comment	i
Public Comment Hearing Consideration	ii
cdpACCESS Update.....	ii
Electronic Voter Validation Reminder.....	ii
Call for Adoption Information.....	ii
Code Change Numbers Not Used	ii
2018/2019 ICC Code Development Schedule.....	iii
ICC Code Development Procedures (Council Policy CP #28).....	vi
Report of the Committee Action Hearing - Table of Contents.....	xxix

INTRODUCTION

This publication contains the 2018 Group A Report of the Committee Action Hearing (ROCAH) on the proposed revisions to the *International Building Code (Egress, Fire Safety, General and Structural provisions (heard by either the Fire Safety or General committee))*, *International Fire Code*, *International Fuel Gas Code*, *International Mechanical Code*, *International Plumbing Code*, *International Private Sewage Disposal Code*, *International Property Maintenance Code*, *International Residential Code (Mechanical and Plumbing)*, *International Swimming Pool and Spa Code* and the *International Wildland-Urban Interface Code*. The hearing was held in Columbus, Ohio, April 15 – 23, 2018.

This report includes the recommendation of the code development committee and the committee's reason on each proposed item. It also includes the results of the Online Assembly Motion Vote via cdpACCESS which occurred subsequent to the hearings during the period of May 9 – 23, 2018. Where the committee or assembly action was "Approved as Modified", the proposed change, or a portion thereof, is included herein with the modification indicated in strikeout/underline format. Where this report indicates "Withdrawn by Proponent" the proposed change was withdrawn by the proponent and is not subject to any further consideration.

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENT DEADLINE JULY 16, 2018

Persons who wish to recommend an action other than that taken at the Committee Action Hearing may submit a public comment in accordance with Section 6.0 of the CP28. **The deadline for receipt of public comments is July 16, 2018. Public comments must be submitted online via cdpACCESS by 11:59 pm Pacific.** Proposals, which receive a public comment, will be included on the Public Comment Hearing Agenda for Individual Consideration and voting by eligible voting members in accordance with Section 7.5 of CP28. Proposals, which do not receive a public comment or a successful assembly action, will be included in the consent agenda and be voted with a motion to sustain the action taken at the Committee Action Hearing.

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

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

ICC WEBSITE

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

ERRATA TO THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

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

MODIFICATIONS BY PUBLIC COMMENT

Section 6.4.4 of CP28 allows modifications to be proposed by a public comment to a code change proposal for consideration at the Public Comment Hearing. For the modification to be considered at the Public Comment Hearing, the public comment must request Approval as Modified with the specific modification included in the

public comment. In accordance with Section 6.4.1, the modification must be within the scope of the original code change proposal, committee action or successful assembly action.

PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING CONSIDERATION

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

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

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

cdpACCESS UPDATE

Current 2018 Group A Cycle

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

2019 Group B Cycle

The deadline for Group B code change proposal submittals is January 7, 2019. When cdpACCESS is open for Group B submittals, a notice will be posted on our website. Be sure to consult the 2018/2019 ICC Code Development Schedule on page iii for the applicable codes and important scoping information.

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

ELECTRONIC VOTER VALIDATION REMINDER (September 24, 2018 deadline)

Attention all Governmental Member Voting Representatives: If your Primary Representative has not validated your voting credentials for 2018, there’s still time. [The Electronic Voter Validation site](#) is open and will remain available until September 24, 2018. If you wish to vote at the Richmond, VA 2018 Annual Conference and Public Comment Hearings on October 24 – 31, 2018, or the Online Governmental Consensus Vote that follows the Public Comment Hearings, your voting credentials must be validated by September 24, 2018.

If your voting credentials have already been validated in the 2018 calendar year, you do **not** have to be revalidated. Not sure if your credentials are up to date? ***Check your GMVRs' status online today!***

CALL FOR ADOPTION INFORMATION

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

CODE CHANGE NUMBERS NOT USED

Where the tentative order of discussion in the code change agenda indicates that a code change number is “Not Used”, it was identified in the posted Committee Action Hearing Results as “NU” (e.g. F255-18.....NU). The following is a list of code change numbers not used and as such are not listed in this Report of the Committee Action Hearing: F255 and F257.

2018/2019 ICC CODE DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE

(February 10, 2017)

STEP IN CODE DEVELOPMENT CYCLE	DATE	
	2018 – Group A Codes IBC- E, IBC - FS, IBC -G, IFC, IFGC, IMC, IPC, IPMC, IPSDC, IRC – M, IRC- P, ISPSC, IWUIC, IZC	2019 – Group B Codes Admin, IBC-S, IEBC, IECC-C, IECC-R/IRC-E, IgCC (Ch. 1), IRC – B
2018 EDITION OF I-CODES PUBLISHED	Fall/2017 (except 2018 IgCC, see Group B Codes on page x)	
DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS FOR ALL CODE COMMITTEES	June 1, 2017 for the 2018/2019 Cycle. Call for committee posted in February /2017.	
DEADLINE FOR cdpACCESS ONLINE RECEIPT OF CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS	January 8, 2018 (Extended to January 11, 2018)	January 7, 2019
WEB POSTING OF “PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE I-CODES”	February 28, 2018*	March 4, 2019*
COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING (CAH)	April 15 – 23, 2018 Greater Columbus Convention Center Columbus, OH	April 28 – May 8, 2019 Albuquerque Convention Center Albuquerque, NM
ONLINE CAH ASSEMBLY FLOOR MOTION VOTE	Starts approx. two weeks after last day of the CAH. Open for 2 weeks.	Starts approx. two weeks after last day of the CAH. Open for 2 weeks.
WEB POSTING OF “REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING”	May 30, 2018	June 11, 2019
DEADLINE FOR cdpACCESS ONLINE RECEIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	July 16, 2018	July 24, 2019
WEB POSTING OF “PUBLIC COMMENT AGENDA”	August 31, 2018*	September 4, 2019*
PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING (PCH) ANNUAL CONFERENCE DATES NOTED BY AC	October 24 – 31, 2018 Greater Richmond Convention Center Richmond, VA AC: October 21 – 23	October 23 – 30, 2019 Clark County, NV AC: October 20 - 22
ONLINE GOVERNMENTAL CONSENSUS VOTE (OGCV)	Starts approx. two weeks after last day of the PCH. Open for 2 weeks.	Starts approx. two weeks after last day of the PCH. Open for 2 weeks.
WEB POSTING OF FINAL ACTION	Following Validation Committee certification of OGCV and ICC Board confirmation.	Following Validation Committee certification of OGCV and ICC Board confirmation.

* Web posting of the “Proposed Changes to the I-Codes” and “Public Comment Agenda” will be posted no later than scheduled. ICC will make every effort to post these documents earlier, subject to code change/public comment volume and processing time.

2018 Group A Codes/Code committees:

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

2019 Group B Codes/Code committees:

- Admin: Chapter 1 of all the I-Codes except the IECC, IgCC and IRC. Also includes the update of currently referenced standards in all of the 2018 Codes, except the IgCC.
- IBC-S: IBC Structural provisions. IBC Chapters 15 – 25 and IEBC structural provisions. See notes.
- IEBC: IEBC Non-structural provisions. See notes.
- IECC-C: IECC Commercial energy provisions.
- IECC-R/IRC-E: IECC Residential energy provisions and IRC Energy provisions in Chapter 11.
- IgCC: Chapter 1 of the IgCC. Remainder of the code is based on the provisions of ASHRAE Standard 189.1 *Standard for the Design of High-Performance Green Buildings, Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings*. The 2018 IgCC is scheduled to be published in the Summer/2018.
- IRC-B: IRC Building provisions. Chapters 1 – 10.

A 2020 Group C cycle is not scheduled.

Notes:

- Be sure to review the document entitled “2018/2019 Code Committee Responsibilities” which will be posted. This identifies responsibilities which are different than Group A and B codes and committees which may impact the applicable code change cycle and resulting code change deadline. As an example, throughout Chapter 9 of the IBC (IBC- Fire Safety), there are numerous sections which include the designation “[F]” which indicates that the provisions of the section are maintained by the IFC code committee. Similarly, there are numerous sections in the IEBC which include the designation “[BS]”. These are structural provisions which will be heard by the IBC – Structural committee. The designations

in the code are identified in the Code Committee Responsibilities document.

- I-Code Chapter 1: Proposed changes to the provisions in Chapter 1 of the majority of the I-Codes are heard in Group B (see Admin above for exceptions). Be sure to review the brackets ([]) of the applicable code.
- Definitions. Be sure to review the brackets ([]) in Chapter 2 of the applicable code and the Code Committee Responsibilities document to determine which code committee will consider proposed changes to the definitions.
- Proposed changes to the ICC Performance Code will be heard by the code committee noted in brackets ([]) in the section of the code and in the Code Committee Responsibilities document



CP #28-05 CODE DEVELOPMENT

Approved: 9/24/05

Revised: 12/08/17

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 **Purpose of Council Policy:** The purpose of this Council Policy is to prescribe the Rules of Procedure utilized in the continued development and maintenance of the International Codes (Codes).
- 1.2 **Objectives:** The ICC Code Development Process has the following objectives:
 - 1.2.1 The timely evaluation and recognition of technological developments pertaining to construction regulations.
 - 1.2.2 The open discussion of code change proposals by all parties desiring to participate.
 - 1.2.3 The final determination of Code text by public officials actively engaged in the administration, formulation or enforcement of laws, ordinances, rules or regulations relating to the public health, safety and welfare and by honorary members.
 - 1.2.4 The increased participation of all parties desiring to participate through an online submittal and voting process that includes opportunities for online collaboration.
- 1.3 **Code Publication:** The ICC Board of Directors (ICC Board) shall determine the title and the general purpose and scope of each Code published by the ICC.
 - 1.3.1 **Code Correlation:** The provisions of all Codes shall be consistent with one another so that conflicts between the Codes do not occur. A Code Scoping Coordination Matrix shall determine which Code shall be the primary document, and therefore which code development committee shall be responsible for maintenance of the code text where a given subject matter or code text could appear in more than one Code. The Code Scoping Coordination Matrix shall be administered by the Code Correlation Committee as approved by the ICC Board. Duplication of content or text between Codes shall be limited to the minimum extent necessary for practical usability of the Codes, as determined in accordance with Section 4.5.
- 1.4 **Process Maintenance:** The review and maintenance of the Code Development Process and these Rules of Procedure shall be by the ICC Board. The manner in which Codes are developed embodies core principles of the organization. One of those principles is that the final content of the Codes is determined by a majority vote of the governmental and honorary members. It is the policy of the ICC Board that there shall be no change to this principle without the affirmation of two-thirds of the governmental and honorary members responding.

- 1.5 Secretariat:** The Chief Executive Officer shall assign a Secretariat for each of the Codes. All correspondence relating to code change proposals and public comments shall be addressed to the Secretariat. The Secretariat shall have the authority to facilitate unforeseen situations which arise in the implementation of this council policy. Staff shall maintain a record of such actions.
- 1.6 Recording:** Individuals requesting permission to record any meeting or hearing, or portion thereof, shall be required to provide the ICC with a release of responsibility disclaimer and shall acknowledge that ICC shall retain sole ownership of the recording, and that they have insurance coverage for liability and misuse of recording materials. Equipment and the process used to record shall, in the judgment of the ICC Secretariat, be conducted in a manner that is not disruptive to the meeting. The ICC shall not be responsible for equipment, personnel or any other provision necessary to accomplish the recording. An unedited copy of the recording shall be forwarded to ICC within 30 days of the meeting. Recordings shall not otherwise be copied, reproduced or distributed in any manner. Recordings shall be returned to ICC or destroyed upon the request of ICC.

2.0 Code Development Cycle

- 2.1 Intent:** The code development cycle shall consist of the complete consideration of code change proposals in accordance with the procedures herein specified, commencing with the deadline for submission of code change proposals (see Section 3.5) and ending with publication of the Final Action on the code change proposals (see Section 10.4).
- 2.2 New Editions:** The ICC Board shall determine the schedule for publishing new editions of the Codes. Each new edition shall incorporate the results of the code development activity since the previous edition.
- 2.3 Supplements:** The results of code development activity between editions may be published.
- 2.4 Emergency Action Procedures:**
- 2.4.1 Scope:** Emergency actions are limited to those issues representing an immediate threat to health and safety that warrant a more timely response than allowed by the Code Development Process schedule.
- 2.4.2 Initial Request:** A request for an emergency action shall be based upon perceived threats to health and safety and shall be reviewed by the Codes and Standards Council for referral to the ICC Board for action with their analysis and recommendation.
- 2.4.3 Board and Member Action:** In the event that the ICC Board determines that an emergency amendment to any Code or supplement thereto is warranted, the same may be adopted by the ICC Board. Such action shall require an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the ICC Board.

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

All code revisions pursuant to these emergency procedures and the reasons for

such corrective action shall be published as soon as practicable after ICC Board action. Such revisions shall be identified as an emergency amendment.

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

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

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

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

3.0 Submittal of Code Change Proposals

3.1 Intent: Any interested person, persons or group may submit a code change proposal which will be duly considered when in conformance to these Rules of Procedure.

3.2 Withdrawal of Proposal: A code change proposal may be withdrawn by the proponent (WP) at any time prior to membership action on the consent agenda at the Public Comment Hearing or prior to testimony on the code change proposal on the individual consideration agenda at the Public Comment Hearing. All actions on the code change proposal shall cease immediately upon the withdrawal of the code change proposal.

3.3 Form and Content of Code Change Submittals: Each code change proposal shall be submitted separately and shall be complete in itself. Each submittal shall contain the following information:

3.3.1 Proponent: Each code change proposal shall include the name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address of the proponent. Email addresses shall be published with the code change proposals unless the proponent otherwise requests on the submittal form.

3.3.1.1 If a group, organization or committee submits a code change proposal, an individual with prime responsibility shall be indicated.

3.3.1.2 If a proponent submits a code change proposal on behalf of a client, group, organization or committee, the name and mailing address of the client, group, organization or committee shall be indicated.

3.3.2 Code Reference: Each code change proposal shall relate to the applicable code

sections(s) in the latest edition of the Code.

3.3.2.1 If more than one section in the Code is affected by a code change proposal, appropriate proposals shall be included for all such affected sections.

3.3.2.2 If more than one Code is affected by a code change proposal, appropriate proposals shall be included for all such affected Codes and appropriate cross referencing shall be included in the supporting information.

3.3.3 Multiple Code Change Proposals to a Code Section. A proponent shall not submit multiple code change proposals to the same code section. When a proponent submits multiple code change proposals to the same section, the proposals shall be considered as incomplete proposals and processed in accordance with Section 4.3. This restriction shall not apply to code change proposals that attempt to address differing subject matter within a code section.

3.3.4 Text Presentation: The text of the code change proposal shall be presented in the specific wording desired with deletions shown struck out with a single line and additions shown underlined with a single line.

3.3.4.1 A charging statement shall indicate the referenced code section(s) and whether the code change proposal is intended to be an addition, a deletion or a revision to existing Code text.

3.3.4.2 Whenever practical, the existing wording of the text shall be preserved with only such deletions and additions as necessary to accomplish the desired change.

3.3.4.3 Each code change proposal shall be in proper code format and terminology.

3.3.4.4 Each code change proposal shall be complete and specific in the text to eliminate unnecessary confusion or misinterpretation.

3.3.4.5 The proposed text shall be in mandatory terms.

3.3.5 Supporting Information: Each code change proposal shall include sufficient supporting information to indicate how the code change proposal is intended to affect the intent and application of the Code.

3.3.5.1 Purpose: The proponent shall clearly state the purpose of the code change proposal (e.g. clarify the Code; revise outdated material; substitute new or revised material for current provisions of the Code; add new requirements to the Code; delete current requirements, etc.)

3.3.5.2 Reasons: The proponent shall justify changing the current Code provisions, stating why the code change proposal is superior to the current provisions of the Code. Code change proposals which add or delete requirements shall be supported by a logical explanation which clearly shows why the current Code provisions are inadequate or overly restrictive, specifies the shortcomings of the current Code provisions and explains how such code change proposals will improve the Code.

3.3.5.3 Substantiation: The proponent shall substantiate the code change proposal based on technical information and substantiation. Substantiation provided which is reviewed in accordance with Section 4.2 and determined as not germane to the technical issues addressed

in the code change proposal may be identified as such. The proponent shall be notified that the code change proposal is considered an incomplete proposal in accordance with Section 4.3 and the proposal shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected. The proponent shall have the right to appeal this action in accordance with the policy of the ICC Board. The burden of providing substantiating material lies with the proponent of the code change proposal. Supporting documentation may be provided via a link to a website provided by the proponent and included in the reason statement. The reason statement shall include the date the link was created. All substantiating material published by ICC is material that has been provided by the proponent and in so publishing ICC makes no representations or warranties about its quality or accuracy.

3.3.5.4 Bibliography: The proponent shall submit a bibliography of any substantiating material submitted with the code change proposal. The bibliography shall be published with the code change proposal and the proponent shall make the substantiating materials available for review at the appropriate ICC office and during the public hearing. Supporting documentation may be provided via a link to a website provided by the proponent and included in the bibliography. The reason statement shall include the date the link was created.

3.3.5.5 Copyright Release: The proponent of code change proposals, floor modifications and public comments shall sign a copyright release developed and posted by ICC.

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;
- 2) The code change proposal will decrease the cost of construction; or
- 3) The code change proposal will not increase or decrease the cost of construction.

The proponent shall submit information which substantiates such assertion. This information will be considered by the code development committee and will be included in the published code change proposal. Supporting documentation may be provided via a link to a website provided by the proponent and included in the cost substantiation statement. The cost substantiation statement shall include the date the link was created.

Any proposal submitted which does not include the requisite cost impact information shall be considered incomplete and shall not be processed.

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

send such copies to the respective code development committee.

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

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

3.6.1 Code References:

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

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

3.6.2 Standard Content:

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

3.6.2.2 The standard shall be appropriate for the subject covered.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.6.3 Standard Promulgation:

3.6.3.1 Code change proposals with corresponding changes to the code text which include a reference to a proposed new standard or a proposed update of an existing referenced standard shall comply with this section.

3.6.3.1.1 Proposed New Standards. In order for a new standard to be considered for reference by the Code, such standard shall be submitted in at least a consensus draft form in accordance with Section 3.4. If the proposed new standard is not submitted in at least consensus draft form, the code change proposal shall be considered incomplete and shall not be processed. The code change proposal shall be considered at the Committee Action Hearing by the applicable

code development committee responsible for the corresponding proposed changes to the code text. If the committee action at the Committee Action Hearing is either As Submitted or As Modified and the standard is not completed, the code change proposal shall automatically be placed on the Public Comment Agenda with the recommendation stating that in order for the public comment to be considered, the new standard shall be completed and readily available prior to the Public Comment Hearing. If the committee action at the Committee Action Hearing is Disapproval, further consideration on the Public Comment Agenda shall include a recommendation stating that in order for the public comment to be considered, the new standard shall be completed and readily available prior to the Public Comment Hearing.

3.6.3.1.2 Update of Existing Standards. Code change proposals which include technical revisions to the code text to coordinate with a proposed update of an existing referenced standard shall include the submission of the proposed update to the standard in at least a consensus draft form in accordance with Section 3.4. If the proposed update of the existing standard is not submitted in at least consensus draft form, the code change proposal shall be considered incomplete and shall not be processed. The code change proposal, including the update of the existing referenced standard, shall be considered at the Committee Action Hearing by the applicable code development committee responsible for the corresponding changes to the code text. If the committee action at the Committee Action Hearing is either As Submitted or As Modified and the updated standard is not completed, the code change proposal shall automatically be placed on the Public Comment Agenda with the recommendation stating that in order for the public comment to be considered, the updated standard shall be completed and readily available prior to the Public Comment Hearing. If the committee action at the Committee Action Hearing is Disapproval, further consideration on the Public Comment Agenda shall include a recommendation stating that in order for the public comment to be considered, the updated standard shall be completed and readily available prior to the Public Comment Hearing.

Updating of standards without corresponding code text changes shall be accomplished administratively in accordance with Section 4.6.

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

4.0 Processing of Code Change Proposals

- 4.1 Intent:** The processing of code change proposals is intended to ensure that each proposal complies with these Rules of Procedure and that the resulting published code change proposal accurately reflects that proponent's intent.
- 4.2 Review:** Upon receipt in the Secretariat's office, the code change proposals will be checked for compliance with these Rules of Procedure as to division, separation, number of copies, form, language, terminology, supporting statements and substantiating data. Where a code change proposal consists of multiple parts which fall under the maintenance responsibilities of different code committees, the Secretariat shall determine the code committee responsible for determining the committee action in

accordance with Section 5.6 and the Code Scoping Coordination Matrix (see Section 1.3.1).

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

considered.

5.0 Committee Action Hearing

- 5.1 Intent:** The intent of the Committee Action Hearing is to permit interested parties to present their views including the cost and benefits on the code change proposals on the published agenda. The code development committee will consider such comments as may be presented in the development of their action on the disposition of such code change proposals. At the conclusion of the code development committee deliberations, the committee action on each code change proposal shall be placed before the hearing assembly for consideration in accordance with Section 5.7.
- 5.2 Committee:** The Codes and Standards Council shall review all applications and make committee appointment recommendations to the ICC Board. The Code Development Committees shall be appointed by the ICC Board.
- 5.2.1 Chairman/Moderator:** The Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall be appointed by the Codes and Standards Council from the appointed members of the committee. The ICC President shall appoint one or more Moderators who shall act as presiding officer for the Committee Action_Hearing.
- 5.2.2 Conflict of Interest:** A committee member shall withdraw from and take no part in those matters with which the committee member has an undisclosed financial, business or property interest. The committee member shall not participate in any committee discussion or any committee vote on the matter in which they have an undisclosed interest. A committee member who is a proponent of a code change proposal shall not participate in any committee discussion on the matter or any committee vote. Such committee member shall be permitted to participate in the floor discussion in accordance with Section 5.5 by stepping down from the dais.
- 5.2.3 Representation of Interest:** Committee members shall not represent themselves as official or unofficial representatives of the ICC except at regularly convened meetings of the committee.
- 5.2.4 Committee Composition:** The committee may consist of representation from multiple interests. A minimum of thirty-three and one-third percent (33.3%) of the committee members shall be regulators.
- 5.3 Date and Location:** The date and location of the Committee Action Hearing shall be announced not less than 60 days prior to the date of the hearing.
- 5.4 General Procedures:** *The Robert's Rules of Order* shall be the formal procedure for the conduct of the Committee Action Hearing except as a specific provision of these Rules of Procedure may otherwise dictate. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting members of the committee.
- 5.4.1 Chair Voting:** The Chairman of the committee shall vote only when the vote cast will break a tie vote of the committee.
- 5.4.2 Open Hearing:** The Committee Action Hearing is an open hearing. Any interested person may attend and participate in the floor discussion and assembly consideration portions of the hearing. Only code development committee members may participate in the committee action portion of the hearings (see Section 5.6). Participants shall not advocate a position on specific code change proposals with committee members other than through the methods

provided in this policy.

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

5.4.4 Agenda Order: The Secretariat shall publish a Code Change Agenda for the Committee Action Hearing, placing individual code change proposals in a logical order to facilitate the hearing. Any public hearing attendee may move to revise the agenda order as the first order of business at the public hearing, or at any time during the hearing except while another code change proposal is being discussed. Preference shall be given to grouping like subjects together, and for moving items back to a later position on the agenda as opposed to moving items forward to an earlier position.

5.4.4.1 Proponent Approval: A motion to revise the agenda order is considered in order unless the proponent(s) of the moved code change proposals are in attendance in the hearing room and object to the move. Where such objections are raised, the motion to revise the hearing order shall be ruled out of order by the Moderator. The ruling of the Moderator shall be final and not subject to a point of order in accordance with Section 5.4.8. The motion to change the hearing order is not debatable.

5.4.4.2 Revised Agenda Order Approved: A motion to revise the agenda order is subject to a 2/3 vote of those present.

5.4.5 Tabling: Tabling of code change proposals shall be permitted. The motion to table is considered in order unless the proponent(s) of the tabled code change proposals are in attendance at the hearing and object to the tabling. Where such objections are raised, the motion to table shall be ruled out of order by the Moderator. The ruling of the Moderator shall be final and not subject to a point of order in accordance with Section 5.4.8. The motion to table is not debatable.

The motion to table must identify one of the following as to the location in the agenda when or where the code change proposal(s) will be considered:

1. To a specific date and time within the timeframe of the Code Change Agenda for the code change proposals under consideration, or
2. To a specific location in the Code Change Agenda for the code change proposals under consideration.

5.4.5.1 Tabling approved: A motion to table is subject to a 2/3 vote of those present.

5.4.5.2 Tabled code change proposals back to the floor: The Moderator shall bring the tabled code change proposal(s) back to the floor at the applicable time/agenda location in accordance with Section 5.4.5

Items 1 or 2. The testimony on the code change proposal shall resume at the point in the process where the tabling occurred.

5.4.6 Reconsideration: There shall be no reconsideration of a code change proposal after it has been voted on by the committee in accordance with Section 5.6.

5.4.7 Time Limits: Time limits shall be established as part of the agenda for testimony on all code change proposals at the beginning of each hearing session. Each person requesting to testify on a code change proposal shall be given equal time. In the interest of time and fairness to all hearing participants, the Moderator shall have limited authority to modify time limitations on debate. The Moderator shall have the authority to adjust time limits as necessary in order to complete the hearing agenda.

5.4.7.1 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.

5.4.7.2 Proponent Testimony: The Proponent is permitted to waive an initial statement. The Proponent shall be permitted to have the amount of time that would have been allocated during the initial testimony period plus the amount of time that would be allocated for rebuttal. Where the code change proposal is submitted by multiple proponents, this provision shall permit only one proponent of the joint submittal to be allotted additional time for rebuttal.

5.4.8 Points of Order: Any person participating in the public hearing may challenge a procedural ruling of the Moderator or the Chairman. A majority vote of ICC Members in attendance shall determine the decision.

5.5 Floor Discussion: The Moderator shall place each code change proposal before the hearing for discussion by identifying the proposal and by regulating discussion as follows:

5.5.1 Discussion Order:

1. Proponents. The Moderator shall begin by asking the proponent and then others in support of the code change proposal for their comments.
2. Opponents. After discussion by those in support of a code change proposal, those opposed hereto, if any, shall have the opportunity to present their views.
3. Rebuttal in support. Proponents shall then have the opportunity to rebut points raised by the opponents.
4. Re-rebuttal in opposition. Opponents shall then have the opportunity to respond to the proponent's rebuttal.

5.5.2 Modifications: Modifications to code change proposals may be suggested from the floor by any person participating in the public hearing. The person proposing the modification, or his/her designee, is deemed to be the proponent of the modification.

5.5.2.1 Submission. All modifications shall be submitted electronically to the ICC Secretariat in a format determined by ICC unless determined by

the Chairman to be either editorial or minor in nature. The modification will be forwarded electronically to the members of the code development committee during the hearing and will be projected on the screen in the hearing room.

5.5.2.2 Criteria. The Chairman shall rule proposed modifications in or out of order before they are discussed on the floor. A proposed modification shall be ruled out of order if it:

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

The ruling of the Chairman on whether or not the modification is in or out of order shall be final and is not subject to a point of order in accordance with Section 5.4.8.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5.7.1 Assembly Floor Motion: Any attendee may raise an objection to the

committee's action in which case the attendee will be able to make a motion to:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6.0 Public Comments

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

1. Consideration of items for which a public comment has been submitted; and

2. Consideration of items which received a successful assembly action.

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

6.3 Withdrawal of Public Comment: A public comment may be withdrawn by the public commenter at any time prior to public comment consideration of that comment. A withdrawn public comment shall not be subject to public comment consideration. If the only public comment to a code change proposal is withdrawn by the public commenter prior to the vote on the consent agenda in accordance with Section 7.5.5, the proposal shall be considered as part of the consent agenda. If the only public comment to a code change proposal is withdrawn by the public commenter after the vote on the consent agenda in accordance with Section 7.5.5, the proposal shall continue as part of the individual consideration agenda in accordance with Section 7.5.6, however the public comment shall not be subject to public comment consideration.

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

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

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

6.4.2 Code Reference: Each public comment shall include the code change proposal number.

6.4.3 Multiple public comments to a code change proposal. A proponent shall not submit multiple public comments to the same code change proposal. When a proponent submits multiple public comments to the same code change proposal, the public comments shall be considered as incomplete public comments and processed in accordance with Section 6.5.1. This restriction shall not apply to public comments that attempt to address differing subject matter within a code section.

6.4.4 Desired Final Action: In order for a public comment to be considered, the public

comment shall indicate the desired Final Action as one of the following:

1. Approve the code change proposal As Submitted (AS), or
2. Approve the code change proposal As Modified by the committee modification published in the Report of the Committee Action Hearing (AM) or published in a public comment in the Public Comment Agenda (AMPC), or
3. Disapprove the code change proposal (D)

6.4.5 Supporting Information: The public comment shall include a statement containing a reason and justification for the desired Final Action on the code change proposal. Reasons and justification which are reviewed in accordance with Section 6.5 and determined as not germane to the technical issues addressed in the code change proposal or committee action may be identified as such. The public commenter shall be notified that the public comment is considered an incomplete public comment in accordance with Section 6.5.1 and the public comment shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected. The public commenter shall have the right to appeal this action in accordance with the policy of the ICC Board. A bibliography of any substantiating material submitted with a public comment shall be published with the public comment and the substantiating material shall be made available at the Public Comment_Hearing. Supporting documentation may be provided via a link to a website provided by the public commenter and included in the reason statement and bibliography. The reason statement shall include the date the link was created. All substantiating material published by ICC is material that has been provided by the proponent and in so publishing ICC makes no representations or warranties about its quality or accuracy.

6.4.6 Cost Impact: The proponent of the public comment shall indicate one of the following regarding the cost impact of the public comment to the code change proposal:

- 1) The net effect of the public comment and code change proposal will increase the cost of construction;
- 2) The net effect of the public comment and code change proposal will decrease the cost of construction; or
- 3) The net effect of the public comment and code change proposal will not increase or decrease the cost of construction.

The public commenter shall submit information which substantiates such assertion. This information will be considered at the Public Comment Hearing and will be included in the published public comment. Supporting documentation may be provided via a link to a website provided by the public commenter and included in the cost substantiation statement. The cost substantiation statement shall include the date the link was created.

Any public comment submitted which does not include the requisite cost impact information shall be considered incomplete and shall not be processed.

6.4.7 Online submittal: Each public comment and substantiating information shall be submitted online at the website designated by ICC. Additional copies may be requested when determined necessary by the Secretariat.

6.4.8 Submittal Deadline: ICC shall establish and post the submittal deadline for each cycle. The posting of the deadline shall occur no later than 120 days prior to the public comment deadline. Each public comment shall be submitted online at the website designated by ICC by the posted deadline. The submitter of a public

comment is responsible for the proper and timely receipt of all pertinent materials by the Secretariat.

6.5 Review: The Secretariat shall be responsible for reviewing all submitted public comments from an editorial and technical viewpoint similar to the review of code change proposals (see Section 4.2).

6.5.1 Incomplete Public Comment: When a public comment is submitted with incorrect format, without the required information or judged as not in compliance with these Rules of Procedure, the public comment shall not be processed. The Secretariat shall notify the public commenter of the specific deficiencies and the public comment shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected, or the public comment shall be returned to the public commenter with instructions to correct the deficiencies with a final date set for receipt of the corrected public comment.

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

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

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

7.0 Public Comment Hearing

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

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

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

7.4 Public Comment Agenda: The Public Comment Consent Agenda shall be comprised of code change proposals which have neither a successful assembly action nor public

comment. The agenda for public testimony and individual consideration shall be comprised of proposals which have a successful assembly action or public comment (see Section 6.1).

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

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

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

7.5.2.1 Proponent Approval: A motion to revise the agenda order is considered in order unless the proponent(s) of the moved code change proposals are in attendance at the hearing and object to the move. Where such objections are raised, the motion to revise the hearing order shall be ruled out of order by the Moderator. The ruling of the Moderator shall be final and not subject to a point of order in accordance with Section 5.4.8. The motion to change the hearing order is not debatable.

7.5.2.2 Revised Agenda Order Approved: A motion to revise the agenda order is subject to a 2/3 vote of those present.

7.5.3 Tabling: Tabling of code change proposals shall be permitted. The motion to table is considered in order unless the proponent(s) of the tabled code change proposals are in attendance at the hearing and object to the tabling. Where such objections are raised, the motion to table shall be ruled out of order by the Moderator. The ruling of the Moderator shall be final and not subject to a point of order in accordance with Section 5.4.8. The motion to table is not debatable.

The motion to table must identify one of the following as to the location in the agenda when or where the code change proposal(s) will be considered:

1. To a specific date and time within the timeframe of the Public Comment Agenda for the code change proposals under consideration, or
2. To a specific location in the Public Comment Agenda for the code change proposals under consideration.

7.5.3.1 Tabling approved: A motion to table is subject to a 2/3 vote of those present.

7.5.3.2 Tabled code change proposals back to the floor: The Moderator shall bring the tabled code change proposal(s) back to the floor at the applicable time/agenda location in accordance with Section 7.5.3 Items 1 or 2. The testimony on the code change proposal shall resume at the point in the process where the tabling occurred.

7.5.4 Presentation of Material at the Public Comment Hearing: Information to be

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

- 7.5.5 Public Comment Consent Agenda:** The Public Comment Consent Agenda (see Section 7.4) shall be placed before the assembly with a single motion for Final Action in accordance with the results of the Committee Action Hearing. When the motion has been seconded, the vote shall be taken with no testimony being allowed. A simple majority (50% plus one) based on the number of votes cast by eligible voters shall decide the motion. This action shall not be subject to the Online Governmental Consensus Vote following the Public Comment Hearing (see Section 8.0).
- 7.5.6 Public Comment Individual Consideration Agenda:** Upon completion of the Public Comment Consent Agenda vote, all code change proposals not on the Public Comment Consent Agenda shall be placed before the assembly for individual consideration of each item (see Section 7.4).
- 7.5.7 Reconsideration:** There shall be no reconsideration of a code change proposal after it has been voted on in accordance with Section 7.5.9.
- 7.5.8 Time Limits:** Time limits shall be established as part of the agenda for testimony on all code change proposals at the beginning of each hearing session. Each person requesting to testify on a code change proposal shall be given equal time. In the interest of time and fairness to all hearing participants, the Moderator shall have limited authority to modify time limitations on debate. The Moderator shall have the authority to adjust time limits as necessary in order to complete the hearing agenda.
 - 7.5.8.1 Time Keeping:** Keeping of time for testimony by an individual shall be by an automatic timing device. Remaining time shall be evident to the person testifying. Interruptions during testimony shall not be tolerated. The Moderator shall maintain appropriate decorum during all testimony.
- 7.5.9 Discussion and Voting:** Discussion and voting on code change proposals being individually considered shall be in accordance with the following procedures and the voting majorities in Section 7.6:
 - 7.5.9.1 Proponent testimony:** The Proponent of a public comment is permitted to waive an initial statement. The Proponent of the public comment shall be permitted to have the amount of time that would have been allocated during the initial testimony period plus the amount of time that would be allocated for rebuttal. Where a public comment is submitted by multiple proponents, this provision shall permit only one proponent of the joint submittal to waive an initial statement.
 - 7.5.9.2 Points of Order:** Any person participating in the public hearing may challenge a procedural ruling of the Moderator. A majority vote of ICC Members in attendance shall determine the decision.

- 7.5.9.3 Eligible voters:** Voting shall be limited to eligible voters in accordance with Section 9.0.
- 7.5.9.4 Allowable Final Action Motions:** The only allowable motions for Final Action are Approval as Submitted (AS), Approval as Modified by the committee (AM) or by one or more modifications published in the Public Comment Agenda (AMPC), and Disapproval (D).
- 7.5.9.5 Initial Motion:** The code development committee action shall be the initial motion considered.
- 7.5.9.6 Motions for Modifications:** Whenever a motion under consideration is for Approval as Submitted or Approval as Modified, a subsequent motion and second for a modification published in the Public Comment Agenda may be made (see Section 6.4.4). Each subsequent motion for modification, if any, shall be individually discussed and voted before returning to the main motion. A two-thirds majority based on the number of votes cast by eligible voters shall be required for a successful motion on all modifications.
- 7.5.9.7 Voting:** After dispensing with all motions for modifications, if any, and upon completion of discussion on the main motion, the Moderator shall then ask for the vote on the main motion. The vote on the main motion shall be taken electronically with the vote recorded and each vote assigned to the eligible voting member. In the event the electronic voting system is determined not to be used by ICC, a hand/standing count will be taken by the Moderator. If the motion fails to receive the majority required in Section 7.6, the Moderator shall ask for a new motion.
- 7.5.9.8 Subsequent Motion:** If the initial motion is unsuccessful, a motion for either Approval as Submitted or Approval as Modified by one or more published modifications is in order. A motion for Disapproval is not in order. The vote on the main motion shall be taken electronically with the vote recorded and each vote assigned to the eligible voting member. In the event the electronic voting system is determined not to be used by ICC, a hand/standing count will be taken by the Moderator. If a successful vote is not achieved, Section 7.5.9.9 shall apply.
- 7.5.9.9 Failure to Achieve Majority Vote at the Public Comment Hearing.** In the event that a code change proposal does not receive any of the required majorities in Section 7.6, the results of the Public Comment Hearing for the code change proposal in question shall be Disapproval. The vote count that will be reported as the Public Comment Hearing result will be the vote count on the main motion in accordance with Section 7.5.9.7.
- 7.5.9.10 Public Comment Hearing Results:** The result and vote count on each code change proposal considered at the Public Comment Hearing shall be announced at the hearing. In the event the electronic voting system is not utilized and a hand/standing count is taken in accordance with Sections 7.5.9.7 and 7.5.9.8, the vote count will not be announced if an individual standing vote count is not taken. The results shall be posted and included in the Online Governmental Consensus Ballot (see Section 8.2).

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

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

8.0 Online Governmental Consensus Vote

8.1 Public Comment Hearing Results: The results from the Individual Consideration Agenda at the Public Comment Hearing (see Sections 7.5.6 and 7.5.9.10) shall be the basis for the Online Governmental Consensus Vote. The ballot shall include the voting options in accordance with the following table:

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

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

1. The Public Comment Hearing result and vote count.
2. The allowable Online Governmental Consensus Vote actions in accordance with Section 8.1.
3. Where the Public Comment Hearing result is As Submitted (AS) or Disapproval (D), the original code change proposal will be presented.
4. Where the Public Comment Hearing result is As Modified by the committee (AM) or As Modified by one or more Public Comments (AMPC), the original code change and approved modification(s) will be presented.
5. The committee action taken at the Committee Action Hearing.
6. ICC staff identification of correlation issues.
7. For those who voted at the Public Comment Hearing, the ballot will indicate how they voted, unless an electronic vote count is not taken in accordance with Section 7.5.9.10.

8. An optional comment box to provide comments.
9. Access to the Public Comment Agenda which includes: the original code change, the report of the committee action and the submitted public comments.
10. Access to the audio and video of the Committee Action and Public Comment Hearing proceedings.
11. Identification of the ballot period for which the online balloting will be open.

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

8.3.1 Participation requirement: A minimum number of participants to conduct the Online Governmental Consensus Vote shall not be required unless the code change proposal(s) were not voted upon utilizing the electronic voting devices at the Public Comment Hearing and the resulting vote was not assigned to each eligible voting member in accordance with Sections 7.5.9.7 and 7.5.9.8 . If this occurs, a minimum number of participants shall be required for those code change proposal(s) based on an assessment of the minimum number of votes cast during the entire Public Comment Hearing and the Online Governmental Consensus Vote shall determine the final on action on the code change proposal(s) in accordance with Section 10.1.

9.0 Eligible Final Action Voters

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

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

10.0 Tabulation, certification and posting of results

10.1 Tabulation and Validation: Following the closing of the online ballot period, the votes received will be combined with the vote tally at the Public Comment Hearing to determine the final vote on the code change proposal. If a hand/standing count is utilized per Subsection 7.5.9.7 or 7.5.9.8, those votes of the Public Comment Hearing will not be combined with the online ballot. ICC shall retain a record of the votes cast and the

results shall be certified by a validation committee appointed by the ICC Board. The validation committee shall report the results to the ICC Board, either confirming a valid voting process and result or citing irregularities in accordance with Section 10.2.

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

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

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

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

11.0 Code Publication

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

11.2 Code Correlation: The Code Correlation Committee is authorized to resolve technical or editorial inconsistencies resulting from actions taken during the code development process by making appropriate changes to the text of the affected code. The process to resolve technical or editorial inconsistencies shall be conducted in accordance with CP#44 Code Correlation Committee.

12.0 Appeals

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

The following actions are not appealable:

1. Variations of the results of the Public Comment Hearing compared to the Final Action result in accordance with Section 10.4.
2. Denied requests to extend the voter balloting period in accordance with Sections 5.7.4 or 8.3.

3. Lack of access to the internet based online collaboration and voting platform to submit a code change proposal, to submit a public comment or to vote.
4. Code Correlation Committee changes made in accordance with Section 11.2.

13.0 Violations

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

Sections revised in December 8, 2017 revision to CP-28:

3.3.5.5
8.3.1

Sections revised in September 9, 2017 revision to CP-28:

3.2
3.3.5.3
3.3.5.4
3.3.5.6
3.6.3.1.1
3.6.3.1.2
4.6
5.4.4
5.4.4.1
5.4.4.2
5.4.5
5.4.5.1
5.4.5.2
5.5.2
5.5.2.2
6.4.5
6.4.6
7.5.2
7.5.2.1
7.5.2.2
7.5.3
7.5.3.1
7.5.3.2
7.5.9.10
8.2 – Number 7
11.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CODE	PAGE
IBC – Fire Safety	1
IBC – General	35
IBC – Means of Egress	74
IBC – Structural (heard by either IBC – FS or IBC – G)	104
IFC	109
IFGC.....	188
IMC	194
IPC.....	217
IPSDC.....	247
IPMC.....	249
IRC – Building (heard by either IRC – M or IRC – P)	253
IRC - Mechanical	256
IRC - Plumbing	264
ISPSC.....	267
IWUIC	276

2018 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE – FIRE SAFETY

FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE

Kenneth E. Bush, Chair

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

Joseph McElvaney, Jr., PE, Vice Chair

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

Nelson Bryner

Chief, Fire Research Division
National Institute of Standards and Technology
Gaithersburg, MD

Matthew Dobson

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Vice President, Regulatory and Advocacy
Vinyl Siding Institute
Burlington, NC

Kevin Duerr-Clark, PE

Assistant Director for Technical Support,
Professional Engineer II
NY Department of State, Division of Building
Standards and Codes
Albany, NY

Kara Gerczynski

Rep: Fire Marshal's Association of Colorado
Fire Marshal
Elizabeth Fire Protection District
Kiowa, CO

Jefrey Heiss

Construction Official
Township of Warren
Warren, NJ

Robert M. Longo, AIA

Rep: AIA New Jersey
Partner
Cornerstone Architectural Group LLC
South Plainfield, NJ

John Mengedoht, AIA

Senior Associate
NBBJ
Seattle, WA

Bob D. Morgan, PE, CPCU

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

Dennis Richardson, PE, CBO

Western Regional Manager
American Wood Council
Santa Rosa, CA

Richard A. Soltis, Jr.

Fire SubCode Official
Lawrence Township
Lawrence, NJ

Michael Tomaselli, PE, M. Eng

Fire Protection Engineer
Anne Arundel County
Annapolis, MD

Richard N. Walke

Senior Regulatory Engineer
Underwriters Laboratories
Northbrook, IL

Mang sum Mercy Wong, RA

Code Development Architect-Technical Affairs
and Code Development
New York Department of Buildings
New York, NY

Staff Secretariat

Kermit Robinson

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

Michelle Britt, LEED AP

Director, Energy Programs
Technical Services
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hills, IL

International Building Code - Fire Safety

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

FS1-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

Modify proposal as follows:

703.2 Fire-resistance ratings.

The fire-resistance rating of building elements, components or assemblies shall be determined in accordance with Sections 703.2.1 or 703.2.2 without the use of automatic sprinklers or any other fire suppression system being incorporated, or in accordance with Section 703.2.3.

703.2.1 Tested assemblies.

A fire-resistance rating of building elements, components or assemblies shall be determined by the test procedures set forth in ASTM E119 or UL 263, without the use of automatic sprinklers or any other fire suppression system being incorporated as part of the test, or in accordance with Section 703.3. The fire-resistance rating of penetrations and fire-resistant joint systems shall be determined in accordance Sections 714 and 715, respectively.

~~703.3 Methods for determining fire resistance.~~ 703.2.2 Analytical methods.

The fire resistance of building elements, components or assemblies established by an analytical method shall be by the application of any of the methods listed in this section shall be based on the fire exposure and acceptance criteria specified in ASTM E119 or UL 263. The required fire resistance of a building element, component or assembly shall be permitted to be established by any of the following methods or procedures:

1. Fire-resistance designs documented in approved sources.
2. Prescriptive designs of fire-resistance-rated building elements, components or assemblies as prescribed in Section 721.
3. Calculations in accordance with Section 722.
4. Engineering analysis based on a comparison of building element, component or assemblies designs having fire-resistance ratings as determined by the test procedures set forth in ASTM E119 or UL 263.
5. ~~Alternative protection methods as allowed by Section 104.11.~~
6. Fire-resistance designs certified by an approved agency.

703.2.3 Approved alternative method.

The fire resistance of building elements, components or assemblies not complying with Sections 703.2.1 or 703.2.2 shall be permitted to be established by an alternative protection method in accordance with Section 104.11.

Committee Reason: The modification replaces the original portion of the proposal which revised Sections 703.2 and 703.3. It provides a clear path for determining fire resistance ratings. The path options are found in 703.2.1 or 703.2.2. If neither of these work, the proponent can seek an alternative method as outline in Section 703.2.3. It eliminates the confusion regarding sprinklers. In neither Section 703.2.1 nor 703.2.2 are sprinklers part of the test. The ratings are achieved by testing the materials and assemblies alone. Under alternate methods, the building official is able to use whatever testing seems appropriate which could include sprinklers as part of a test. There was strong assembly support of the proposition that the organization of the text as found in the modification says what code users think this provision of the code should be saying. (Vote 12-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

Staff Analysis:

The modification does not address Section 703.4. It is still proposed for complete deletion. If approved, FS1-18 will result in renumbering of the balance of Section 703.

FS2-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:****703.5.1 Non-composite materials.**

Materials required to be noncombustible shall be tested in accordance with ASTM E136.

Exception: Materials having a structural base of noncombustible material as determined in accordance with ASTM E136 and ~~this section~~ with a surfacing of not more than 0.125 inch (3.18 mm) thick that has a flame spread index not greater than 50 when tested in accordance with ASTM E84 or UL 723 shall be acceptable as non-combustible.

Committee Reason: The proposal - as revised by the modification - brings clarity to the determination of non-combustible materials. The existing sections have titles which weren't reflected in the text and using terms which weren't defined and weren't really used in the industry. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

FS3-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal brings in a new standard as an option to ASTM E136. The two standards reference each other and are considered equivalent for testing materials. The committee expressed concern about the integration of FS2 and FS3, urging a public comment be submitted to meld FS3 revision into the format of the FS2 approved change. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

FS4-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent that this addresses a valid concern, but found that the proposed text isn't quiet addressing the issue. The proposal is also inconsistent with FS2. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

FS5-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC GENERAL COMMITTEE

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proponents have done their homework. This is how heavy timber should be done. The western fire test validated this approach and that should be taken into consideration. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

FS6-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC GENERAL COMMITTEE

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is necessary to maintain the integrity of the system. It was suggested that a public comment related to the proposed modification may be in order. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

FS7-18

Errata: This proposal includes unpublished errata

The primary text of Section 704.3 and exception #1 are not new text and should not have been underlined. The change is only a new exception #2.

704.3 Protection of primary structural frame other than columns.

Members of the primary structural frame other than columns that are required to have protection to achieve a fire-resistive rating and support more than two floors or one floor and roof or support a load-bearing wall or a non-load bearing wall more than two stories high, shall be provided individual encasement protection by protecting them on all side for the full length, including connections to other structural members, with materials having the required fire-resistive rating.

Exception Exceptions:

1. Individual encasement protection on all sides shall be permitted on all exposed sides provided the extent of the protection is in accordance with the required fire-resistive rating, as determined in Section 703.

2. Where primary structural members are enclosed within a continuous horizontal membrane of fire-resistive rated construction that is equal to or greater that required by other sections of this code, shall not be required to be individually encased on any side of the primary structural member, including connections

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The would allow an unprotected element of the structural frame. A wall or horizontal assembly doesn't provide the equivalent level of protection. But if the membrane is removed, the protection is gone. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS8-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

704.6.1 Secondary ~~(non-structural)~~ attachments to structural members.

Where primary and secondary structural steel members require fire protection, secondary ~~(non-structural)~~ tubular steel attachments to those structural members shall be protected with the same fire resistive ~~rating material and thickness~~ as required for the structural member. The protection shall extend away from the structural member a distance of not less than 12 inches, or shall be applied to the entire length when the attachment is less than 12 inches long. An When the ends are open, the fire resistive material and thickness shall be applied to both exterior and interior of the tubular steel attachment. ~~shall be filled with an equivalent fire protection method for a distance of 12 inch length from the structural member, or the entire length of the open tube, whichever is less.~~

Committee Reason: The modification refines the language to better reflect the intent of the proposal. The change clarifies an area of framing and the appropriate level of protection. Structural tubing has been a question of the years and there is evidence of heat transferring into the structure from such tubing. Perhaps a public comment expanding this solution to other attachments of shapes other than tubular. (Vote 11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS9-18

Errata: This proposal includes unpublished errata

In table 601 - The third row - the first column.

The word 'element' shown was not part of the proposal. That cell should read

'Bearing walls and supporting primary or secondary structural frame members.

Exterior^{e,f}

Interior"

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee did not find the existing text unclear and that the proposed language improves upon it. There was concern about creating laundry lists within Table 601. There was also concern that the revised Section 704.11 will be troublesome in preparing designs. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****Staff Analysis:**

Please note that the word 'element' shown in Table 601 in second line of the first column was not part of the proposal. That cell should read 'Bearing walls and supporting primary or secondary structural frame members. Exterior^{e,f} Interior"

FS10-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While there was support from committee members to change the terminology from 'coatings' to 'materials', the overall proposal was not ready for approval. The definition was found to be confusing. The wording of Section 704.14 implies that the IFRM meets the fire resistance rating where is the IFRM and the base to which it is applied that is meeting the rating. Section 705.15 should also be revised to correlate with the new definition. Committee encouraged the proponent to fix the various issues and bring a public comment to the Richmond hearing. (Vote 8-6)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****FS11-18**

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC GENERAL CODE COMMITTEE

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

Table 705.2 had been shown in an incomplete format.

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the committee acknowledged that exterior soffits are an issue that needs to be addressed, the proposal is not clear as drafted. The use of the term 'projection' was questioned. Is this a projection in the same sense as other building elements known as projections. The definition needs clarity and to not be a list. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****FS12-18****Errata: This proposal includes published errata**

A clearer version of the figure in the Reason statement was provided.

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee did not like calling these building features projections. That term is fairly well understood and applied. The fuel load underneath these 'projections' was not addressed. The case was made based on there being an adjoining building. Such may not be the case, the issue should be addressed because of its proximity to the property line - not proximity to other buildings. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****FS13-18****Committee Action:****Withdrawn**

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS14-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change clarifies the application of table and simplifies the 'math' for 3 to 5 foot distances. (Vote 13-1).

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS15-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal had merit but still had issues that need resolution. The definition should be refined. There needs to be a selection of term - architectural vs building. The issue of unenclosed elements needs to be better addressed. (Vote 9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS16-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the use of non-combustible materials. The format of the revisions into a list format helps with understanding the provisions. (Vote 11-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS17-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal seems to only be addressing limited causes of fires. It addresses distance from doors, but not other openings such as windows. It is only addressing fires getting into an attic not other fire entry issues. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS18-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

Modify proposal as follows:

705.5 Fire-resistance ratings.

Exterior walls shall be fire-resistance rated in accordance with Table 601 based on the type of construction and Table 705.5 and this section based on the fire separation distance. The required fire-resistance rating of exterior walls with a fire separation distance of greater than 10 feet (3048 mm) shall be rated for exposure to fire from the inside. The required fire-resistance rating of exterior walls with a fire separation distance of less than or equal to 10 feet (3048 mm) shall be rated for exposure to fire from both sides.

Committee Reason: The modification is a minor correction to grammar. The committee agreed that fire separation from the property line is a Chapter 7 issue and the rating of exterior walls now found in Chapter 6 belongs in Chapter 7. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS19-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal raised as many issues as it was solving on the topic of wall continuity. Is the continuity just for the wall, or does it include the foundation that might be exposed above grade? What is impact on floors which support the walls, do they need the same rating? (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

FS20-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is so specific to wood construction that there will be unintended consequences for other materials. Language is confusing and would be difficult to enforce. Introducing wood into a non-combustible wood changes the nature of that wall. This needs refinement before it clearly address the issues raised by the opponents. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

FS21-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No history of building to building fires resulting from small 'penetrations'. Creates a lot of design problems without providing clear solutions. Section 714 is clear, the solutions should be there. There is support for regulating penetrations. After a certain distance there can be unrated openings. The proposal was unclear how this threshold of allowing unrated openings works with this proposal. (Vote 9-4)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

FS22-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The intent of the section is clearer with the added text. (Vote 9-5.)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

FS23-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the current text is clear and doesn't need change. The proposed text is confusing (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

FS24-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee found the overall proposal provides better and more understandable text. This is not a technical change. The committee encouraged the proponent to submit a public comment to further refine the language. They noted extra words at the end of item 1; a conflict is style between the 4 items and finally a suggestion that part 4 of the exception may not be a requirement of the exception but rather an allowance of the exception. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS25-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Section 704.1 already requires the design factors shown in the new text, therefore it is not needed. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS26-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

Footnote changes within the table were corrected.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The approval was based for the most part on the proponent's reason statement. The committee agreed that the construction parameters for these enclosures should be in the building code with operational criteria in the IFC. The allowance of only fire rated glazing is understood based on protecting the enclosure from exterior problems and keeping radiant heat in the enclosure in case of fire. The committee encouraged the proponents to explore if there are ways to lift the complete ban of other glazing. (Vote 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS27-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal addresses a need in the code. It allows a method that is frequently approved as an alternate method. The language is modeled from the provisions for top of shaft construction. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS28-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was very concerned that this reduced protection for key elements of the structure; that it impinged on the safe design of stairways thereby endangering occupants and emergency responders. The committee recommended defining the extent of the supporting structure. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS29-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's testimony, without FS30 and FS31-18, this proposal is incomplete. The committee expressed concern whether the list is complete and clear between joints and voids. For example if two rated assemblies adjoin each other and that 'intersection' doesn't need to accommodate movement, how is it classified? (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS30-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is a companion to FS31-18 and is disapproved for the same reason. (Vote 12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS31-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found this proposal to be unnecessary. The existing provisions are adequate. The proponent may wish to restructure as an alternate method. (Vote 11-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS32-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the Proponent's reason statement. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS33-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

Modify proposal as follows:

708.1 General.

The following wall assemblies shall comply with this section.

- Separation walls as required by Section 420.2 for Group I-1 and Group R occupancies.
- Walls separating tenant spaces in covered and open mall buildings as required by Section 402.4.2.1.
- Corridor walls as required by Section 1020.1.
- Enclosed elevator lobby separation as required by Section 3006.3.
- Egress balconies as required by Section 1021.2
- Walls separating ambulatory care facilities from adjacent spaces, corridors or tenants as required by Section 422.2.
- Walls separating individual dwelling and sleeping units in Groups R-1 and R-2 in accordance with and contiguous attic and crawl spaces to those units are separated from each other and public or common areas as required by Sections 907.2.8.1, and 907.2.9.1 and 907.2.9.1.
- Walls separating vestibules from a level of exit discharge as required by Vestibules in accordance with Section 1028.1.

708.4.1 Supporting construction.

The supporting construction for a fire partition shall have a fire-resistance rating that is equal to or greater than the required fire-resistance rating of the supported fire partition.

Exception: In buildings of Types IIB, IIIB and VB construction, the supporting construction requirement shall not apply to fire partitions separating tenant spaces in covered and open mall buildings, fire partitions separating dwelling units, fire partitions separating sleeping units, ~~and fire partitions serving as corridor walls, fire partitions separating ambulatory care facilities from adjacent spaces or corridor, fire partitions separating dwelling and sleeping units in Groups R-1 and R-2 and fire partitions separating vestibules from the level of exit discharge.~~

Committee Reason: The proposal completes this existing 'laundry list'. The modification further clarifies the text. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS34-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The increases required by this proposal are unwarranted. The cost impact statement is not credible. We always seek a balance when increasing protections and the practical. This proposal does not balance. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS35-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would increase unit to unit protection but doesn't address the lower rating of the corridor . Some of the justification was based on protection systems in extenuating circumstances which shouldn't be the basis of an across the board change. Perhaps their concerns is the 13R system. Perhaps a 13R system should be extended to the attic. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS36-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The provisions were found to be vague. What is meant by the phrase 'not a component'. The term 'underlayment' is not intended the same as one might use for the underlayment of flooring, and therefore should be defined, or a different word used. Overall there is insufficient information to guide the code user (Vote 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS37-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The approval is based on the proponent's reason statement. The proponent was encouraged to submit a public comment which would add 'tenant' so that it would read 'from adjacent tenant spaces or corridors'. (Vote 9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS38-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal makes this provision clear and concise. Provides flexibility for designers by clearly eliminating the exterior walls as part of the assemblies surrounding a smoke compartment. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS39-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: We do need to coordinate with the federal standards, yet there was a concern that the openings are too large and perhaps shutter to reduce actual leakage. The committee suggested a modification to clarify that all 4 items must be complied with. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS40-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Buildings that don't have a secondary water supply are potentially compromised. This is a repeat of an exception for high-rise buildings where it is limited to mechanical shafts – this contains no such limit. The limits on effectiveness of sprinkler heads in shafts (trying to catch the rising heat) is acknowledged and the committee was uncomfortable extending this sprinkler based exception to other shaft construction. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS41-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

Modify proposal as follows:

713.12 Enclosure at top.

The top of shaft enclosures shall comply with one of the following:

- ~~They shall~~ Extend to the underside of the roof sheathing, deck or slab of the building and the roof assembly shall comply with the requirements for the type of construction as specified in Table 601.
- ~~They shall~~ Terminate below the roof assembly and be enclosed at the top with construction of the same fire-resistance rating as the topmost floor penetrated by the shaft, but not less than the fire-resistance rating required for the shaft enclosure.
- ~~They shall~~ Extend past the roof assembly and comply with the requirements of Section 1510.

Committee Reason: The proposal reorganizes the requirements of this section, bringing clarity to users. The modification improved the format of the proposal. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS42-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The approval was based on the proponent's reason statement. There is no need for a damper at these locations.(Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS43-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Without a door, the chute simply becomes a chimney for the room. It is critical to keep the fire in the room and that is defeated if there is no door. Perhaps an exception for a non-rated door could be considered. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS44-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is an appropriate change because of the growth in recycling of materials. Amending these sections may be just a beginning. The issue should be addressed elsewhere such as Section 903. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS45-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The reference is not need for just these openings. The proposal confuses the shaft surrounding a chute and a chute itself. The proposal doesn't bring clarity to the code. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS46-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee, in part, saw the value of such systems, but not everyone. In addition the committee expressed a number of concerns. This doesn't help improper installations, field changes not reflected on plans and then changed again in the field. Nothing prohibits improper labelling. The contractors should provide this as part of showing their compliance with the code. The label on the wall of 1 or 2 hours, etc, should be enough to indicate the type of penetration protection. (Vote 8-6)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS47-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was not supportive of establishing licensing criteria for contractors in the code. Such is not the role of the codes. In addition there is concern with the seeming proprietary nature of the proposed text. It was acknowledged that these systems are being installed incorrectly but there was not a consensus that this was the solution. (Vote 9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS48-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approved based on proponent's reason statement. The new text parallels horizontal assembly protections. (Vote 11-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS49-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal is not providing the clarity it seeks. There is concern about the insufficient testing. What is the science behind the 36 inch distance. Perhaps a more specific exception to the pipes which were the focus of the debate. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS50-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's reason statement. (Voter 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS51-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the rearrangement of this section. They found the arrangement consistent with other sections. Consistency helps users of the code. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS52-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides a good clean up of existing text. Text in 715.4.2 that is specific to installation is relocated to the installation section. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS53-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

Modify proposal as follows:

715.4.1 Fire test criteria.

Perimeter fire ~~barriers~~containment systems shall be tested in accordance with the requirements of ASTM E2307.

Exception: Voids created at the intersection of the exterior curtain wall assemblies and floor assemblies where the vision glass extends to the finished floor level shall be permitted to be protected with an approved material to prevent the interior spread of fire. Such material shall be securely installed and capable of preventing the passage of flame and hot gases sufficient to ignite cotton waste where subjected to ASTM E119 time-temperature fire conditions under a minimum positive pressure differential of 0.01 inch (0.254 mm) of water column (2.5 Pa) for the time period not less than the fire-resistance rating of the floor assembly.

Committee Reason: Through the new term and its definition, we now have a common method of identifying what is needed to address voids created by the intersection of exterior curtain wall assemblies and the rated floor/ceiling assemblies. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS54-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The intent of the proposal was for consistent use of the term 'curtain wall spandrel'. There were at least 2 locations where the needed amendment was not proposed. The proponent is urged to return with a public comment. (Vote 12-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS55-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS56-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

A clearer version of the table was provided.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no documentation of the two door design being an issue in the field. As the design is usually limited to connection just 2 guest rooms, the concern over fire spread is exaggerated. (Vote 8-6)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS57-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

A clearer version of the table was provided.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The current code provisions are preferred as they are part of critical fire protection. Rated glazing should be provided in these doors. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS58-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

A corrected version of the proposal is provided.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The testing procedures don't correlate for larger windows. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS59-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

The complete table was not shown in the original CAH agenda.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

In the 5th line of the table in the column labeled: Required Wall Assembly Ratings, the proposal creates 2 subcolumns with their own headers.

For the left of the 2 subcolumns the header is amended as follows:

Single wall assembly rating (hours)^f

For the right of the 2 subcolumns the header is amended as follows:

Each wall of the double wall assembly (hours)^g.

Notes:

- a. Two doors, each with a fire protection rating of 1¹/₂ hours, installed on opposite sides of the same opening in a fire wall, shall be deemed equivalent in fire protection rating to one 3-hour fire door.
- b. Fire-resistance-rated glazing tested to ASTM E119 in accordance with Section 716.1.2.3 shall be permitted, in the maximum size tested.
- c. Under the column heading "Fire-rated glazing marking door vision panel," W refers to the fire-resistance rating of the glazing, not the frame.
- d. See Section 716.2.5.1.2.1.
- e. See Section 716.1.2.2.1 and Table 716.1(1) for additional permitted markings.

f. As required in Section 706.4.

g. As allowed in NFPA 221 Section 4.6.

TYPE OF ASSEMBLY	REQUIRED WALL ASSEMBLY RATING (hours)	MINIMUM FIRE DOOR AND FIRE SHUTTER ASSEMBLY RATING (hours)	DOOR VISION PANEL SIZE ^b	FIRE-RATED GLAZING MARKING DOOR VISION PANEL ^{c, e}	MINIMUM SIDELIGHT/TRANSOM ASSEMBLY RATING (hours)	FIRE-RATED GLAZING MARKING SIDELIGHT/TRANSOM PANEL			
Fire protection	Fire resistance	Fire protection	Fire resistance						
Fire walls and fire barriers having a required fire-resistance rating greater than 1 hour	4	3	See Note b	D-H-W-240	Not Permitted	4	Not Permitted	W-240	
3	3a	See Note b	D-H-W-180	Not Permitted	3	Not Permitted	W-180		
2	1½	100 sq. in.	100 sq. in. = D-H-90 >100 sq. in.=D-H-W-90	Not Permitted	2	Not Permitted	W-120		
1½	1½	100 sq. in.	100 sq. in. = D-H-90 >100 sq. in.= D-H-W-90	Not Permitted	1½	Not Permitted	W-90		
	<u>Single wall assembly rating (hours)</u>	<u>Each wall of the double wall assembly (hours)</u>							
<u>Double Fire walls constructed in accordance with NFPA 221</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>See Note b</u>	<u>D-H-W-180</u>	<u>Not Permitted</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>Not Permitted</u>	<u>W-180</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1 1/2</u>	<u>100 sq. in.</u>	<u>100 sq. in. = D-H-90 >100 sq. in. = D-H-W-90</u>	<u>Not Permitted</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Not Permitted</u>	<u>W-120</u>	
<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100 sq. in.</u>	<u>100 sq. in. = D-H-60 >100 sq. in. = D-H-W-60</u>	<u>Not Permitted</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Not Permitted</u>	<u>W-60</u>	

Committee Reason: Improves upon proposal from last cycle. It provides option and flexibility for the double wall condition. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS60-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** The committee was convinced by the proponent's reasons statement. In addition, the doors are seeing wide ranging use in health care occupancies without documented issued. (Vote 11-3)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

FS61-18**Errata: This proposal includes published errata**

The first CAH version incorrectly showed the proposed change.

Committee Action:**Disapproved****Committee Reason:** Inconsistent between the provisions of Section 716.2.3.3.1 and the proposed text. The proposal allows exemption for any sprinkler system and not just the NFPA 13. (Vote 13-1)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

FS62-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:****Modify proposal as follows:****717.3.1 Damper testing.**

Dampers shall be listed and labeled in accordance with the standards in this section.

Fire dampers shall comply with the requirements of UL 555.

Smoke dampers shall comply with the requirements of UL 555S.

Combination fire/smoke dampers shall comply with the requirements of both UL 555 and UL 555S.

Ceiling radiation dampers shall comply with the requirements of UL 555C or shall be tested as part of a fire-resistance-rated floor/ceiling or roof/ceiling assembly in accordance with ASTM E119 or UL 263. ~~Only ceiling radiation dampers labeled for use in dynamic systems shall be installed in heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems designed to operate with fans on during a fire.~~

Corridor dampers shall comply with requirements of both UL 555 and UL 555S. Corridor dampers shall demonstrate acceptable closure performance when subjected to 150 feet per minute (0.76 mps) velocity across the face of the damper during the UL 555 fire exposure test.

Committee Reason: The modification simply eliminated duplicative text. The proposal then relocates installation requirements into the proper location. There was concern that the definition would be providing more information than it needs to and could be slimmed down via public comment. (Vote 13-1)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

FS63-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved****Committee Reason:** The committee preferred the revisions provided by FS62-18. (Vote 13-0).**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

FS64-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

Modify proposal as follows:

717.6.2.1.2 Static systems.

Static ceiling radiation dampers shall be provided with systems which are not designed to operate during a fire.

Exceptions:

1. Where a static ceiling radiation damper is installed at the opening of a duct, a smoke detector shall be installed inside the duct or outside the duct with sampling tubes protruding into the duct. The detector or tubes within the duct shall be within 5 feet (1524 mm) of the damper. Air outlets and inlets shall not be located between the detector or tubes and the damper. The detector shall be listed for the air velocity, temperature and humidity anticipated at the point where it is installed. Other than in mechanical smoke control systems, dampers shall be closed upon fan shutdown where local smoke detectors require a minimum velocity to operate.
2. Where a static ceiling radiation damper is installed in a ceiling, the ceiling radiation damper shall be permitted to be controlled by a smoke detection system installed within the same room or area as the ceiling radiation damper.
- ~~3. Where a static ceiling radiation damper is installed in an area served by the duct in which the damper will be located, the ceiling radiation damper shall be permitted to be controlled by the smoke detection system.~~
4. ~~3. Where a ceiling radiation damper is installed within a room and an occupant sensor is provided within the room served by the damper, a~~ A static ceiling radiation damper shall be permitted to be installed within a room where an occupant sensor is provided within the room that will shut down the down the system.

Committee Reason: The modification corrects for consistent terminology. Overall the committee was persuaded by the proponent's reason statement (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS65-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee was convinced by the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

Staff Analysis:

Section 607.3 of the IMC is linked to provisions of 717.3 of the IBC. Actions taken to amend the IBC will also be reflected by amendments to the IMC.

FS66-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

The CAH version showed more changes to the text than were actually proposed.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

Modify proposal as follows:

717.4 Access and identification ~~and periodic inspection and testing.~~

Access, and identification ~~and periodic inspection and testing~~ of fire and smoke dampers shall comply with Sections 717.4.1 through ~~717.4.3.~~ 717.4.2.

717.4.1 Access.

Fire and smoke dampers shall be provided with an approved means of access that is large enough to permit

inspection and maintenance of the damper and its operating parts. Dampers equipped with fusible links, internal operators, or both shall be provided with an access door that is not less than 12 inches (305 mm) square or provided with a removable duct section.

717.4.3 Periodic inspection and testing.

~~Periodic inspection and testing of fire dampers shall be in accordance with NFPA 80. Periodic inspection and testing of smoke dampers shall be in accordance with NFPA 105. Periodic inspection and testing of combination fire/smoke dampers shall be in accordance with NFPA 80 and NFPA 105.~~

Committee Reason: The proposal provides key information in the IBC regarding access to fire and smoke dampers. The access is needed for periodic testing required by the IFC. Therefore the construction aspects of providing the access is now positioned in the IBC. The modifications leave the periodic inspection and testing as part of the IFC. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS67-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal reflects common practice for many of these installations. It is consistent with the IMC. Flex duct is limited to 14 feet. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS68-18

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS69-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal expands an existing exception significantly. There is not adequate substantiation for this expansion. Among the issues is it expands the exception from occupancies required to provide fast response sprinkler heads to those which do not. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

Staff Analysis:

If this proposal is reconsidered and approved, changes made to the IBC text will also be made to text in Section 607 of the IMC which parallels these IBC provisions.

FS70-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee was convinced by the proponent's reason statement. The clarification of the guage is important. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

Staff Analysis:

New provisions in the IBC would be also added to Section 607 of the IMC.

FS71-18

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Text of FS67-18 preferred. The existing provision is flawed in that it allows unprotected openings within inches of the wall being protected. The proposal adds more openness to the already flawed provisions. (Vote 13-1).

Assembly Motion:**NONE****FS72-18****Committee Action:****Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:****Modify proposal as follows:****718.2.1 Fireblocking materials.**

Fireblocking shall consist of the following materials:

1. Two-inch (51 mm) nominal lumber.
2. Two thicknesses of 1-inch (25 mm) nominal lumber with broken lap joints.
3. One thickness of 0.719-inch (18.3 mm) wood structural panels with joints backed by 0.719-inch (18.3 mm) wood structural panels.
4. One thickness of 0.75-inch (19.1 mm) particleboard with joints backed by 0.75-inch (19 mm) particleboard.
5. One-half-inch (12.7 mm) gypsum board.
6. One-fourth-inch (6.4 mm) cement-based millboard.
7. Batts or blankets of mineral wool, mineral fiber or other approved materials installed in such a manner as to be securely retained in place.
8. Cellulose insulation ~~installed as tested in accordance with ASTM E119 or UL 263 for the specific application, tested in the form and manner intended for use to demonstrate its ability to remain in place and to retard the spread of fire and hot gases.~~

Committee Reason: The modification specifies the installation criteria. As #8 stands and would be amended it only states the testing criteria not how the material is used as fire blocking. The revised proposal makes #8 consistent with the other 7 items. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****FS73-18**

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC GENERAL COMMITTEE

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Mass timber is acceptable for fire blocking given the other materials on the list. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****FS74-18****Errata: This proposal includes unpublished errata**

The published proposal failed to include Section 1406.10.4 which was part of the proponent's submittal.

1406.10.4 Full-scale tests.

The MCM system shall be tested in accordance with, and comply with, the acceptance criteria of either NFPA-285, or the 16 foot parallel panel test as described in ANSI/FM 4880. Such testing shall be performed on the MCM system with the MCM in the maximum thickness intended for use.

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There has not been sufficient testing of the new standard to provide clear answers. It is not

equivalent to NFPA 285. The criteria in NFPA are clear and understood. There needs to be a broader range of testing. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS75-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no reason to add these provisions (pointers) in the table. The text already sufficiently address the concern. The pointer would be more confusing. Committee suggested that a major part of the issue here is that tables for a later section are presented in the code before the text of the section - and often in the midst of a previous section. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS76-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proponent's reason statement was persuasive. The product thickness in the table is not produced. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS77-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides a clearer organization to Section 722.1. It provides the updated and renamed PCI 124 standard.(Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS78-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal appears to be addressing structural capacity in the provisions regarding fire resistance. It adds an analysis that is not now required. This will add costs. It appears to be located in the wrong location of the code.. The existing section is about concrete cover, the code change is about structural strength. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS79-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee was convinced by the information provided in the proponent's reason statement including the range of test results. The use of equivalent thicknesses is nothing new to concrete construction. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS81-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC GENERAL COMMITTEE

Committee Action:**Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:**

In the column of TABLE 722.7.1(2) that addresses 1/2 inch Type X Gypsum Board, change the protection contribution value (in minutes) to 25 instead of 30.

Committee Reason: The modification coordinates well with the existing language in the code. The committee recommends approval based upon the proponent's reason statement. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****FS82-18****Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee determined there was no data presented to indicate there was a problem, the committee was unclear what the proposal applied to, and they had concerns for potential unintended consequences. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion:**NONE****FS83-18****Errata: This proposal includes published errata**

Section numbers shown to indicate the coordinating section in the IFC that will change.

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee did not find adequate fire issues associated with bathrooms to warrant the proposed requirements, and desired consistency with the G-7 decision, which was disapproval of a proposal to eliminate toilet room privacy partitions from the definition of Interior Wall and Ceiling Finish. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****FS84-18****Errata: This proposal includes published errata**

Section numbers shown to indicate the coordinating section in the IFC that will change.

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee concluded site fabricated stretch systems were intended to be Class A and therefor the requirements of Class A are appropriate to reference in accordance with Section 803.1.2. Approved as Submitted (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****FS85-18****Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the current table is understandable and not in need of clarification. Furthermore they concluded corridors should not be split between sprinkled and non-sprinkled as proposed. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****FS86-18**

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the modification appropriately aligns the IBC with the IFC. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS87-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposed change was not necessary. While the concept was acceptable, and currently allowed by code, it did not need to be required. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS88-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee found no reason or technical data for the change. Disapproved (Vote 12-2).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS89-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee determined there was no technical substantiation for the change. (Vote 13-1).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS90-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposal provides a flexible approach for buffering pressure and is a worthy addition to the code. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS91-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposed requirements needs to be in the IBC, not provided as a reference to the IECC, and a limitation to the prescriptive approach was not desirable. (Vote 10-4).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS92-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee concluded the proposal was too broad and conflicted with current widespread practices. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS93-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval after he had tabled the item. He was unable to address the concerns with the proposal in the time frame of the day. (Vote 13-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS94-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee deemed the proposed pointer not necessary, indicating users should know to use all the codes. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS95-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated the proposal was difficult to understand and the issue should be addressed in Section 1405. (Vote 9-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS96-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the modification (Nickson 8) was out of order, upon which the proponent requested disapproval. The committee disapproved, noting the language was cumbersome and complex, and there was no merit without the modification. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS97-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It was disapproved as requested by proponent for consistency with previous action on FS97. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS98-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: It was approved based on proponent's reason statement. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS99-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

The table did not appear in the CAH.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee concluded there are too many questions of how wall geometry and wind are considerations in the testing procedures, there is no standardized method for measuring the effects of wind on fire, and it is not known how wind will effect buildings over 40'. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS101-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee concluded the proposal does not meet the stated objective for water-resistance if the only trigger to test is the existence of a water-resistant barrier. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS102-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee determined there was no compelling evidence for the code change, the language did not belong in this section, nor did the section need expanding. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS103-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee determined there was no technical justification to introduce fire retardant treated wood. (Vote 12-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS104-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee concluded the proposal did not contribute to improved fire safety, it did not clarify the properties of first resistant barriers, nor did it define adhered veneer. (Vote 13-1).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS105-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

1402.5 Vertical and lateral flame propagation.

Exterior walls on buildings of Type I, II, III or IV construction that are greater than 40 feet (12 192 mm) in height above grade plane and contain a combustible water-resistive barrier shall be tested in accordance with and comply with the acceptance criteria of NFPA 285. Combustibility shall be determined in accordance with Section 703.5. For the purposes of this section, fenestration products, flashing of fenestration products and water-resistive-barrier flashing and accessories at other locations, including through wall flashings, shall not be considered part of the water-resistive barrier.

Exceptions:

1. Walls in which the water-resistive barrier is the only combustible component and the exterior

wall has a wall covering of brick, concrete, stone, terra cotta, stucco or steel with minimum thicknesses in accordance with Table 1404.2.

2. Walls in which the water-resistive barrier is the only combustible component and the water-resistive barrier has a peak heat release rate of less than 150 kW/m², a total heat release of less than 20 MJ/m² and an effective heat of combustion of less than 18 MJ/kg as determined in accordance with ASTM E1354 and has a flame spread index of 25 or less and a smoke-developed index of 450 or less as determined in accordance with ASTM E84 or UL 723. The ASTM E1354 test shall be conducted on specimens at the thickness intended for use, in the horizontal orientation and at an incident radiant heat flux of 50 kW/m².

~~3. Water-resistive barriers complying with Section 703.5.2.~~

Committee Reason: The overall proposal, as modified, provides need clarity using existing language, The modification added charging language for how to determine combustibility. It cleans up the language of the section and provides a pointer where needed. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS106-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the action on FS108-18 the committee disapproved. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS107-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the action on FS108-18 the committee disapproved, (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS108-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

1403.2 Water-resistive barrier.

Not fewer than one layer of water-resistive barrier material ~~No.15 asphalt felt, complying with ASTM D226 for Type 1 felt or other approved materials with a water resistance complying with ASTM E2556, Type I,~~ shall be attached to the studs or sheathing, with flashing as described in Section 1404.4, in such a manner as to provide a continuous water-resistive barrier behind the exterior wall veneer. Water-resistive barriers shall comply with one of the following:

(1) No. 15 felt complying with ASTM D226, Type 1,

(2) ASTM E2556, Type I or II,

(3) ASTM E331 in accordance with Section 1402.2, or

(4) other approved materials installed in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions.

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposal clarifies the intent of the section, the modification addresses all material types, allows for innovation, and is consistent with appropriate standard references. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS109-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposed change was both unnecessary and inconsistent - the

pointer did not direct to the correct section. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS110-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee concluded the existing language was clear without this change, and this broadened the scope of with regards to plastics. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS111-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee indicated cladding is already addressed in Section 1405, and there is no data that it would be safe in Type V construction. The currently language has been vetted and was overwhelmingly approved in the last code change cycle. (Vote 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS112-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposal would reduce the potential distance between buildings, contrary to the reason statement. (Vote 13-0).

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS113-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee determined the additional language provided a useful pointer to Chapter 26. (Vote 10-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS114-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee concluded that because the assemblies are sold as a system, rather than individual components, they need to be tested as such. (Vote 9-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS115-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS116-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS117-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS118-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1404.3.1 Class I and II vapor retarders.

Class I and II vapor retarders shall not be provided on the interior side of frame walls in Zones 1 and 2. Class I vapor retarders shall not be provided on the interior side of frame walls in Zones 3 and 4 other than Marine 4. Class I or II vapor retarders shall be provided on the interior side of frame walls in Zones 5, 6, 7, 8 and Marine 4. The appropriate zone shall be selected in accordance with Chapter 3 [CE] of the International Energy Conservation Code-Commercial Provisions.

Exceptions:

Basement walls.

Below-grade portion of any wall.

Construction where moisture or its freezing will not damage the materials.

Class I and II vapor retarders with vapor ~~permeability~~ permeance greater than 1 perm when measured by ASTM E96 water method (Procedure B) shall be allowed on the interior side of any frame wall in all climate zones.

Conditions where Class III vapor retarders are required in Section 1404.3.2.

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposed change was consistent with FS108-18, which had previously been approved, and would allow the dry to the inside and avoid getting wet from the outside. The modification appropriately replaced the word permeability with permeance. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS119-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponents reason statement, and the committee determined it clarifies application of the code. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS120-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1404.3.1 Class I and II vapor retarders.

Class I and II vapor retarders shall not be provided on the interior side of frame walls in Zones 1 and 2. Class I vapor retarders shall not be provided on the interior side of frame walls in Zones 3 and 4 other than Marine 4. Class I or II vapor retarders shall be provided on the interior side of frame walls in Zones 5, 6, 7, 8 and Marine 4. Where a Class II vapor retarder is used in combination with foam plastic insulating sheathing installed as continuous insulation on the exterior side of frame walls, the continuous insulation shall comply with Table 1404.3.1 and the Class II vapor retarder shall have a vapor permeance greater than 1 perm when measured by ASTM E96 water method (Procedure B). Use of a Class I interior vapor retarder in frame walls with a Class I vapor retarder on the exterior side shall require an approved design. The appropriate zone shall be selected in accordance with Chapter 3 [CE] of the International Energy Conservation Code-Commercial Provisions.

Committee Reason: Approval of the proposal was based on the proponents reason statement. The modification introduced the appropriate standard - ASTM E 96. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS121-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponents reason statement, and approval of FS120. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS122-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

~~1404.3.2.1 Foam plastic insulating sheathing for moisture control with Class III vapor retarders.~~

~~Where foam plastic insulating sheathing with a perm rating of less than 1 is installed in accordance with Table 1404.3.2 on the exterior side of the frame wall, only Class III vapor retarders shall be used on the interior side of the frame wall.~~

Committee Reason: Approval as modified was based on the proponents reason statement, and consistency with previous approvals. The committee found the modification removed inconsistencies in the proposal with previous FS actions. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS123-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: At the request of the proponent, the committee dismissed the proposal based on previous actions. Disapproved (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS124-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: At the request of the proponent, the committee dismissed the proposal based on previous actions. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS125-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS126-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved as requested by the proponent. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS127-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS128-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the approval of FS127-18 and the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS130-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposal was a useful tie to the IECC. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS131-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS132-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

Modify proposal as follows:

1404.3.4 Minimum airspaces and vented openings for vented cladding.

For the purposes of this section, vented cladding shall include the following minimum clear-airspaces:

1. Vinyl, polypropylene or horizontal aluminum siding applied over a weather-resistive barrier as

- specified in this chapter.
- 2. Brick veneer with an airspace as specified in this code.
- 3. Other approved vented claddings.

Committee Reason: The committee determined the modification, Clark 1, appropriately aligned the proposal language with that approved in FS117. Modification Approved (Vote 14-0).
Approval was based on the proponent's reason statement. Approved as Modified (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS133-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposed change was appropriate in that it expanded the use and application of the code. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS134-18

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS135-18

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS136-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved based on the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS137-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved based on the proponent's reason statement. Approved as Submitted (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS138-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee dismissed based on the approval of FS139. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS139-18

Errata: This proposal includes no errata

-

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved based on the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS140-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

The table number and title were not deleted in the CAH.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: As requested by the proponent, the committee dismissed based on the approval of FS139. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS141-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposal language clarified when metal composite materials should be tests as an assembly. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS142-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved based on the approval of FS139. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS143-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved based on the approval of FS139. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS144-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved based on the approval of FS139. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS145-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved based on the proponent's reason statement, noting the proposed

language would only be added if FS139 was not approved, because the actions of FS139 would supercede. (Vote 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS146-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposal clarified that when there is foam, it needs testing. (Vote: 13-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS147-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

Code change number FS148-18 was combined with FS147-18.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee concluded the proposal provides an additional option of using NFPA 286. (Vote 13-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS149-18

Errata: This proposal includes unpublished errata

Adding Section 1406.10.4.1 was part of the proponent's original submittal.

Add the following text

1406.10.4.1 Window protection.

Where window openings are provided within the installed wall assembly, they shall be covered as follows:

1.Where the assembly was tested per NFPA 285,provide protection as provided in the actual test.

2.Where the assembly was tested per ANSI/FM 4880, provide minimum 20 ga. (0.03595 in, 0.9 mm) steel flashing around the window opening, fastened at a maximum spacing of 16 in. (406 mm) on center into the wall structure using no. 10 (5 mm) screws.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved based on the proponent's request, due to the disapproval of FS74. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS150-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

Code change number FS151-18 was combined with FS150-18.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposal correctly correlates the appropriate testing and referencing NFPA 285. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS152-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee did not agree with eliminating all reference to UL1703, but determined that the reference did not belong in this section. The proposal was approved with request for public comment to add a reference to the IBC section that requires UL 1703. (Vote 12-1).

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS153-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

The table did not appear in the CAH.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposal provides greater consistency in the code. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS154-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee did not find compelling evidence for the proposed deletion of language. (Vote 7-6).

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS155-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal based on proponent's reason statement. (Vote 13-0).

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS156-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee did not find the proponent's evidence compelling nor did they agree with the cost statement. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS157-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

Section 2603.5 should have been deleted without substitution.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Following the proponent's request for disapproval and an opportunity to address the issues with a public comment, the committee disapproved (Vote 13-0).

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FS158-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposal introduces a list standard and good tool. (Vote 12-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS159-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the benefit of limiting the installation to 75 feet. (Vote 12-1).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS160-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 13-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FS161-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the additional language was not necessary. (Vote 12-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

2018 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE – GENERAL

GENERAL CODE COMMITTEE

Gary Lewis, Chair
Chief Inspector
City of Summit
Summitt, NJ

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

Matt Belcher
Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Principal
Verdatek Solutions LLC
Wildwood, MO

Brian Bishop, CBO
Deputy Building Official
City of Des Moines
Des Moines, IA

Amy T. Carpenter, AIA
Senior Designer/Project Manager-Vice President
SFCS Architects
Blue Bell, PA

John Catlett, MCP
Director of Codes & Standards
BOMA International
Washington, DC

Jenifer Gilliland, MPA
Code Development Analyst
City of Seattle
Seattle, WA

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

Ron E. Hampton, MCP, CBO
Field Inspector II
KY Department of Housing, Building & Const.
Div. Building Code Enforcement
Catlettsburg, KY

Eirene Knott, MCP, CBO, CFM
Director of Code Services
BRR Architecture
Merriam, KS

Thomas Pitchford, CBO
Chief Building Official
Greenwood, Village, CO

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

Michael Shannon, PE, CBO
Development Services Director-Building Official
City of San Antonio, Development Services
Department
San Antonio, TX

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

James M. Williams, AIA, PE, CE, SE, LEED AP
President
AE URBIA
South Jordan, UT

Staff Secretariat

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

Allan Bilka, RA
Senior Staff Architect
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hills, IL

International Building Code - General

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

G1-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the testimony of the proponents was clear, the proposal results in confusion. It is better to leave the definition we have and not add confusion based on regulations and exemptions in Chapter 10. (Vote 9-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G2-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The existing definition is preferred to this proposal. Atriums are characterized by be a space closed at the top and this takes that key feature out of the definition. The listing of sections to say what an atrium is not is an unusual code structure. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G3-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: It correctly defines a word used in the codes, and provides good clarification. (Vote 9-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G4-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: By adding "emergency escape and rescue openings" the defined term will match how the term is used in the requirements. The change in the definition will allow for doors and windows. Using "bottom of the clear opening" will improve consistency for where to measure for the bottom of the opening. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G5-18 Part I

THIS IS A TWO PART CODE CHANGE. PART 1 WAS HEARD BY THE IBC MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE. PART 2 WAS HEARD BY THE PROPERTY MAINTENANCE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Adding 'exterior' clarifies where the emergency escape and rescue openings are required and utilized. This will also improve consistency between the requirements in the different codes. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G5-18 Part II

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

EMERGENCY ESCAPE AND RESCUE OPENING. An operable exterior window, door or other similar device that provides for a means of escape and access for rescue in the event of an emergency.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the definition of EERO should be consistent among the I-codes. The modification inserts "exterior" for further consistency with the definition in other I-codes. (Vote: 9-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G6-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposal defined a term that is already in the IRC. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G7-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The code has considered toilet and shower partitions as part of the interior finish at least since the 2006. They need to be tested to meet interior finish criteria. Without compliance they can significantly add to any fire in such rooms. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G8-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed definition doesn't solve any issues, but would raise more. Would motorized toys be included? The format of the proposal is not a full definition but relies on a laundry list to try to say what is a motorized vehicle. For now the dictionary definition is sufficient. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G9-18

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G10-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposed language was not needed and it was misleading.
(Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G11-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposed language provided a useful, clarifying definition. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G12-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Both procedures are needed to address the variety of materials and products being used. Further it is appropriate that it is either Procedure A or Procedure B because each material or product needs to pass the analysis that is appropriate. Passing both procedures is not required. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G13-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee viewed this as a simple series of fixes that will make the code easier to use. While there is hesitancy to add too many 'pointers' in the code, the committee concluded this set would be useful.
(Vote 10-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G14-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed change doesn't accomplish a great deal. Treating a school's larger assembly spaces as a separate occupancy will create problems for design and use of the buildings. The 300 occupant factor seems arbitrary. The change is regressive. The issue has been dealt with in the past and the current language provides the solution to that previous debate. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G15-18 Part I

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Section 303.1.1 allows smaller assembly spaces to be classified as Group B. The committee felt that this section addressed the issue adequately. The committee also noted that the size of the space may not be the

best threshold, but how the space is being used may warrant a classification other than A-3 for galleries. (Vote 12-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G15-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval of this proposal will match the action of the General Code Development Committee for Part 1. There was no technical justification for the 30 square foot gross. If the art gallery is a mercantile space, the current occupant load factor is 60 sq.ft. - what is different for an art gallery? How is an art gallery different from an exhibition space? What type of space this is intended to address needs to be clarified. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G16-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The definition has unintended consequences. By making a fuel specific definition and subsequent regulations, other fueled vehicles would appear to be unregulated. Electric vehicles alone present hazards which this proposal would not address and perhaps were result in such vehicles being unregulated. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G17-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Energy storage needs are increasing as part of the electrical grid. Adding ESS as a dedicated use to the F-1 occupancy categories is consistent with energy generation facilities. The proposal is consistent with the IFC rewrite to Section 1206. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G18-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

306.2 Moderate-hazard factory industrial, Group F-1.

Factory industrial uses that are not classified as Factory Industrial F-2 Low Hazard shall be classified as F-1 Moderate Hazard and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Aircraft (manufacturing, not to include repair)
- Appliances
- Athletic equipment
- Automobiles and other motor vehicles
- Bakeries
- Beverages: over 16-percent alcohol content
- Bicycles
- Boats
- Brooms or brushes
- Business machines
- Cameras and photo equipment

- Canvas or similar fabric
- Carpets and rugs (includes cleaning)
- Clothing
- Construction and agricultural machinery
- Disinfectants
- Dry cleaning and dyeing
- Electric generation plants
- Electronics
- Engines (including rebuilding)
- Food processing establishments and commercial kitchens not associated with restaurants, cafeterias and similar dining facilities more than 2,500 square feet (232 m²) in area.
- Furniture
- Hemp products
- Jute products
- Laundries
- Leather products
- Machinery
- Metals
- Millwork (sash and door)
- Motion pictures and television filming (without spectators)
- Musical instruments
- Optical goods
- Paper mills or products
- Photographic film
- Plastic products
- Printing or publishing
- Recreational vehicles
- Refuse incineration
- Shoes
- Soaps and detergents
- Textiles
- Tobacco
- Trailers
- Upholstering
- Water/Sewer Treatment Facilities
- Wood; distillation
- Woodworking (cabinet)

306.3 Low-hazard factory industrial, Group F-2.

Factory industrial uses that involve the fabrication or manufacturing of noncombustible materials that during finishing, packing or processing do not involve a significant fire hazard shall be classified as F-2 occupancies and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Beverages: up to and including 16-percent alcohol content
- Brick and masonry
- Ceramic products
- Foundries

- Glass products
- Gypsum
- Ice
- Metal products (fabrication and assembly)
- ~~Water/Sewer Treatment Facilities~~

Committee Reason: The committee found the testimony persuasive that the F-2 occupancy category doesn't reflect the potential hazards, therefore they approved a modification to switch the occupancy F-1. There was concern that some of the materials used, especially in water treatment, may exceed MAQ's and a Group H occupancy may be more appropriate. Since an H occupancy category would need to be determined on a case by case basis regardless of any classification approved at this time the committee was comfortable with the F-1 classification.. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G19-18

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G20-18

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G21-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

The image in the reason statement was improved.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Clarifies that dwelling units used as transient lodging such as short term rentals through systems such as Air B & B should also be classified as Group R-1.. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G22-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change provides clarity as well as coordination between the IBC and IRC. It doesn't preclude local amendment options to remove the requirement. (Vote: 9-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G23-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE GENERAL CODE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.PART II WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE CODE COMMITTEE.

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

Replacing an image in the reason statement.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Rather than clarifying aircraft hanger classification, the proposal confuses. It would appear to leave out of the classifications for simple storage hangers where no FBO servicing is occurring. It also may confuse where service is provided by others than a FBO. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G23-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the proposed revisions to the section exception in regards to the reference standard requirements and the use of the undefined terms of "major maintenance" and "overhaul" were the reasons for disapproval. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G24-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Electrical rooms and mechanical rooms are not storage rooms and it would be a dangerous misleading of the code user to classify them as storage occupancies. The proposal conflicts with G17-18. The proposal does raise the question of occupancy classification for such spaces and whether they are part of the occupancy they support or need to be individually identified. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G25-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: While this doesn't resolve a conflict with the IZC, it does resolve a conflict internal to the IBC. Fences of this height are exempt from permit. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G26-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G27-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement. The need for this pointer was found wanting. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G28-18

THIS CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IFC COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G29-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The deletion of this section was approved. Since emergency escape and rescue openings are never required in high rise buildings in Section 1030, an exception in the high rise building section is not needed. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G30-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The definition of atrium is broken because code users frequently try to impose Section 404 requirements on openings which aren't atriums. This change will provide clear guidance to designers to say that elements of the building complying with one of the listed sections from 712.1 are not subject to atrium provisions. (Vote: 14-0).

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G31-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Locating the requirements for means of egress in a atrium in Chapter 10 will make it easier for users to determine the the egress requirements for a building as a whole. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G32-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

Modify proposal as follows:

404.5 Smoke control.

A smoke control system shall be installed in accordance with Section 909.

Exceptions:

1. In other than Group I-2, and Group I-1, Condition 2, smoke control is not required for atriums that connect only two stories.
2. A smoke control system is not required for atriums connecting more than two stories when all of the following are met:
 - 2.1. Only the 2 lowest stories shall be permitted to be open to the atrium.
 - 2.2. All stories above the lowest 2 stories shall be separated from the atrium in accordance with ~~Section 404.6~~ the provision for a shaft in Section 713.4.

Committee Reason: Clarifies that the code allows a combination of an atrium with a shaft enclosure. The exception

provides an alternative where a natural smoke sink is provided. The modification clarifies that the extension of the atrium needs to meet shaft construction requirements. The proposal doesn't redefine atrium, but replaces smoke control with a natural sink. The proponent may wish to consider via a public comment addressing a hatch or similar means to vent smoke at the top of the shaft. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G33-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed revision helps clarify in the code where other treatments of 'holes in the building' can be associated with an atrium. Some believe these two measures make clear designs already allowed by the code. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G34-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

404.6 Enclosure of atriums.

Atrium spaces shall be separated from adjacent spaces by a 1-hour fire barrier constructed in accordance with Section 707 or a horizontal assembly constructed in accordance with Section 711, or both.

Exceptions:

1. A fire barrier is not required where a glass wall forming a smoke partition ~~or a 20-minute fire protective curtain assembly~~ is provided. The glass wall ~~or fire protective curtain assembly~~ shall comply with all of the following:
 - 1.1. Automatic sprinklers are provided along both sides of the separation wall, ~~fire protective curtain assembly~~ and doors, or on the room side only if there is not a walkway on the atrium side. The sprinklers shall be located between 4 inches and 12 inches (102 mm and 305 mm) away from the glass and at intervals along the glass ~~or fire protective curtain assembly~~ not greater than 6 feet (1829 mm). The sprinkler system shall be designed so that the entire surface of the glass ~~or fire protective curtain assembly~~ is wet upon activation of the sprinkler system without obstruction;
 - 1.2. The glass wall shall be installed in a gasketed frame in a manner that the framing system deflects without breaking (loading) the glass before the sprinkler system operates; and
 - ~~1.3. The fire protective curtain assembly shall be installed in accordance with Section 716.4 and shall be actuated in conjunction with the atrium smoke control system, and~~
 - ~~1.4. 1.3~~ Where glass doors are provided in the glass wall, they shall be either self-closing or automatic-closing.
2. A fire barrier is not required where a glass-block wall assembly complying with Section 2110 and having a ³/₄-hour fire protection rating is provided.
3. A fire barrier is not required between the atrium and the adjoining spaces of up to three floors of the atrium provided that such spaces are accounted for in the design of the smoke control system.
4. A fire barrier is not required between the atrium and the adjoining spaces where the atrium is not required to be provided with a smoke control system.

Chapter 35- UL

10D-14 17:

Standard for Fire Tests of Fire Protective Curtain Assemblies

Committee Reason: The proposal is a simplified version (after the modification) of the original. The products have been used for years through the alternative methods process, they should be recognized in the code. (Vote: 8-6)

G35-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved because current Section 1023.2 already allows for a stairway within an atrium to be considered an exit stairway. This language in Items 2 and 3 would clarify that the exit access travel distance and exit separation requirements is measured to the top of the stairway. While the language in Item 1 for two directions could be subject to interpretation, Items 1 and 4 do further limit where a stairway in an atrium can serve as an exit, so this would improve safety. (Vote: 8-7)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

G36-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agrees with the proponent that not having slopes in these open parking garages of concrete construction jeopardizes their long term durability. Snow and water need a clear method for drainage. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

G37-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was not convinced there was evidence which warranted this increase in size. Testimony of recent fire loss in an open parking garage prompts concern. Another change has been proposed to the fire code to sprinkler these open parking garages. It was suggested if the sprinkler requirement passes, then a public comment for approval of this item for the Richmond hearing may be appropriate. More information is needed to approve this increase at this time. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

G38-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved because there were no problems identified with the single exit from parking garages where the cars are automatically parked. Typically the attendant does not remain with the vehicle once they put the car on the docking system, so the attendants would probably not be on upper floors in the building. The only people on the floors would be someone doing a repair, so the occupant load is extremely low. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

G39-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee sees the need to improve the code in this topic, but found the current proposal needs substantial work. They pointed out the following areas needing improvement: sprinkler design criteria; smoke control; the fire control equipment control room and to what extent it needs to parallel other control rooms, definition

complexity and the impact this could have on low income housing. The proponent was urged to work with the BCAC to develop improved criteria. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G40-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approved based on proponent's reason statement. In addition, the changes make the provisions easier to enforce and bring the IBC closer to the CMS requirements. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G41-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Again, this brings the IBC into closer concurrence with the CMS requirements. It better addresses concerns related to patient use of the equipment. (Vote: 10-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G42-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal also coordinates with the federal guidelines. There is concern regarding the enforceability of some of the text such as 'close fitting operational tolerances'. As the health care industry is already complying with this language via the federal guidelines, the committee approved the proposal in order for the concepts to get into the code - and with hopes that the language can be improved. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G43-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE

Errata: This proposal includes the following errata

Editorial modifications:

407.4.4.3 Access to corridor. Every care suite shall have a door leading directly to an exit access corridor or horizontal exit. Movement from habitable rooms within the care suite shall not require more than 100 feet (30 480 mm) of travel within the care suite to a door leading to the exit access corridor or horizontal exit. Where a care suite is required to have more than one exit access door by Section 407.4.4.5.2 or 407.4.4.6.2, the additional door shall lead directly to an exit access corridor, horizontal exit or an adjacent suite.

Exceptions:

The distance of travel shall be permitted to be increased to 125 feet (38 100 mm) where an automatic smoke detection system is provided throughout the care suite and installed in accordance with NFPA 72.

Where two or more exit access doors are required by Section 407.4.4.5.2 or 407.4.4.6.2, not more than one of the doors shall be permitted to be an exit door leading to an exit stairway, exit ramp, exit passageway, or an exterior exit door.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee modified Section 407.4.4.3 to consistently use the defined term "care suite" instead of just "suite". The addition of "of" in the main text and "an" in Exception 2 was for better grammar. This was viewed as editorial only, so the committee did not vote on a modification.

The proposal was approved as appropriate for a facility that used a defend-in-place strategy for occupant safety during a fire event. This will coordinate the IBC with CMS requirements, thus reducing potential conflicts for hospitals and nursing homes. The committee suggested that Exception 2 is really a requirement, and should be moved up into the main text.(Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G44-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Removal of the exception would be consistent with CMS/federal requirements for healthcare. Removal of this extended dead end allowance would be an increase in safety for occupants in a care suite. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G45-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE IBC MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved for several reasons. There was no justification for the 22,500 sq.ft. size allowance - this seems large for the non-patient-care suites in a hospital or nursing home facility. The requirements in Section 407.4.5.1 for exit access appears to have conflicts with existing Section 407.4.4.1. Defining these business areas as a type of suite may cause confusion with the current requirements for patient care suites. These types of spaces can already be addressed in the codes using requirements currently in place. The reason statement only discusses these areas in Type 1 construction. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G46-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approved based on proponent reason statement and to further align with federal standards. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G47-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recognized that the code sets up an impossible task requiring the smoke control system to maintain a tenable environment. Such is not feasible in the area of origin, but eliminating that phrase extends the requirement to 'everywhere' in the building. The committee encouraged the proponent to seek a solution via a public comment. (Vote: 9-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G48-18

Errata: This proposal includes the following errata

The revision is editorial because the final number of subsections is not expanding.

411.1 General.

Special amusement areas having an occupant load of 50 or more shall comply with the requirements for the appropriate Group A occupancy and Sections 411.1 through ~~411.7, 411.8~~. Special amusement areas having an occupant load of less than 50 shall comply with the requirements for a Group B occupancy and Sections 411.1 through ~~411.7, 411.8~~.

Exception: Special amusement areas that are without walls or a roof and constructed to prevent the accumulation of smoke need not comply with this section.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal as a welcome improvement to the Amusement Area section as well as its inclusion of puzzle rooms. That said, the committee had many suggestions for further wordsmithing of the text including the definition. Improvements the committee felt should be considered include addressing standby personnel and some additional guidance for the building official when considering an alternative design (Section 411.5). (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G49-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

~~415.6.1 Liquid use, dispensing and mixing rooms and r~~**415.6.1 Rooms for flammable or combustible liquid use, dispensing or mixing in open systems.** ~~Liquid use, dispensing and mixing rooms and r~~Rooms for flammable or combustible liquid use, dispensing or mixing in open systems, ~~where vapors are emitted,~~ having a floor area of not more than 500 square feet (46.5 m²) need not be located on the outer perimeter of the building where they are in accordance with the International Fire Code and NFPA 30.

415.6.2 Liquid storage rooms and rooms for flammable or combustible liquid use in closed systems. Liquid storage rooms and rooms for flammable or combustible liquid use in closed systems, ~~where no vapors are emitted,~~ having a floor area of not more than 1,000 square feet (93 m²) need not be located on the outer perimeter where they are in accordance with the International Fire Code and NFPA 30.

~~507.8.1.1.1 Liquid use, dispensing and mixing rooms and r~~**507.8.1.1.1 Rooms for flammable or combustible liquid use, dispensing or mixing in open systems.** ~~Liquid use, dispensing and mixing rooms and r~~Rooms for flammable or combustible liquid use, dispensing or mixing in open systems, ~~where vapors are emitted, and~~ having a floor area of not more than 500 square feet (46.5 m²) need not be located on the outer perimeter of the building where they are in accordance with the International Fire Code and NFPA 30.

~~507.8.1.1.2 Liquid storage rooms and rooms for flammable or combustible liquid use in closed systems.~~ **507.8.1.1.2 Liquid storage rooms and rooms for flammable or combustible liquid use in closed systems.** Liquid storage rooms and rooms for flammable or combustible liquid use in closed systems, ~~where no vapors are emitted,~~ having a floor area of not more than 1,000 square feet (93 m²) need not be located on the outer perimeter where they are in accordance with the International Fire Code and NFPA 30.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement and and appropriately recognizes the difference in hazard between closed and open use. The modification reduces the unnecessary verbiage. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G50-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it will be difficult to apply to multi-story buildings and would not work with Group H-5 occupancies. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G51-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G52-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G53-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee did not approve of this duplication of a code requirement found elsewhere. In this case the committee in general found the existing pointer adequate and 'educational' to the code user. A suggestion to have the pointer name the type of partition to be used would improve the provision. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G54-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would attempt to required buildings with stepped facades to be analyzed as if the steps represent different buildings on the same property. The committee found the proposal to be vague and unenforceable. It is not adequately supported with data that the building designs which it would prohibit are in fact, providing dangerous design conditions. . A case to require a building to be protected from itself was not made. The committee felt that the cost of construction was significantly understated. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G55-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change provides consistency with similar provisions addressing Group I-2 occupancies and provides more consistency with federal standards. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G56-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approved based on proponent's reason. Further coordination with federal standards. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G57-18

Errata: This proposal includes no errata

A clearer version of the table was provided.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent did not provide technical justification for the change. The provisions already require sprinkler protection. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G58-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal was part of a package updating federal health care standards. See proponent's reason statement. (Vote: 14-0}

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G59-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change improves the coordination between the code and the storm shelter standard. It also is more usable for designers. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G60-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was not found to improve application of the requirements, but instead it would add confusion. Adding 'tornado' in a number of locations removed the application of the provisions for hurricane shelters. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G61-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would only confuse code users. School facilities which have a part time use of day care are not exempted from this requirement. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G62-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee feels the existing text is preferred to that which is proposed. In this case the word accessory is clear in its application. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G63-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found that the existing text is clearer than that in the proposal. The correct term is occupant load, not occupant capacity. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G64-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was found to be unacceptable as it changed how the size of shelters would be determined. The size of shelters would likely be smaller based on this proposed text. As many school facilities are widely used by the community, the adults have as much right to safety provided by shelters as do the students. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G65-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee concluded that the proposed language of 'largest' assembly space was clearer than 'any' assembly space. While some have interpreted 'any' to mean 'all' assembly spaces, such interpretation is not universal. (Vote: 9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G66-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

The proposal is corrected.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

424.2 Materials.

Play structures shall be constructed of noncombustible materials or of combustible materials that comply with the following:

Items 1 through 9 are unchanged by the modifications.

10. Interior finishes for structures exceeding 600 ~~300~~ square feet (56 ~~28~~ m²) in area or 10 feet (3048 mm) in height shall have a flame spread index not greater than that specified in Table 803.13 for the occupancy group and location designated. Interior wall and ceiling finish materials tested in accordance with NFPA 286 and meeting the acceptance criteria of Section 803.1.1.1, shall be permitted to be used where a Class A classification in accordance with ASTM E84 or UL 723 is required.

424.5.1 Design.

Play structures exceeding 300 ~~600~~ square feet (56 ~~28~~ m²) in area or 10 feet (3048 mm) in height shall be designed in accordance with ~~Section 1601.1~~ Chapter 16.

Committee Reason: The modifications coordinate with G68-18 with respect to the change from 300 to 600 and simplification of the reference to be broader in coverage. The proposal recognizes a growth of play structures being used by all ages and the limit of the code to children's play structures isn't warranted. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G67-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the section addresses a unique situation and that the play structures are not intended to include more than what the current language requires. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G68-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

424.5 Area limits.

Children's play structures ~~complying with Section 424.2~~ shall be not greater than 600 square feet (56 m²) in area, unless a special investigation, acceptable to the building official, has demonstrated adequate fire safety.

Committee Reason: The modification removed a circular reference to a section which all play structures need to comply any way. The balance of the change increases the testing threshold to something more easily tested. Both the original 300 square feet and the proposed 600 square feet are selected thresholds not tied to other provisions or test criteria. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G69-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as the fire code official can request a technical report to review which standards would be applicable. This provides the ability to address the specific hazard only as necessary. (Vote: 13-1).

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G70-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the action for approval as submitted taken on G69-18 which may have potential conflicts. Some committee members did appreciate the detail provided in this proposal. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G71-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE GENERAL CODE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.PART II WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was support on the committee for the basic concept of the change. The activity is occurring and needs to be addressed in the code. The proposal needs work based an the extensive testimony and the committee encourage all parties to work toward an improved proposal. The proposal should address the

modifications proposed. The application seems overly broad and needs to be more specific. The use of plastics needs to be coordinated with Chapter 26. FTRW needs to be more clearly addressed, perhaps in its own section. It is hoped that results from ongoing tests will be available for the fall. The ACM panels need to be addressed clearly. This defaults to a special investigation in almost every case therefore the review criteria of the special investigation should be specified. Can this be done without a lot of pointers? Finally it needs to distinguish between small racks that someone might erect in their garage and the substantially larger structure or structures in a former warehouse building. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G71-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This was disapproved based upon the action on G71-18 Part I which was for disapproval. Approval would result in reference to requirements that do not yet exist. Some committee members felt that such provisions are needed with the types of growing operation they are seeing. Others felt that these requirements already exist within the code and are unnecessary. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G72-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This issue needs to be addressed especially to address facilities where 5 or fewer persons are 'locked' up and not free to egress in malls, small court houses. The committee spoke to areas where the proposal needs further development: 1. Clarity of locking arrangements, specifically unlocking during emergency situations. 2. Consider limiting the number of doors in the path of egress. 3. Relying on the 'owner' to call the fire department in case of emergencies. 4. Cost of compliance for very small jurisdictions that may have only 1 or 2 persons in lock up at any time. 5. Reconsider the maximum threshold. 6. Consider separating those needed for health care and those needed for law enforcement. (Vote 9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G73-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

503.1.4 Occupied roofs.

A roof level or portion thereof shall be permitted to be used as an occupied roof provided the occupancy of the roof is an occupancy that is permitted by Table 504.4 for the story immediately below the roof. The area of the occupied roofs shall not be included in the building area as regulated by Section 506.

Exceptions:

1.The occupancy located on an occupied roof shall not be limited to the occupancies allowed on the story immediately below the roof where the building is equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2 and occupant notification ~~where required by~~ in accordance with Sections 907.5.2.1 and 907.5.2.3 is provided in the area of the occupied roof. Emergency voice/alarm communication system notification per Section 907.5.2.2 shall also be provided in the area of the occupied roof where such system is required elsewhere in the building.

2.Assembly occupancies shall be permitted on roofs of open parking spaces of Type I or Type II construction, in accordance with the exception to Section 903.2.1.6.

Committee Reason: The intent of the original proposal, as well as the modification to it, is to send the code user direction to the specific alarm requirements for occupied roofs. This section developed in the last cycle via G24-15 resulted in an alarm reference that was too general. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G74-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

Correcting the proposal.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found the exception to be confusing. It seems to be forcing parapets and also seems to be trying to control adjacent buildings. Rather than improve openness it appears to be restricting it. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G75-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

In Table 504.4, the value under Type IV A construction is to be 180 instead of 270 and the value under Type IV B construction is to be 120 instead of 180. All other portions of the proposal are not modified.

Committee Reason: The modification proposed makes this proposal work. The proposal was excessive without it. Otherwise, many of the reasons cited by the committee for proposal G80-18 apply. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G76-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

Missing table cells have been restored.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that a newer study and analysis is needed before making this change in the current code. In addition, the proposal conflicts with Section 510.6. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G77-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approved based on the proponent's reason statement and to provide clearer connection to the tables. (Vote: 13-10)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G78-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

The committee added a second revision to Table 504.4.

In the S-1 row for Sprinklered buildings (S), 3 hours has been changed to 4 hours in the column under Type IIIB construction.

Committee Reason: The proposal, as modified, restores 2006 story allowances. The buildings of these heights and occupancies have had good performance. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G79-18

Errata: This proposal includes the following errata

504.4 Number of stories.

The maximum number of stories of a building shall not exceed the limits specified in Table 504.4. An occupied roof is considered a story above grade plane unless otherwise specified as a portion of the story below by the provisions of this code.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The issues raised are already addressed in Section 505.4.1. Approving this change would undo the compromise accomplished for occupied roofs in the 2018 code. (Vote: 14-0).

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G80-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

The complete table is now shown

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: We need to have increased heights for these new construction types based on all the work that has been done. Tweaks can be made and debated in the public comment process for other story heights. However, Canada has already set precedents for tall wood structures. We may already have overkill in fire protection features to address the additional stories. The information supporting this proposal is online on the ICC website for those that have concerns. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G81-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

Missing table cells have been restored.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: As provided in the proponent's reason statement. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G82-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal changes a fundamental concept regarding how mezzanines have been regulated for many years. Mezzanines do not require access from the room of which they are a part. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G83-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approved based on the proponent's reason statements. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G84-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

The balance of the table's columns are now shown.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal based on their previous testimony as recorded in the committee reason statements to proposals G27, G75, G80, G89, G108, G146, G152, FS5, FS6, F73 and FS81. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G85-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

506.2.1 Single-occupancy buildings.

The allowable area of each story of a single-occupancy building shall be determined in accordance with Equation 5-1:

$$A_a = A_t + (NS \times I_f) \quad (\text{Equation 5-1})$$

where:

A_a = Allowable area (square feet).

A_t = Tabular allowable area factor (NS, S1, S13R or S13D value, as applicable) in accordance with Table 506.2.

NS = Tabular allowable area factor in accordance with Table 506.2 for nonsprinklered building (regardless of whether the building is sprinklered).

I_f = Area factor increase due to frontage (percent) as calculated in accordance with Section 506.3.

The allowable area per story of a single-occupancy building with a maximum of three stories above grade shall be determined by Equation 5-1. The total allowable area ~~per story~~ of a single-occupancy building more than three stories above grade plane shall be determined in accordance with Equation 5-2:

$$A_a = [A_t + (NS \times I_f)] \times S_a \quad (\text{Equation 5-2})$$

where:

A_a = Allowable area (square feet).

A_t = Tabular allowable area factor (NS, S13R, S13D or SM value, as applicable) in accordance with Table 506.2.

NS = Tabular allowable area factor in accordance with Table 506.2 for a nonsprinklered building (regardless of whether the building is sprinklered).

I_f = Area factor increase due to frontage (percent) as calculated in accordance with Section 506.3.

$S_a = 3$ where the actual number of stories above grade plane, exceeds three, or

$S_a = 4$ where the building is equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.2.

The actual area of any individual floor shall not exceed the allowable area per Equation 5-1.

506.2.2 Mixed-occupancy buildings.

The allowable area of a ~~floor~~ each story of a mixed-occupancy building shall be determined in accordance with the applicable provisions of Section 508.3.2 for non separated occupancies and 508.4.2 for separated occupancies.

For buildings with more than three stories above grade plane, the total building area shall be such that the aggregate sum of the ratios of the actual area of each story divided by the allowable area of such stories, determined in accordance with Equation 5-3 based on the applicable provisions of Section 508.1, shall not exceed three.

$$A_a = [A_t + (NS \times I_f)]$$

(Equation 5-3)

where:

A_a = Allowable area (square feet).

A_t = Tabular allowable area factor (NS, S13R, S13D or SM value, as applicable) in accordance with Table 506.2.

NS = Tabular allowable area factor in accordance with Table 506.2 for a nonsprinklered building, regardless of whether the building is sprinklered.

I_f = Area factor increase due to frontage (percent) as calculated in accordance with Section 506.3.

Exception: For buildings designed as separated occupancies under Section 508.4 and equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.2, the total building area shall be such that the aggregate sum of the ratios of the actual area of each story divided by the allowable area of such stories determined in accordance with Equation 5-3 based on the applicable provisions of Section 508.1, shall not exceed four.

Committee Reason: This proposal will help designers and other code users better understand these provisions. The modification clarified existing text. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G86-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

The proposal has been corrected.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The tabular version found some favor with the committee, but it wasn't convinced that even with the modifications offered that the change was neutral. A well crafted public comment with some examples may make this acceptable. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G87-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent asked for disapproval as they were unsure whether the proposal as submitted conflicts with the federal standards. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G88-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Committee members spoke both in support and opposition to this proposal which intends to replicate the existing information in the upper right half of the table in the lower left half. However errors were found in the proposal which showed that further refinement was needed. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G89-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

508.4.4.1 Construction. Required separations shall be fire barriers constructed in accordance with Section 707 or horizontal assemblies constructed in accordance with Section 711, or both, so as to completely separate adjacent occupancies. Mass timber elements serving as fire barriers or horizontal assemblies to separate occupancies in Type

IV-B or IV-C construction shall be separated from the interior of the building with an approved thermal barrier consisting of a minimum of 1/2 inch (12.7 mm) gypsum board or a ~~noncombustible equivalent~~ material that is tested in accordance with and meets the acceptance criteria of both the Temperature Transmission Fire Test and the Integrity Fire Test of NFPA 275.

509.4.1.1 Type IV-B and IV-C construction. Where Table 509 specifies a fire-resistance-rated separation, mass timber elements serving as fire barriers or a horizontal assembly in Type IV-B or IV-C construction shall be separated from the interior of the incidental use with an approved thermal barrier consisting of a minimum of 1/2 inch (12.7 mm) gypsum board or a ~~noncombustible equivalent~~ material that is tested in accordance with and meets the acceptance criteria of both the Temperature Transmission Fire Test and the Integrity Fire Test of NFPA 275.

(Portions of proposal not shown are not modified.)

Committee Reason: The modification makes the proposal consistent with the current code. The proposal was approved based upon the proponents published reason statement. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G90-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved the change recognizing that live/work units are a method of addressing mixed occupancy in a space and therefore is well placed in Section 508. The Chapter 4 location was felt to be no longer needed as these units have become more mainstream and not 'special' in nature. (Vote: 8-6)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G91-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as it was seen as an unnecessary pointer. There appears to be very little related to Table 509 found within Chapter 6 of the IFC. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G92-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it correlates with the rewrite of IFC Section 1206 in proposal F203-18 which addresses the necessary protection of battery systems. The 10% area limitation is no longer needed. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G93-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: After returning this item from the Table, the proponents stated they were unable to arrive at a compromise. There was a consensus that these items require protections as provided in Section 509. There was not a consensus on whether the 10% limit could be eliminated outright or if the elimination needs to be balanced by new provisions to address larger installations. When asked by the proponents, the committee was more supportive of efforts to fix the provisions over leaving them as they stand. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G94-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee saw the wording of G95-18 as a better solution to this issue. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G95-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The issue of stairway construction through podium buildings has been a issue for many jurisdictions and the cause of many alternative method reviews - and approvals. This proposal was preferable to G94-18. It provides a good clarification of the stair transition between upper and lower buildings. The presence of sprinklers throughout both buildings adds to the acceptability of this approach. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G96-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee found that replacing 'incidental' in this location eliminates the confusion that this one provision in Section 510.3 is not talking about incidental uses as regulated through Section 509. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G97-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponents reason statement. (Vote: 8-6)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G98-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This section is a vintage provision from one of the legacy codes. It appears to be out of step with the current height and area tables. This proposal cleans up the interaction between the two; eliminating a conflict. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G99-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approved based on the proponent's reason statement. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G100-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The change doesn't provide clarity to the section. This type of reorganization gave the committee concerns that something will be missed, that an unintended substantive change may be occurring. The new organization will likely result in misapplication of provisions that are now understood. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G101-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee's approval was based on the proponent's reason statement. The code works on an underlying assumption that HT is equivalent to one hour. Therefore this change is appropriate. (Vote: 8-7)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G102-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The revision provides clarity to the application of the table. The change specifically addresses the primary structural frame that is supporting the roof construction. The change does not alter any technical requirements. (Vote 11-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G103-18

Errata: This proposal includes the following errata

The third item of the definition of Secondary Structure Member is editorially corrected to read:

Bracing members that are not designated as part of a primary structural frame or bearing wall.

"or" replaces 'of' at the end of the sentence.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee found that the changes bring needed clarity in the determination of primary and secondary structural frame. (Vote: 14-0).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G104-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The provision as proposed is unclear. Despite the argument by the proponent that this was replacing a previous exception, this one does not address sprinklers as the previous code provision did. The exception (as provided in a footnote) is more extensive than previously allowed. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G105-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal does indeed include a technical change. There needs to be more data regarding the impact of this change on construction. Of issue among other things is the size of the buildings to which this would apply. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G106-18

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G107-18

Errata: This proposal includes unpublished errata

602.3 Type III.

Type III construction is that type of construction in which the exterior walls are of noncombustible materials and the interior building elements are of any material permitted by this code. ~~Nonbearing Fire-fire-retardant-treated wood framing and sheathing complying with Section 2303.2 shall be permitted within exterior wall assemblies of a 2-hour rating or less less provided the required fire resistance is maintained and the exposed outer and inner faces of such walls are noncombustible.~~

602.4.1 Fire-retardant-treated wood in exterior walls.

~~Fire-Nonbearing fire-retardant-treated wood framing and sheathing complying with Section 2303.2 shall be permitted within exterior wall assemblies not less than 6-inches in thickness with a 2-hour rating or less provided the required fire resistance is maintained and the exposed outer and inner faces of such walls are noncombustible.~~

602.4.2 Cross-laminated timber in exterior walls.

Cross-laminated timber complying with Section 2303.1.4 shall be permitted within exterior wall assemblies not less than 6 inches (152 mm) in thickness with a 2-hour rating or less, provided the exterior ~~surface and interior surfaces of~~ the cross-laminated timber ~~is~~ are protected by one the following and the required fire resistance rating is maintained:

- ~~1. Fire-retardant-treated wood sheathing complying with Section 2303.2 and not less than $1\frac{5}{32}$ inch (12 mm) thick;~~
2. Gypsum board not less than $\frac{1}{2}$ inch (12.7 mm) thick; or
3. A noncombustible material.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that there were not sufficient reasons provided by the proponent to limit the use of FRTW to only non-bearing walls. The use of FRTW in bearing walls has been permitted for some time. There would be significant costs if this proposal were to be implemented which is contrary to the proponent's statement. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G108-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

602.4 Type IV.

Type IV construction is that type of construction in which the building elements are mass timber or noncombustible materials and have fire resistance ratings in accordance with Table 601. Mass timber elements shall meet the fire resistance rating requirements of this section based on either the fire resistance rating of the noncombustible protection, the mass timber, or a combination of both and shall be determined in accordance with Section 703.2 or 703.3. The minimum dimensions and permitted materials for building elements shall comply with the provisions of this section and Section 2304.11. Mass timber elements of Types IV A, IV B and IV C construction shall be protected with noncombustible protection applied directly to the mass timber in accordance with Sections 602.4.1 through 602.4.3. The time assigned to the noncombustible protection shall be determined in accordance with Section 703.8 and comply with 722.7.

~~Cross-laminated timber shall be labeled as conforming to PRG 320 - 18 as referenced in Section 2303.1.4. the heat performance requirements of Section 6.1.3.4 of DOC PS1 and have no delamination in any specimen, except where occurring at a localized characteristic when permitted in the product standard.~~

Exterior load-bearing walls and nonload-bearing walls shall be mass timber construction, or shall be of noncombustible

construction.

Exception: Exterior load-bearing walls and nonload-bearing walls of Type IV-HT Construction in accordance with

602.4.1.1 Exterior protection.

The outside face of exterior walls of mass timber construction shall be protected with noncombustible protection with a minimum assigned time of 40 minutes as determined in Section 722.7.1(~~a~~). All components of the exterior wall covering, shall be of noncombustible material except water resistive barriers having a peak heat release rate of less than 150kW/m², a total heat release of less than 20 MJ/m² and an effective heat of combustion of less than 18MJ/kg as determined in accordance with ASTM E1354 and having a flame spread index of 25 or less and a smoke-developed index of 450 or less as determined in accordance with ASTM E 84 or UL 723. The ASTM E 1354 test shall be conducted on specimens at the thickness intended for use, in the horizontal orientation and at an incident radiant heat flux of 50 kW/m².

602.4.1.2.1 Protection time.

Noncombustible protection shall contribute a time equal to or greater than times assigned in Table 722.7.1(1a), but not less than 80 minutes. The use of materials and their respective protection contributions listed in Table 722.7.1(2b) shall be permitted to be used for compliance with Section 722.7.1.

602.4.2.1 Exterior protection.

The outside face of exterior walls of mass timber construction shall be protected with non-combustible protection with a minimum assigned time of 40 minutes as determined in Section 722.7.1(~~a~~). All components of the exterior wall covering shall be of noncombustible material except water resistive barriers having a peak heat release rate of less than 150kW/m², a total heat release of less than 20 MJ/m² and an effective heat of combustion of less than 18MJ/kg as determined in accordance with ASTM E1354, and having a flame spread index of 25 or less and a smoke-developed index of 450 or less as determined in accordance with ASTM E 84 or UL 723. The ASTM E 1354 test shall be conducted on specimens at the thickness intended for use, in the horizontal orientation and at an incident radiant heat flux of 50 kW/m².

602.4.2.2.1 Protection time.

Noncombustible protection shall contribute a time equal to or greater than times assigned in Table 722.7.1(1a), but not less than 80 minutes. The use of materials and their respective protection contributions listed in Table 722.7.1(2b) shall be permitted to be used for compliance with Section 722.7.1.

602.4.3.1 Exterior protection.

The exterior side of walls of combustible construction shall be protected with non-combustible protection with a minimum assigned time of 40 minutes as determined in Section 722.7.1(~~a~~). All components of the exterior wall covering, shall be of noncombustible material except water resistive barriers having a peak heat release rate of less than 150kW/m², a total heat release of less than 20 MJ/m² and an effective heat of combustion of less than 18MJ/kg as determined in accordance with ASTM E1354 and having a flame spread index of 25 or less and a smoke-developed index of 450 or less as determined in accordance with ASTM E 84 or UL 723. The ASTM E 1354 test shall be conducted on specimens at the thickness intended for use, in the horizontal orientation and at an incident radiant heat flux of 50 kW/m².

602.4.3.5 Concealed spaces.

Concealed spaces shall not contain combustibles other than electrical, mechanical, fire protection, or plumbing materials and equipment permitted in plenums in accordance with Section 602 of the International Mechanical Code, and shall comply with all applicable provisions of Section 718. Combustible construction forming concealed spaces shall be protected with noncombustible protection with a minimum assigned time of 40 minutes as determined in Section 722.7.1(~~a~~).

602.4.3.6 Shafts.

Shafts shall be permitted in accordance with Section 713 and Section 718. Shafts and elevator hoistway and interior exit stairway enclosures shall be protected with noncombustible protection with a minimum assigned time of 40 minutes as determined in Section 722.7.1(~~a~~), on both the inside of the shaft and the outside of the shaft.

(Portions of proposal not shown are not modified.)

Committee Reason: Some portions of the modification were editorial and other portions were needed as the referenced standard needed to be incorporated into the code change. The definitions clarify that there are different types of mass timber construction. It is a rational way of addressing protected vs. unprotected construction. This allows the code to keep up with innovations in construction practice that are actually occurring in the field. This is an opportunity for faster construction with less foundation. All testing was done that should have been done, and more than has ever been done for other construction types. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G109-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

602.4.3 Concealed spaces. Concealed spaces shall not contain combustible materials other than building elements and electrical, mechanical, fireprotection, or plumbing materials and equipment permitted in plenums in accordance with Section 602 of the International Mechanical code. Concealed spaces.....

Committee Reason: This proposal and modification address concerns regarding what can be in a plenum. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G110-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal corrects something that was done to correlate conflicting approved proposals in a previous cycle. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G111-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Based on the proponents reason statement. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G112-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal improves coordination with federal standards, however the format of exception text within the provision is awkward. A straight forward exception as found under item 1.3 would be better. The text makes mixed occupancy building construction complex. (Vote: 8-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G113-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: NFPA 101 requirements of 2012 would allow this material. There should be a public comment on this that fixes the threshold. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G114-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: It makes sense that wood strips and nailers should be allowed. It is a similar category to blocking but it sometimes does help to have things spelled out no matter how we generally hate laundry lists. (Vote: 10-4)

14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G115-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: We can do what we want to do, we just need to get to the appropriate standard for the material, not just any material. This needs to be brought back with the appropriate references. The laundry list in 603.1 is a problem. There should be a reference to combustible materials and blocking and interior finishes. The references need to make it clear that these are interior finishes. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G116-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. BOTH PARTS WERE HEARD BY THE MECHANICAL CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text is confusing and sounds as if it is requiring 5 ACH of natural ventilation. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G116-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Action is consistent with G116 Part I (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G117-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE MECHANICAL CODE COMMITTEE

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text is too restrictive by not having more options for compliance. (Vote: 10-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G118-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval of this proposal in favor of G119, which the committee approved, but wanted to keep this G118 proposal alive, rather than withdraw it, so that it is available in the event that G119 is voted down at the public comment hearings. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G119-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The type of practice addressed by this proposal has been in place for some time, is in the

residential code and is backed up by sound research and building science. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G120-18

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G121-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the committee understands the concerns addressed by the proposal, many start up schools begin in the basement of a facility which often are already provided with sprinkler systems and code compliant egress facilities to make the building safe. This proposal would be too limiting regarding the types of spaces that could be used for such start up schools. Furthermore, many classrooms are not on an outside wall and may not have the opportunity to install skylights. If the proponent returns with a public comment, the committee also recommends that the proposed modifications be considered. The proponent mentioned existing buildings, which should be addressed in the International Existing Building Code. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G122-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is not an expansion of the scope of this provision. It is a clarification. This is not limited to the areas that have been stricken. It includes public areas "such as," meaning many other things. Chapter 12 is interior environment. Exterior building features are not addressed in Chapter 12. (Vote: 8-7)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G123-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

1206.2 Airborne sound. Walls, partitions and floor-ceiling assemblies separating dwelling units and sleeping units from each other or from public or service areas shall have a sound transmission class of not less than 50 where tested in accordance with ASTM E90, or have a Normalized Noise Isolation Class (NNIC) rating of not less than 45 if field tested in accordance with ASTM E336, for airborne noise. Alternatively, the.....

Committee Reason: Proposal and modification reason: These changes correct the references in this section. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G124-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would put a burden on the code official. There is a lack of certification for this. It could be in conflict with 1206.2 and 1206.3. A professional engineer can do this. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G125-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent asked for disapproval. The increased cost could be a concern. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G126-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

1206.3 Structure-borne sound. Floor-ceiling assemblies between dwelling units and sleeping units or between a dwelling unit or sleeping unit and a public or service area within the structure shall have an impact insulation class rating of not less than 50 where tested in accordance with ASTM E492, or have a Normalized Impact Sound Rating (NISR) ~~an apparent IIC (AIIIC)~~ of not less than 45 if field tested in accordance with ASTM E1007. Alternatively, the.....

Committee Reason: This proposal cleans up the language and references the correct test standards. The modification adds clarification. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G127-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal correlates A117.1 with the building code. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G128-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal strikes redundant and unenforceable language regarding square footage requirements that is not the intent of the code. (Vote: 12-1-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G129-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal addresses a real problem. The pressure for smaller units is something that happens every day. (Vote: 9-4-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G130-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IBC GENERAL CODE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal addresses the increasing real need for smaller dwelling units. This proposed language is useable and enforceable. (Vote: 8-6)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G130-18 Part II

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE PROPERTY MAINTENANCE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Referencing accessible units in the IPMC will cause confusion as most property maintenance inspectors can not be expected to identify accessible units and therefore may misapply the provisions. (Vote: 7-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G131-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed definition is needed and long overdue. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G132-18

THIS IS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:8-7, Chair voted.)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G132-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is a necessary change to coordinate with previous committee actions. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G133-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is an area that is quite often missed and should be referenced. A public comment may be in order. But where do we stop regarding bringing in requirements from other codes? That is a slippery slope. It may be more appropriate to have a simple and brief pointer. Chapter 29 may be the proper place for this. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G134-18

THIS IS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This could create a conflict between the IPC (Section 405.3.5) and IBC. There needs to be allowances for the variability between partition manufacturers such that putting limits on the dimensions might cause problems for one or more manufacturers. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G135-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal contains a large amount of unenforceable language. A lot of substantiation was provided for schools, but not all Group I occupancies. The timing may not be right to make radon mitigation mandatory as there are testing and liability issues that still need to be worked out. There is science behind this proposal and it appears to be a significant problem, but school boards, possibly at the state level, should have been engaged. The starting place for this may be best as an appendix, much like in the residential code. It would be better to bring the tables over rather than reference the residential code. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G136-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is an excellent clarification of the code and is coordinated with what was done in the last cycle. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G137-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: When you have a non-mandatory requirement, it should be in an appendix or a standard. If someone wanted to do something less than this, they should not be mandated to do this unless a specific code requirement drives it. NFPA 70 already addresses this. It has not been demonstrated that there is a real problem. (Vote: 9-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G138-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal based on the proponents reason statement and the proponents promise to withdraw the proposal if the A117.1 standard incorporates the desired language, though it may simply be a duplication of the language, not a conflict. A portion of Item 2 in the proposal was Item 3 in the 2018 IBC. The committee verified with the proponent that the intent of the proponent was that Item 3 should not be deleted and the Item 3 as shown in this proposal should become Item 4. The committee indicated its intent was to approve the proposal in the form that the proponent intended, in the form as follows:

3001.2 Emergency elevator communication systems for the deaf, hard of hearing and speech impaired. An emergency two-way communication system shall be provided. The system shall provide visible text and audible modes that:

~~Is a visual and text-based and a video-based 24/7 live interactive system;~~When operating in each mode, includes a live interactive system that allows back and forth conversation between the elevator occupants and emergency personnel;

~~Is operational when the elevator is operational; fully accessible by the deaf, hard of hearing and speech impaired, and shall include voice-only options for hearing individuals. and~~

~~Has the ability to communicate with emergency personnel utilizing existing video conferencing technology, chat/text software or other approved technology; and~~

~~Allows elevator occupants to select the text-based or audible mode depending on their communication needs to interact with emergency personnel.~~

(Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

Staff Analysis:

The staff analysis is included in the committee reason.

G139-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: G138-18 and G139 are trying to accomplish the same thing. The G138-18 approach is the correct approach. There is an agreement that if this criteria may be added to A117.1 in time. This can be addressed in public comment period. However, it should be noted that, if this was approved and there were no public comments, this could trump the previous committee action to approve G138-18. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G140-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is confusion regarding cueing at elevator lobbies and whether the elevator is available or not. The proposal doesn't specify clearly. The code official may enforce the requirement at all elevator call stations, not just occupant elevators. The flaw in this proposal is dealing with the typical highrise situations. It is should not be every elevator in every lobby. The use of the term "is" will create a situation where occupants may wait for an elevator that never comes. Tinker with the words "is" and "may" and possibly "pictoral." There may be a way to link the signage to the visual requirement that is going to be part of the A117.1 automated system.....so that when someone goes to an elevator lobby they would know whether the elevator will come or not....or when to go to the stairs. There is a need to identify the elevators, but this is not the way to do it. Maybe simple a sign saying "evacuation elevator, "occupant elevator," "when directed," or "this elevator available...: (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G141-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on testimony, this could create a conflict in the code. Loss of electrical power could occur in a fire event. If the fire occurred on the floor one was heading to, that would be a big problem. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G142-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: In many tall buildings there are fire service access elevators. When fire service personnel access a floor, the elevator is typically is staged on a floor below, not on the floor they are on. (Vote: 9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G143-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Committee members have experience with these provisions and believe the proposal clarifies the requirements. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G144-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This requirement is very limiting and doesn't allow for the alternatives that are regularly applied in the field. The language in the 2018 code extends these requirements to occupant elevators. In buildings with fire service elevators, the owners often would like them to serve multiple uses and we cannot preclude the idea that there will be other occupants in them, which drags accessibility into the mix. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G145-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This provision for elevator hoistway pressurization are now voluntary in lieu of providing elevator lobbies. Putting these requirements in the smoke proof enclosure requirements would create confusion. The code is clear right now regarding what protection is required outside of elevator hoistways and machine rooms and those areas are already protected. This would lead to subjective application of the code. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G146-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is a necessary change for correlation based on previous committee actions on the tall wood provisions. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G147-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

3103.1 General. The provisions of Sections 3103.1 through 3103.4 shall apply to structures erected for a period of less than 180 days. ~~Tents~~ Special event structures, tents, umbrella structures and other membrane structures erected for a period of less than 180 days shall also comply with the International Fire Code. Those erected for a longer period of time shall comply with applicable sections of this code.

Committee Reason: The committee approved the modification as it alleviated concerns regarding temporary structures. The committee approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G148-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponents published reason and the fact that this proposal clarifies the code. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G149-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal has some merit, but the language is too loose. "Public" could mean any building that is considered public in the Americans with Disabilities Act. "Governmental entities" may be a better term. (Vote: 9-

5)

Assembly Motion: **Approved as Submitted**

Online Vote Results: Successful - Support: 53% (71) Oppose: 47% (63)

Assembly Action: **Approved as Submitted**

G150-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no relevance to go back to Section 2405. If this is brought back in public comment, the first portion may be acceptable, but the second portion is not. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

G151-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

The proposed table has been corrected.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

3114.1 General. The provisions of Section 3114 and other applicable sections of this code, shall apply to intermodal shipping containers that are repurposed for use as buildings or structures or as a part of buildings or structures.

Exceptions:

Intermodal shipping containers previously approved as existing relocatable buildings complying with Chapter 14 of the International Existing Building Code.

Stationary storage battery arrays located in intermodal shipping containers complying with Chapter 12 of the International Fire Code.

Intermodal shipping containers that are listed as equipment complying with the standard for equipment, such as air chillers, engine generators, modular data centers, and other similar equipment.

Intermodal shipping containers used as experimental equipment or apparatuses.

3114.3 Intermodal shipping container information. Intermodal shipping containers shall bear an existing data plate containing the following information as required by ISO 6346 and verified by an approved agency. A report of the verification process and findings shall be provided to the building owner.

Manufacturer's name or identification number

Date manufactured.

Safety approval number.

Identification number.

Maximum operating gross mass or weight (kg) (Lbs)

Allowable stacking load for 1.8G (kg) (lbs)

Transverse racking test force (Newtons)

Valid maintenance examination date

Where approved by the building official, the markings and existing data are permitted to be removed from the intermodal shipping containers before they are repurposed for use as buildings or structures or as a part of buildings or structures.

3114.8.4.2 Seismic design parameters. ~~The appropriate detailing requirements of ASCE 7; response modification coefficient, R; overstrength factor; deflection amplification factor, C_d; and limits on structural height, h_n, for the corrugated shear wall is permitted to be developed in accordance with generally accepted procedures where approved by the building official in accordance with Section 104.11. The seismic force-resisting system shall be designed and detailed in accordance with one of the following:~~

Where all or portions of the corrugated steel container sides are considered to be the seismic force-resisting system, design and detailing shall be in accordance with the ASCE 7 Table 12.2-1 requirements for light-frame bearing-wall systems with shear panels of all other materials.

Where portions of the corrugated steel container sides are retained, but are not considered to be the seismic force-resisting system, an independent seismic force-resisting system shall be selected, designed and detailed in accordance with ASCE 7 Table 12.2-1, or Where portions of the corrugated steel container sides are retained and integrated into a seismic force-resisting system other than as permitted by Section 3114.4.2 Item 1, seismic design parameters shall be developed from testing and analysis in accordance with Section 104.11 and ASCE 7 Section 12.2.1.1 or 12.2.1.2.

3114.8.5.3 Allowable shear. The allowable shear for the corrugated steel side walls (longitudinal) and end walls (transverse) for wind design and for seismic design using the coefficients of Section 3114.8.5.2 shall be ~~permitted to have the allowable shear values set forth in~~ in accordance with Table 3114.8.5.3 provided that all of the following conditions are met:

The total linear length of all openings in any individual side walls or end walls shall be limited to not more than 50% of the length of that side walls or end walls, as shown in Figure 3114.8.5.3(1).

Any full height wall length, or portion thereof, less than 4 feet (305 mm) long shall not be considered as a portion of the lateral force-resisting system, as shown in Figure 3114.8.5.3(2).

All side walls or end walls used as part of the lateral force-resisting system shall have an existing or new boundary element on all sides to form a continuous load path, or paths, with adequate strength and stiffness to transfer all forces from the point of application to the final point of resistance, as shown in Figure 3114.8.5.3(3).

Where openings are made in container walls, floors, or roofs for doors, windows and other openings: 4.1. The openings shall be framed with steel elements that are designed in accordance with Chapter 16 and Chapter 4.2. The cross section and material grade of any new steel element shall be equal to or greater than the steel element removed.

5. A maximum of one penetration not greater than a 6-inch (152 mm) diameter hole for conduits, pipes, tubes or vents, or not greater than 16 square inches (10,322 sq mm) for electrical boxes, is permitted for each individual 8 foot length (2,438 mm) lateral force resisting wall. Penetrations located in walls that are not part of the wall lateral force resisting system shall not be limited in size or quantity. Existing intermodal shipping container vents shall not be considered a penetration, as shown in Figure 3114.8.5.3(4).

6. End wall door or doors designated as part of the lateral force-resisting system shall be welded closed.

TABLE 3114.8.5.3

Allowable Strength Shear Values for Intermodal Shipping Container Corrugated Steel Siding Shear Walls for Wind or Seismic Loading

(No changes to body of table)

The allowable ~~strength-shear~~ for the side walls and end walls of the intermodal shipping containers are derived from ISO 1496-1 and reduced by a factor of safety of 5. Container designation type is derived from ISO 668. Limitations of Sections 3114.8.5.1 shall apply

(Portions of proposal not shown are not modified)

Committee Reason: The modifications add clarifications that will help the approval process go smoothly, but the committee would like to see a public comment to change the term "corrugated" container to "intermodal" container to be consistent with other language in the proposal. Other discrepancies in the modifications are minor and could also be cleaned up in the public comment process. The proposal addresses a need for guidance regarding the approval of intermodal shipping containers in the context of the building code. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G153-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is quite a bit of information contained in the proposal, but no indication where it came from. There was not enough substantiation to support the proposed changes. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

G154-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Many items in the list are above code. Many of these materials are readily available without code requirements. If the building department doesn't follow through and get the required documentation, they become responsible. A third party should be responsible. The VOC definition needs to be something based on a consensus standard. The exterior and interior requirements need to be addressed to be within the scope of Chapter 12, which is interior environment. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

2018 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE – MEANS OF EGRESS

MEANS OF EGRESS CODE COMMITTEE

Jeffrey Tubbs, PE, Chair

Principal
Arup
Boston, MA

William D. (Bill) Dupler, Vice Chair

Deputy County Administrator- Community
Development
Chesterfield County VA
Chesterfield, VA

Matt Archer

Chief Building Official
City of Lone Tree
Lone Tree, CO

Matthew Bailey

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Bailey Company
Rogersville, MO

Gene Boecker, AIA, RAS

Rep: National Association of Theatre Owners
Accessibility Project Manager
Code Consultants, Inc.
St. Louis, MO

William A. Brizee, AIA

Principal
Architects Hawaii
Honolulu, HI

Jeffrey S. Grove, P.E.

Director
Jensen Hughes
Las Vegas, NV

Lee Kranz, CBO

Plan Review Supervisor
City of Bellevue, WA
Bellevue, WA

Paul D. Martin

Rep: National Association of State Fire Marshals
Deputy State Fire Administrator
New York State Office of Fire Prevention and
Control
Albany, NY

Gregory N. Nicholls, AIA

Architect
The PREVIEW Group, Inc.
Cincinnati, OH

Carroll Lee Pruitt, FAIA

President/CEO
Pruitt Consulting, Inc.
Fort Worth, TX

Patrick Tomasino

State Building Official
State of UTAH
Salt Lake City, UT

Keith L. Wen, RA

Technical Advisor to the First Deputy
Commissioner
New York Department of Buildings
New York, NY

Dan Willham, RA

Deputy Building Official
County of Fairfax, Virginia
Fairfax, VA

Armin Wolski, PE

Principal
Reax Engineering
Berkeley, CA

Staff Secretariat:

Kimberly Paarlberg, RA

Senior Staff Architect
Codes and Standards Development
ICC Indiana Field Office
Carmel, IN

International Building Code - Means of Egress

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

E1-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was an issue with the location in the code. Historically showers and tubs have not been considered part of the circulation path for means of egress as indicated in this proposal. The proposal should not include exceptions for slip resistance or stepping over the tub edge or shower threshold. It was suggested that perhaps a better place for a requirement for grab bars would be Section 1209 with the other interior wall requirements for toilet and bathing rooms.

From a scoping perspective, apartments and condominium already have Type A and Type B requirements for blocking for the future installation of grab bars, and these requirements may conflict with that. In nursing homes and hospitals these grab bars may conflict with the space needed for mobility equipment and transfers. In Accessible units, the vertical station would be an obstruction for transfer to the tub, and the grab bar requirements are not coordinated with ICC A117.1. It was suggested that the non-accessible bathrooms in hotels may be type of facility to start with to reduce slip and fall issues with grab bars at the tubs and showers.

Technical issues - What is the justification for the grab bar locations and lengths? How would the vertical station work with shower/bathtub doors or curtains? How would the ends of the vertical station attach to the floors, tub edge or ceiling? What happens at larger showers, gang showers, or showers with glass or no walls on some sides? (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E2-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The referenced standard contains proprietary testing equipment. While this test can be performed consistently in a laboratory, it does not seem to be useable for concrete surfaces poured in the field. There were concerns for who would do field inspection, what information should be on the box of products that had been tested, how this would work for sloped surfaces, what slip resistance would be acceptable. This is proposed for all hard surface floors – perhaps it should only be required for higher risk areas. (Vote: 12-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E3-18

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E4-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1003.5 Elevation change. Where changes in elevation of less than 12 inches (305 mm) exist in the means of egress, sloped surfaces shall be used. Where the slope is greater than one unit vertical in 20 units horizontal (5-percent slope), ramps complying with Section 1012 shall be used. Where the difference in elevation is 6 inches (152 mm) or less, the ramp shall be equipped with either handrails or floor finish materials that contrast with adjacent floor finish

materials.

Exceptions:

1. ~~Steps at~~ exterior doors complying in accordance with Section 1010.1.5.
2. A stair with a single riser or with two risers and a tread is permitted at locations not required to be accessible by Chapter 11 where the risers and treads comply with Section 1011.5, the minimum depth of the tread is 13 inches (330 mm) and not less than one handrail complying with Section 1014 is provided within 30 inches (762 mm) of the centerline of the normal path of egress travel on the stair.

Throughout a story in a Group I-2 occupancy, any change in elevation in portions of the means of egress that serve nonambulatory persons shall be by means of a ramp or sloped walkway.

Committee Reason: The modification clarifies that Section 1003.5 Exception 1 is applicable to steps. The rearrangement of the code text clarifies the application and puts the requirement in a more appropriate location. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E5-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Providing a pointer here does not add clarification. The original intent for this section is to deal with occupant load, therefore the move to Section 1003 is inappropriate. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E6-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

The table in the reason statement was unreadable in the monograph.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There could be some confusion on what constitutes a 'game table'. While the suggested occupant load factors are okay for billiard tables this needs to be tightened up for what else this applies too. Gambling tables are already addressed appropriately under Gaming floors with an occupant load factor of 11 gross. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E7-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: If these collaboration spaces are interpreted as conference rooms, the increase in the occupant load factor in the 2018 edition for Group B from 100 to 150 should still result in a similar occupant load for egress capacity. Nowhere else in the code does the room size drives the occupant load factor. Could a collaboration room be interpreted to mean an office with guest chairs or a small work table with chairs? How could a code official interpret the difference between a conference room and a large collaboration room? If this is an employee work area, why the jump for the occupant load factor from 150 to 30? This allowance could be used to calculate fewer occupants for general conference rooms. If these are spaces within a larger area, how would you determine the extent of the collaboration space? (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E8-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The change is not needed. The code official can approve what occupant load is appropriate as the text is currently written. (Vote: 8-6)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

E9-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This requirement belongs in the IEBC. If this is an alteration, either this is covered by Section 1004.5.1 or it could be addressed by alternative means. There is a concern that some tenants might use this allowance and some not on the same floor, or that this could be used for the first tenant fit out. There is no way to monitor compliance. The signs would not be an adequate control. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

E10-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The intent of the proposed requirement is not clear. The issue of encroachment is if the door is an obstruction during an evacuation event. The addition of an automatic closer or hold open device would not change this. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

E11-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Mechanical rooms and penthouses have a very low occupant load and the people will be in the space for limited times. Exit access travel distance would be sufficient for evacuation. (Vote: 8-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

Staff Analysis:

There is a published errata to Section 1006.2.1 in the 2018 IBC. "Exceptions" is missing from the front of the list.

E12-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is not needed, it is already covered in Section 1006.3.3. The committee also addressed this issue in E24. (Vote: 10-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

Staff Analysis:

There is a published errata to Section 1006.2.1 in the 2018 IBC. "Exceptions" is missing from the front of the list.

E13-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This addition provides clarity for the scoping of this section. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

E14-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The new exception does not address the BTU units for the equipment as part of the limits. Therefore there could be a small room with equipment greater than 400,000 BTUs. There was no technical justification for the proposed exception. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E15-18 Part I

THIS IS A TWO PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE MECHANICAL CODE COMMITTEE. SEE THE TENTATIVE HEARING ORDER OF THESE COMMITTEES.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Adding panic hardware to refrigeration machinery rooms will improve safety for these rooms. There should be a public comment to add this to the list for panic hardware in Section 1010.1.10. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E15-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E16-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal removes redundant language. (Vote: 8-6)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E17-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is an important pointer for electrical room requirements in the National Electrical Code. See also E64 for coordination with this item. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E18-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1006.3.1 Occupant load. Where stairways serve more than one story, or more than one story and an occupied roof, only the occupant load of each story or occupied roof, considered individually, shall be used ~~in~~ when calculating the required number of exits or access to exits serving that story.

1006.3.2 Path of egress travel. The path of egress travel to an exit shall not pass through more than one adjacent story.

Exception: The path of egress travel to an exit shall be permitted to pass through more than one adjacent story in any of the following:

In Group R-1, R-2 or R-3 occupancies, exit access stairways and ramps connecting four stories or less serving and contained within an individual dwelling unit, sleeping unit or live/work unit.

Exit access stairways serving and contained within a Group R-3 congregate residence or a Group R-4 facility.

Exit access stairways and ramps within an atrium comply with the provisions of Section 404.

Exit access stairways and ramps in open parking garages that serve only the parking garage.

Exit access stairways and ramps serving open-air assembly seating complying with the exit access travel distance requirements of Section 1029.7.

Exit access stairways and ramps between the balcony, gallery or press box and the main assembly floor in occupancies such as theaters, places of religious worship, auditoriums and sports facilities.

~~Exterior~~ Exit access stairways and ramps ~~between~~ serving occupied roofs.

Committee Reason: The modification to Section 1006.3.1 is an editorial correction for better English.

The modification to Section 1006.3.2 will allow for the exit access stairways to move down from the occupied roof and into the building for means of egress from the roof. As a new exception, the exit access travel distance, not the number of stories, will be the limiting factor. Without the modification, Section 1006.3.2 Exception 7 would only be applicable if there were multiple roofs and it would limit the application to exterior exit access stairways.

This proposal separates out occupied roofs into a new Section 1006.3.1 which will clarify how egress is addressed for occupied roofs. There was no discussion on the new Exception 3 for Section 1006.3.2. (Vote: 9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E19-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: An open stairway in an atrium should not be an exit stairway. It should only be permitted as an exit access stairway. Travel distance should be down the stairway to an exit to the outside. Atriums are not as safe as an exit because there is fuel load in the atrium. If a stairway in an atrium is an exit it should have additional restrictions. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E20-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The exceptions that permit the travel on exit access stairways to go more than one story were carefully considered. This should not be extended to stairways with draft curtains or atriums. This is too great of an opportunity for smoke migration within high rise buildings. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E21-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The exceptions that permit the travel on exit access stairways to go more than one story were carefully considered. This should not be extended to stairways with draft curtains or atriums as permitted in Section 1019. This is too great of an opportunity for smoke migration within high rise buildings. The additional language adds no additional information. Disapproval would be consistent with the committee action on E20. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E22-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Where an occupied roof can have a single exit is an issue that needs to be addressed,

however, in Table 1006.3.3(1) and 1006.3.3(2) the proposal would allow a single exit roof over what was previously allowed as a single exit story. The roof should be treated as a story and limited as such for a single exit – match the current allowed height rather than exceed the current height limits. (Vote: 9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E23-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The intent of this proposal is already permitted. The additional language does not add clarity. This could be read to apply to a portion of a floor that could not use a single exit under current text. There is no explanation of what a 'portion' is. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E24-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is a good clarification for a point that has been confusing users of the codes. "Common path of travel" is not the correct term for single exit conditions – it is for two exit conditions. "Exit access" is the correct term for single exit buildings and stories. This will coordinate the terminology in the table with the current footnotes and similar sections in the IEBC. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E25-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: If you subdivide a two exit space into two single exit spaces, this proposed configuration would be permitted under current code. There would be an increase in cost for this option. Item 3.3 could be read to imply a separate exit stairway is required for separate means of egress. This allowance should be in the IEBC for new tenant fit outs in existing buildings, not new buildings. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E26-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There are unintended consequences with the language as proposed. The language would allow control of the light by switches for the entire means of egress. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E27-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Allowing for motion sensors or switches for the increased lighting on the stairway would coordinate with the intent of the Energy Codes without any conflict with the safety issues for means of egress lighting. There is technology to allow for different options for how to achieve this. The increased lighting will help people with vision impairments as well as the general population to use the stairs for normal circulation. There is precedence for the 10 foot-candles on stairways in NFPA requirements. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E28-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The revised phrase will coordinate with language used elsewhere in Chapter 10. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E29-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: An occupied roof is not a story, so this needs a different approach. A story is defined as a space between a floor and a ceiling. See E30-18. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E30-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This tells you when standby power is required for an elevator for building with an occupied roof. Occupied roofs are not currently addressed. The vertical distance for assisted rescue for a roof on the top of a 4 story building is the same as a 5th floor, so standby power should be required. Separate provisions for the occupied roof, to avoid confusion over if the occupied roof is a story, floor or level, would make this cleaner. There is an question with the current exception for horizontal exits as an alternative for standby power being permitted on lower floors, which would not be buildable on the roof. Occupied roofs, by being open to the outside air, may be safer than the floor with horizontal exits. See E29-18. (Vote: 8-7)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E31-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The 30 feet separation, where an elevator is required as one of the accessible means of egress may be too tough for small buildings. Section 403.5.1 was referenced for justification, but it is different – it allows for ¼ as well as 30 feet and it measures to the shafts instead of the entrances. In addition, this could be read as requiring elevators to be at least 30 feet apart. Two accessible means of egress next to each other would not meet the current criteria for independent means of egress, so this is already adequately addressed. (Vote: 8-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E32-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The phrase ‘operating systems’ could be read to require a separate power source and standby power. This could conflict with the requirements for Occupant Evacuation Elevators. There term ‘banks’ is not currently defined – so this could be read differently than the intent of the proposal to use elevators in different part of the building rather than banks of elevators facing each other. There is no technical justification or identified issues to require this additional language. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E33-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: An interior area of refuge should be at a discoverable location, so having an area of refuge at a back door is not a good idea. You can do an exterior area of assisted rescue at the grade level back exit, which is preferred. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E34-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This increase in size would increase usability for scooter users and would coordinate with the new sizes in ICC A117.1-2017. While this is related to new requirements in ICC A117.1-2017, the committee wanted it noted that the new standard was not referenced in the text. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E35-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Using “area of rescue assistance” is confusing- this term is not used in the IBC for the locations where the two way system is located. If this is needed, why not also require this for the two way communication system inside the stairway?. It is the same system and serves the same need for assistance to occupants. This additional protection would be erroneous for shorter buildings. (Vote: 8-6)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E36-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Using “approved supervising station” increases the reliability of this communication being available to those that need it. This helps clarify two way communication requirements. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E37-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1010.1 Doors General. Doors in the means of egress shall comply with the requirements of Sections 1010.1.1 through ~~1010.1.3.4~~ 1010.3.4. Exterior exit doors shall also comply with the requirements of Section 1022.2. Gates in the means of egress shall comply with the requirements of Section 1010.4 through 1010.4.1. Turnstiles in the means of egress shall comply with the requirements of Section 1010.5 through 1010.5.4.

Doors, gates and turnstiles provided for egress purposes in numbers greater than required by this code shall comply with the requirements of this section.

Doors in the means of egress shall be readily distinguishable from the adjacent construction and finishes such that the doors are easily recognizable as doors. Mirrors or similar reflecting materials shall not be used on means of egress doors. Means of egress doors shall not be concealed by curtains, drapes, decorations or similar materials.

1010.2.8 Locking arrangements in educational occupancies.

In Group E and Group B educational occupancies, egress doors from classrooms, offices and other occupied rooms shall be permitted to be provided with locking arrangements designed to keep intruders from entering the room where all of the following conditions are met:

1. The door shall be capable of being unlocked from outside the room with a key or other approved means.
2. The door shall be operable from within the room in accordance with Section 1010.2.

2.3. Modifications shall not be made to listed panic hardware, fire door hardware or door closers.

Committee Reason: Two editorial modifications were requested to Section 1010.1. Use 'General' instead of 'Doors' in the title since this is the start of the section. Correct the reference to the end of the door sections. In Section 1010.2.8, leave in exception 2 as it is not certain at this time without all the text being shown that the exception is redundant language. The reference in Exception 2 should be changed to match the revised numbers.

The reorganization of this section provides better organization, logical grouping and consolidation of door subsections that will improve clarity of requirements for doors. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E38-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1010.1 Doors General. ~~Means of egress doors shall meet the requirements of this section. Doors, gates and turnstiles~~ serving a means of egress system shall meet the applicable requirements of this section and Section 1022.2. Doors provided for egress purposes in numbers greater than required by this code shall meet the requirements of this section.

Means of egress doors shall be readily distinguishable from the adjacent construction and finishes such that the doors are easily recognizable as doors. Mirrors or similar reflecting materials shall not be used on means of egress doors. Means of egress doors shall not be concealed by curtains, drapes, decorations or similar materials.

Committee Reason: The modification was to remove the change to Section 1010.1 from the proposal. The changes in E37-18 addressed this in a more comprehensive manner. The revised language is consistent with the remainder of the sections in the code. There was concern about pulling Egress Courts out of the section for exit discharge without a general statement for this means of egress part as indicated in Sections 1003.1, 1014.1 and 1020.1. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E39-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that there is no longer a need to regulate the maximum size of a door. The maximum size of a door is adequately addressed by the force requirements, closing speed and fire door testing. It was suggested that the maximum door size in Exception 10 should be deleted as part of a public comment for consistency. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E40-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This exception could be misapplied to the main door of a large dressing room, such as that used for a bridal fitting room where there would be multiple occupants. It was suggested to limit this to single-user dressing rooms. There should be a minimum size to forestall any size door being permitted. The term 'changing' rooms is not consistent with Section 1109.12.1 for accessibility requirements. (Vote: 9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E41-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal adds common use terminology for door hardware and clarifies allowances for

other types of doors. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E42-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal specifically addresses balanced doors as a type of swinging door, which is consistent with the intent of the provisions. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E43-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There are several concerns with this proposal. With the proposed language the door opening could meet the height, but not the width, and visa versa. The difference for the forces to open, operate and for break away and how that would work is not clear. Maximum speed with no limit could be dangerous. This proposal should reference UL325 or other standard to protect the door from hitting someone when opening and closing. There are no provisions for system failure. There should be a limit to the occupancies and the percentage of exits where these doors would be permitted - as currently written this could be at all exits in any occupancy. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E44-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This updates and clarifies the requirements for door force and unlatching. This would coordinate with the 2017 edition of ICC A117.1. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E45-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This requirement for horizontal sliding doors would coordinate with CMS requirements. This requirement is common sense for this type of door when it is required to latch. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E46-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change for the height of the emergency stop switch is consistent with ANSI/BMHA A156.27. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E47-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change to Item 2 will allow for different design options. This meets the intent of the code and provides for security options. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E48-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change will coordinate requirements between the IBC and IFC for lockdown situations in schools. Item 4 is necessary because there could be modifications to the fire door assemblies in new schools. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E49-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: These provisions could conflict with sallyports for Group I-3. While this is needed for certain situations, as written this could be used in all occupancies for all doors - this should have limited application. Item #3 talks about the sprinkler system - is the intent to only allow this in sprinklered buildings, or is only where a sprinkler system is provided? The word 'emergency' is not needed. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E50-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This requirement could be misapplied to all occupancies where a child might be present - including residential occupancies. Sweeps on doors would be a sanitary issue for hospitals. The sweep may be a conflict with the ICC A117.1 requirement for a 10 inch smooth surface on the bottom of the push side of doors along an accessible route. If this is needed, it should be limited to Group I-4 occupancies. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E51-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This pointer for vestibules is not needed in IBC in areas where the Energy codes are adopted because it is already covered in the Energy Code. The term 'vestibule' could be confused with stairway vestibules. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E52-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The new Item 2 address security and dementia wandering issues for care recipients in assisted living, hospitals and nursing facilities where this is needed. It was suggested to provide a public comment to have keys for 'all' clinical staff. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E53-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

Items 7, 8 and 9 are all new text and should be underlined.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There should be a maximum occupant load for where this should be permitted as an option. It was suggested that an over ride should be available to unlock the doors, but other committee members felt that this would be a security issues for buildings where someone could use this to break into a building during off hours. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E54-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1010.1.9.6 Unlatching. The unlatching of any door or leaf for egress shall require not more than one motion in a single linear or rotational direction to release all latching and all locking devices. ~~Latching or locking devices shall comply with ANSI/BHMA A156.41.~~

Exceptions:

1. Places of detention or restraint.
2. Where manually operated bolt locks are permitted by Section 1010.1.9.5.
3. Doors with automatic flush bolts as permitted by Section 1010.1.9.4, Item 3.
4. Doors from individual dwelling units and sleeping units of Group R occupancies as permitted by Section 1010.1.9.4, Item 4.

BHMA

Builders Hardware Manufacturers' Association

355 Lexington Avenue, 15th Floor

New York NY 10017-6603

US

~~**A156.41-2013 - Door Controls-Closers-**~~

Committee Reason: The proponent informed the committee that the correct reference and name for the standard was BMHA A156.41-2017 Door Hardware Single Motion to Egress. However the modification to delete the last sentence removed the reference to the standard, so the standard is deleted as well. The last sentence was deleted because the standard is only further explaining what 'one motion' is and is not needed. An inspector can understand the language being added without the information in the standard.

Having the 'single motion' is critical to the operation of the door, so the language in the first sentence is needed in the code. (Vote 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E55-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal would coordinate the allowances in CMS for controlled egress doors. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E56-18

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E57-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The addition of “cognitive” in Exception 1 helps clarify the original intent. This would allow for facilities to address concerns for dementia and Alzheimer patients where needed for patient safety. (Vote 10-4)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E58-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While it is appropriate to make the exception a third item, courtrooms are found in both office buildings (Group B) and courthouses (Group A-3). The proposal should be brought back with a public comment to address this issue. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E59-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal groups the occupancies based on the types of sprinkler systems required. This will make the requirements easier to understand. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E60-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the requirements delayed egress locking system should be in the code, not in a referenced standard. (Vote 9-5)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E61-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: There is signage at this door regarding unlocking, so lighting is needed at this location. (Vote 12-2)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E62-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There has been no justification, data or issue identified that would require UL listing for these stairway doors. These type of doors unlock with the loss of power. Adding the UL listing would increase the cost. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E63-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language in and modification to E64-18 addresses the concerns for panic and fire exit hardware in electrical rooms in a more comprehensive manner. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E64-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1010.1.10.1 Rooms with electrical equipment. Exit or exit access doors serving transformer vaults, rooms designated for batteries or energy storage systems, or modular data centers shall be equipped with panic hardware or fire exit hardware. Where rooms contain electrical rooms with equipment rated 800 amperes or more that contain overcurrent devices, switching devices or control devices and where the exit or exit access door is less than 25 feet from the equipment working space, shall be equipped with panic hardware or fire exit hardware. The doors shall swing in the direction of egress travel.

Committee Reason: By adding travel distance, the modification did add a missing part for coordination with the National Electrical Code. However, there is concern on if 'equipment work space' would be understood and how the distance should be measured.

This proposal would coordinate with the committee action on E17-18. The terms for what types of rooms are addressed is in the National Electrical Code, so which rooms should be understood. It was suggested that perhaps the NEC references in E17-18 should also be added into this section in a public comment. (Vote 10-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E65-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Labeling is not required, so there is no way for code officials to check this in the field. There is not a cycling issue with these types of locks in the industry, which appears to be the only difference between the UL 305 and BMHA A156.3 standards. There is no technical justification for the additional requirement and expense. An architect/owner could always ask for the additional requirements in the BMHA A156.3 standard if they wanted to. (Vote 9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E66-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This level of detail is necessary for full understanding and clarity for stairway requirements. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E67-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal did not consider the idea of a compound slope for the riser. The original intent of the 30 degrees is to avoid a toe catch on the underside of the tread. There was no data provided on this being an issue. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E68-18

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Adding "required width" to the landing requirements coordinates and clarifies the code language. This maintains the egress width along the path of travel which is a critical element to avoid bottle necks. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E69-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It is not clear how you would establish a walk line on a curved stairway. The current language for walk lines is only applicable to winder treads. The proposed language is a requirement, not an exception. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E70-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The new exception 2 is a run on sentence that should be simplified. The phrase "direction of travel" is confusing. The new exception is not needed as this landing shape can be done with current language. Stairway landing commonly have standpipes in the corner without any issues. The proposal does not address what do you do if there turn is less than 90 degrees. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E71-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would be a compromise between accessibility and stairway safety requirements for this condition. However, there was a concern about the understanding of the terms "parked position" and "handhold". What is the length and location of the handhold? It was suggested that "creates a stairway" would be more understandable than "accessed by a stairway." (Vote 11-3)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E72-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal clarifies the location and minimum height for tactile signage. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E73-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: A horizontal exit is a type of exit, so tactile signage at this location is appropriate and would be consistent with visual exit signage requirements. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E74-18

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The change in the expected EXIT signage would be a confusing factor in locating exits in an emergency. The proposal would allow for any font – this is too broad. This allowance should not be applicable to all occupancies. The current language does allow alternative fonts for other signs – such as the egress from the building instead of the emergency exits. If this is needed for this specific system – it should be worked out for the entire system using alternative means. (Vote 12-2)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E75-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Demountable guards appears to be an issue for telescoping or relocatable bleachers and grandstands. This should be limited to those situations. The gaps are a concern for safety – an option to address this with current text would to cover the gaps with caps. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E76-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: If this is just an issue for people carrying bikes down a stairway safely, perhaps this should be limited to exterior stairways only. Any protrusion that moves farther out than the handrail could be a hazard to the pedestrian on the stairways. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E77-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Allowance for detectable warnings at limited areas in transportation systems would be reasonable. This would coordinate with NFPA 130. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E78-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While this exception is rarely used, removing it would take away the design option of two horizontal rails over the handrail. (Vote 8-7)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E79-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The original justification for this 4-3/8” was for residential tread sizes. While there were studies showing this spacing would address safety concerns, allowing the 4-3/8” openings for all occupancies seems too broad. (Vote 10-3)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E80-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1015.8 Window openings. Windows in Group R-2 and R-3 buildings including dwelling units, where the bottom of the clear opening of an operable window opening is located less than 36 inches above the finished floor and more than 72 inches (1829 mm) above the finished grade or other surface below on the exterior of the building, shall comply with one of the following:

1. Operable windows where the top of the sill of the opening is located more than 75 feet (22 860 mm) above the finished grade or other surface below and that are provided with window fall prevention devices that comply with ASTM F2006.
2. Operable windows where the openings will not allow a 4-inch-diameter (102 mm) sphere to pass through the opening when the window is in its largest opened position.
3. Operable windows where the openings are provided with window fall prevention devices that comply with ASTM F2090.
4. Operable windows that are provided with window opening control devices that comply with Section 1015.8.1.

Committee Reason: The modification would coordinate the language in this section with the emergency escape and rescue openings. Making the language for windows required to have opening control devices and EERO the same will improve clarity for requirements.

The proposal clarifies the measurement location. This will move the measurement to the fall location, not a piece of the frame for the window. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E81-18

Errata: This proposal includes no errata

The exception is applicable to the entire section, not just Item 4.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: While preventing falls for children is important, this proposal is too far reaching. This requirement for guards would conflict with emergency escape and rescue opening requirements. Window openings are not more hazardous than drop offs protected by guards - there needs to be some minimum height proposed. No limit on the bottom height of the window is too extensive - as written this would apply to windows at all heights. The fall statistics are based on building stock, not where the new limits are in place. The exception should be addressed in a more comprehensive manner. (Vote 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E82-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

Current items 3 and 4 should have been shown as struck out.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was no justification for removal of the current options for fall prevention devices. This proposal would conflict with the EERO requirements. The references to ASTM F2006 and F2090 should not be deleted from this section - they serve different purposes. The two new alternatives for window protection are overly prescriptive. The new #3 is a reduction in safety - screen should not be relied on and 60 pounds force is less than that required for guards. Regarding proposed Section 1015.8.1. The reference back to Section 1015.8 is confusing. The reference to Section 1030.2 is incorrect - Section 1030.2 is emergency escape and rescue opening size - Section 1030.1.1 is the reference to ASTM F2090. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E83-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The current code addresses the installation for this type of fall prevention device adequately. The maintenance and inspection of these devices should be in the Property Maintenance Code and in the International Existing Building Code, not the IBC. The text for what the inspection should be should be a code requirement - not in a referenced standard. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E84-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1015.7 Roof access. Guards shall be provided where the roof hatch opening is located within 10 feet (3048 mm) of a roof edge or open side of a walking surface and such edge or open side is located more than 30 inches (762 mm) above the floor, roof or grade below. The guard shall extend not less than 30 inches (762mm) beyond each end of the hatch parallel to the roof edge. The guard shall be constructed so as to prevent the passage of a sphere 21 inches (533 mm) in diameter.

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

Committee Reason: The modification would allow for guards past the 30 inch limit. The proposal provides clear guidance on how the guard at the hatch should be measured. The coordinates the IBC and the IMC. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E85-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is a common situation in multi-tenant buildings. This clarifies that a small tenant with a single exit access door can go through an elevator lobby to access the two exits from the floor. Where two or more exit access doors are required from the space, one of the exit access routes can go through the elevator lobby to get to the exits. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E86-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1017.3 Measurement. Exit access travel distance shall be measured from the most remote point of each room, area or space along the natural and unobstructed path of horizontal and vertical egress travel to the entrance to an exit. Where more than one ~~means of egress~~ exit is required, exit access travel distance shall be measured to the nearest exit.

Exception: In open parking garages, exit access travel distance is permitted to be measured to the closest riser of an exit access stairway or the closest slope of an exit access ramp.

Committee Reason: The modification is for consistency within the sentence and the rest of Chapter 10. The code change will clarify that travel distance is to only one exit, not both. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E87-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for several reasons. This would confuse if any stairway would be considered an exit access stairway or an exit stairway. Exit access stairways do not decrease the number of ways required off the floor. The protection of this opening should be the same as a shaft enclosure – not an exit enclosure. The proposed language would confuse where to measure travel distance for an exit access stairway – would this be to the enclosure or down the stairway to the exit? This proposal did not consider if the stairway was a supplemental stairway versus a required means of egress. There was no technical justification for the more restrictive enclosure. Exit enclosure requirements are more restrictive than shaft enclosure requirements, therefore this is a cost increase and the reason said this was a cost decrease. (Vote 9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E88-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is an editorial deletion that removes unnecessary language and clarifies the text. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E89-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The original intent of Exception 1 is to limit this allowance to only two stories. Penetration of floors, even if separated can still be an issue if the separation is not sufficient – especially in high rise building where this could be through multiple floors. (Vote 8-6)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E90-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The current text is to allow for access to something like a plumbing chase or around mechanical equipment. Aisles reference corridor widths in Section 1018.5. There is an allowance in the IMC for dwelling units for a 24" wide corridor, so the revision would be a conflict. (Vote 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E91-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The limitation for corridors in hospitals would align with CMS regulations. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E92-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal clarifies the intent by actually describing what incidental air movement is. There needs to be a public comment to coordinate this section with IMC 601.2. Rather than the IMC reference to Section 407.1 which then references ASHRAE 170, perhaps a straight reference to ASHRAE 170 would be more direct. (Vote 12-

2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E93-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no explanation of what an equipment yard is. This is just an open area. What are you supposed to measure too? There is no precedence or technical justification for this requirement. Why is this limited to just egress balconies? (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E94-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is an editorial change to make the last sentence in the section consistent with the first sentence. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E95-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the language in E94-18 which is dealing with the same issue. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E96-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is currently permitted. Additional protection items for exit stairways within an atrium was added by G35-18. There is no history of problems with exit stairways within atriums, so there is no reason to eliminate the option.

A portion of the committee felt that smoke protected atriums do not offer the same level of protection as an exit enclosure. If both exit stairways are within atriums this could be a serious issue. There was also a concern that there is no limit on the travel distance on an exit stairway in an atrium. (Vote 8-7)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E97-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposal would create unsafe conditions. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E98-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This coordinates the requirements for stairways and shafts. Allowing for beams and joist in the stairway enclosure is needed for stairway construction. Section 714.4.2 would address penetration protection. (Vote 7-6)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

E99-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The swing of a barrier in stairways as the level of exit discharge is not typically an obstruction. The proposed language could be misinterpreted and read as a door at this location instead of just a minimal barrier to stop occupants from continuing down the stairways. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

E100-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This issue for signage was more completely addressed in E72-18. (Vote 12-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

E101-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This would coordinate exit enclosures with exit passageway requirements. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

E102-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This coordinates exterior wall requirements for exit stairways and exit passageways. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

E103-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This could be misinterpreted to allow for the stripes to stop for the stairway below 75 feet. Striking 'high-rise' could be an issue for application of this requirement. (Vote 8-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

E104-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is clarification for the elements within smoke protected seating and open air assembly seating. This is consistent with the intent of E132-15. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

E105-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This revision clarifies what happens within the range of seats. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E106-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is used in a variety of school environments so addressing this issue is needed. The handrail adjacent to this stairway seating arrangement should be the same as required for stepped aisles. Where the 2nd handrail is located needs to be clarified. There was a question on what was meant by the "handrail not located on a guard". Perhaps a definition of "stepped aisle" is needed. There were a couple of grammar errors that need to be fixed. (Vote 9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E107-18

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

The errata was the addition of Section 1030.1 Exception 4.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1030.1 Where required. In addition to the means of egress required by this chapter, emergency escape and rescue openings shall be provided in the following occupancies:

1. Group R-2 occupancies located in stories with only one exit or access to only one exit as permitted by Tables 1006.3.3(1) and 1006.3.3(2).
2. Group R-3 and R-4 occupancies.

Basements and sleeping rooms below the fourth story above grade plane shall have not fewer than one emergency escape and rescue opening in accordance with this section. Where basements contain one or more sleeping rooms, an emergency escape and rescue opening shall be required in each sleeping room, but shall not be required in adjoining areas of the basement. Such openings shall open directly into a public way or to a yard or court that opens to a public way.

Exceptions:

1. Basements with a ceiling height of less than 80 inches (2032 mm) shall not be required to have emergency escape and rescue openings.
2. Emergency escape and rescue openings are not required from basements or sleeping rooms that have an exit door or exit access door that opens directly into a public way or to a yard, court or exterior egress balcony that opens to a public way.
3. Basements without habitable space used only to house mechanical equipment and having not more than 200 square feet (18.6 m²) in floor area shall not be required to have emergency escape and rescue openings.
4. Storm shelters are not required to comply with this section where the shelter is constructed in accordance with ICC 500.
5. Within individual dwelling and sleeping units in Groups R-2 and R-3, where the building is equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1, 903.3.1.2 or 903.3.1.3, sleeping rooms in basements shall not be required to have emergency escape and rescue openings provided that the basement has one of the following:
 - 5.1. One means of egress and one emergency escape and rescue opening.
 - 5.2. Two means of egress.

Committee Reason: The modification restores Exception 3 to its original language. The revised language would require a EERO in a non-habitable basement that had other than mechanical equipment. This proposed exception works for single family homes, not is not great for Group R-2 occupancies.

This is a good coordination between the IBC and IRC requirements for emergency escape and rescue openings and also cleans up some of the language. The addition for coordination with storm shelters (see published errata) is needed. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E108-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is an errata to the IRC to Section R310.1.1. This will make the current language in the IRC and IBC match, so this revision is not necessary. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

Staff Analysis:

The code language in IRC 2018 is as follows:

R310.1.1 Operational constraints and opening control devices. Emergency escape and rescue openings shall be operational from the inside of the room without the use of keys, tools or special knowledge. Window opening control devices on windows serving as a required emergency escape and rescue opening shall comply with ASTM F2090.

E109-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The change in the text to Section 1030.2.3 appears to be mandating a window. There is no sill height given for other openings. Emergency escape and rescue openings can be doors or other acceptable openings. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E110-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This clarifies that doors, swinging or sliding door, can be permitted as an emergency escape and rescue opening. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E111-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This coordinates the IRC and IBC for area wells at emergency escape and rescue opening. This also adds good new information for ladders and drainage. There is an enhancement of the language for access to those openings. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E112-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Where these stepped area wells are permitted at emergency escape and rescue openings is addressed in E111-18. These are not stairways, so this should not be sent to Section 1010. The recommendations are consistent with ladder provisions, which are currently permitted. This combined with E111-18 will be a complete package for the area wells. (Vote 11-3)

E113-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This was addressed in Section 1030.4.3 in E111-18 in a more comprehensive manner for area wells at emergency escape and rescue openings. If this is all window wells, this should be in a different location in the code. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****E114-18****Errata: This proposal includes the following errata**

Note: Some existing words were missing from the first sentence of the text. This was not part of the proposal.

1104.4 Multistory buildings and facilities. At least one accessible route shall connect each accessible story, mezzanine and occupied roofs in multilevel buildings and facilities.

Exceptions:

1. An accessible route is not required to stories, of not more than 3,000 square feet (278.7 m²) and are located above and below accessible levels. This exception shall not apply to:
 - 1.1. Multiple tenant facilities of Group M occupancies containing five or more tenant spaces used for the sales or rental of goods and where at least one such tenant space is located on a floor level above or below the accessible levels.
 - 1.2. Stories or mezzanines containing offices of health care providers (Group B or I).
 - 1.3. Passenger transportation facilities and airports (Group A-3 or B).
 - 1.4. Government buildings.
 - 1.5. Structures with 4 or more dwelling units.
2. Stories/mezzanines contain accessible elements or other spaces as determined by Section 1107 or 1108 are not required to be served by an accessible route from an accessible level.
3. In air traffic control towers, an accessible route is not required to serve the cab and the floor immediately below the cab.
4. Where a two-story building or facility has one story or mezzanine with an occupant load of five or fewer persons that does not contain public use space, that story or mezzanine shall not be required to be connected by an accessible route to the story above or below.

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: While this would typically not happen given the size of 4 apartments and the limit of 3,000 sq.ft in the exception, it is important to add this limitation to be consistent with the Fair Housing Act. Use of exception 2 in Section 1104.4 will still be allow for exceptions in Section 1107.7, such as for non-elevator buildings. (14-0).

Assembly Motion:**NONE****E115-18****Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Having one automatic door on these types of facilities would address the needs of person with mobility impairments or persons with not enough strength to open exterior doors. The use group and occupant loads are appropriate levels for application. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****E116-18**

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There are issues with the terminology and the complexity of the proposed language. Guest parking does not serve the residents. There is nothing in the proposal that deals with employee parking for that same type facility. 'Other than resident' parking should be addressed more comprehensively. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E117-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While this item does need to be clarified, this is not the right direction to go for this calculation. The proposed language for Item 3 is effectively doubling up requirements for parking for Groups I-1 and R. The intent is to comply with the most restrictive of the 2010 ADA and the Fair Housing requirements, so this calculation should be the opposite of what is indicated. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E118-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This complicates the requirements - the intent is to base the number of accessible spaces on the total number on the site and disperse by lot and type. This appears to be a conflict with Section 1106.2 Exception 1. The requirement for van accessible spaces to be distributed seems to indicate a van space at each separate location accessible parking is provided. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E119-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Parking meters and pay stations that serve accessible parking spaces should be accessible. This will coordinate with the technical requirements for this equipment in 2017 ICC A117.1. (Vote 12-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E120-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal could be interpreted to limit the first electrical vehicle charging station to be reserved for people that have accessible plates or tags - that is overly restrictive. The committee preferred the language in E121 as a more comprehensive solution. This does not address the parking space associated with the charging station. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E121-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This provides guidance for how to make electrical vehicle charging stations accessible. There are no reservation signs, so this proposal allows for all vehicles to use the accessible stalls at the accessible electric vehicle charging station. This is a separate service, so this would not be part of the accessible parking requirements. This is good harmonization with the technical requirements added in the 2017 edition of ICC A117.1. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

E122-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Assisted living facilities are starting to provide a variety of units in a facility. It is appropriate to disperse the Accessible units in the types similar to hotels. This would be consistent with Department of Justice requirements. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E123-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1107.5.1.1 Accessible units in Group I-1, Condition 1. In Group I-1, Condition 1, at least 4 percent, but not less than one, of the dwelling units and sleeping units shall be Accessible units.

Exceptions:

- ~~1. In not more than 50 percent of the Accessible units, water~~ Water closets shall not be required to comply with ICC A117.1 where such water closets comply with Section 1109.2.2, in not more than 50 percent of the Accessible units.
- ~~2. In not more than 50 percent of the Accessible units, roll-in type~~ Roll-in-type showers shall not be required to comply with ICC A117.1 where roll-in-type showers comply with Section 1109.2.3, in not more than 50 percent of the Accessible units.

1107.5.1.2 Accessible units in Group I-1, Condition 2. In Group I-1, Condition 2, at least 10 percent, but not less than one, of the dwelling units and sleeping units shall be Accessible units.

Exceptions:

- ~~1. In not more than 50 percent of the Accessible units, water~~ Water closets shall not be required to comply with ICC A117.1 where such water closets comply with Section 1109.2.2, in not more than 50 percent of the Accessible units.
- ~~2. In not more than 50 percent of the Accessible units, roll-in type~~ Roll-in-type showers shall not be required to comply with ICC A117.1 where roll-in-type showers comply with Section 1109.2.3, in not more than 50 percent of the Accessible units.

Committee Reason: For the modification, moving the percentage from the front to the back of the exceptions will improve the understanding of the exception.

This is coordinated with the technical provisions in E128 and E129. Allowance for this option is an alternative for fully Accessible units that will work better for the percentage of the population that cannot transfer well without assistance. This increases design options based on the needs of the residents. (Vote 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E124-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1107.5.2.1 Accessible units. At least 50 percent but not less than one of each type of the dwelling units and sleeping units shall be Accessible units.

Exceptions:

- ~~1. In not more than 90 percent of the Accessible units, water~~ Water closets shall not be required to comply with ICC A117.1 where such water closets comply with Section 1109.2.2, in not more than 90 percent of the accessible units.
- ~~2. In not more than 90 percent of the Accessible units, roll-in type~~ Roll-in-type showers shall not be required to comply with ICC A117.1 where roll-in-type showers comply with Section 1109.2.3, in not more than 90 percent of the Accessible

units.

Committee Reason: For the modification, moving the percentage from the front to the back of the exceptions will improve the understanding of the exception.

This is coordinated with the technical provisions in E128 and E129. Allowance for this option is an alternative for fully Accessible units that will work better for the percentage of the population that cannot transfer well without assistance. This increases design options based on the needs of the residents. The higher percentage for nursing homes is supported by the research for care needed for elderly persons with limited upper body strength. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E125-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1107.5.4 Group I-2 rehabilitation facilities. In hospitals and rehabilitation facilities of Group I-2 occupancies that specialize in treating conditions that affect mobility, or units within either that specialize in treating conditions that affect mobility, 100 percent of the dwelling units and sleeping units shall be Accessible units.

Exceptions:

1. ~~In not more than 50 percent of the Accessible units, water~~ Water closets shall not be required to comply with ICC A 117.1 where such water closets comply with Section 1109.2.2, in not more than 50 percent of Accessible units.

2. ~~In not more than 50 percent of the Accessible units, roll-in-type~~ Roll-in-type showers shall not be required to comply with ICC A117.1 where roll-in-type showers comply with Section 1109.2.3, in not more than 50 percent of Accessible units.

Committee Reason: For the modification, moving the percentage from the front to the back of the exceptions will improve the understanding of the exception.

This is coordinated with the technical provisions in E128 and E129. Rehabilitation facilities now require 100% of the units to be Accessible. Allowance for this option is an alternative for fully Accessible units that will work better for the percentage of the population that cannot transfer well without assistance. This increases design options based on the needs of the residents. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E126-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This code change would be a reduction in the number of Type A units required. This allowance would conflict with what is required in Section 1107.7.1.1. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E127-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the language and make is easier to read and apply. The reference to Section 1612.3 is an importance reference to put this provision in context. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E128-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The assisted toileting provisions in this proposal are a good option that is needed for the

elderly population. The study backing this up has shown that this option is important for both resident and staff comfort and safety. This is equivalent or better for this population than what is required for water closets in Accessible units in the ICC A117.1 and the 2010 ADA. The scoping in E123, E124 and E125 will limit this as is an option for Group I-1 and I-2 only, and only as a percentage of the required Accessible units.

This needs to be in the IBC because the industry needs this information now. This will provide for an alternative backed up by research. Right now the industry applies for alternative means with options that are varied and may not have the same level of information or justification to back them up. The proponents will submit this to the ICC A117.1 standard during the next development cycle so it can later be removed from the IBC. (Vote 11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E129-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The assisted bathing provisions are a companion piece to the allowances for assisted toileting in E128. Providing criteria will allow for design options and consistency for an alternative means to be used by the assisted living and nursing home industry. These provisions for showers that are for persons that do not have the upper body strength for self transfer are needed by residents and staff in this industry. The scoping in E123, E124 and E125 will limit this as is an option for Group I-1 and I-2 only, and only as a percentage of the Accessible units.

This needs to be in the IBC because the industry needs this information now. This will provide for an alternative backed up by research. The proponents will submit this to the ICC A117.1 standard during the next development cycle so it can later be removed from the IBC. (Vote 11-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E130-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal will provide scoping provisions and will allow design options for bottle water fillers. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E131-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Dressing rooms in occupancies where the dressing rooms are not a service facility should be accessible. This is an appropriate relocation. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E132-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This revision for service counters to include counters and windows will coordinate with the new technical criteria in the 2017 edition of ICC A117.1. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E133-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This removes redundant language from IBC and relies on the technical criteria for operable parts in the 2017 edition of ICC A117.1. This will reduce possible conflicts in the future. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E134-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Modification:

1110.4.14 Swimming pools, wading pools, cold baths, hot tubs and spas. Swimming pools, wading pools, cold baths, hot tubs and spas shall be accessible and be on an accessible route.

Exceptions:

- 1.Catch pools or a designated section of a pool used as a terminus for a water slide flume shall not be required to provide an accessible means of entry, provided that a portion of the catch pool edge is on an accessible route.
- 2.Where spas, cold baths or hot tubs are provided in a cluster, at least 5 percent, but not less than one of each type of spa, cold ~~baths~~ bath or hot tub in each cluster, shall be accessible and be on an accessible route.
- 3.Swimming pools, wading pools, spas, cold baths and hot tubs that are required to be accessible by Sections 1110.2.2 and 1110.2.3 are not required to provide accessible means of entry into the water.

Committee Reason: There was an editorial correction to the language in Exception 2.

To be consistent with the scoping provisions for these types of facilities, cold baths should be considered similar to hot tubs and spas. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E135-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The allowance for these elevated shooting stands is logical and will coordinate with the 2017 edition of the ICC A117.1. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E136-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This will coordinate the accessible signage requirements with the ICC A117.1. This will also coordinate with signage requirements in the International Plumbing Code. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

E137-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

E104.2.2 Group I-3. In Group I-3 occupancies, at least 2 percent, ~~but no fewer than one~~ of the total number of general holding cells and general housing cells equipped with audible emergency notification systems, and not less than one cell, devices shall be provided with visual notification devices, and ~~Permanently permanently~~ installed telephones within the cell shall comply, both complying with Section E104.2.4.

Committee Reason: The purpose of the modification is to addresses alarm types and separates out phones. This will coordinate the language in NFPA 72. There may be conflict with the federal requirements that will need to be addressed in a public comment. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

International Building Code - Structural

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

S1-18

THIS IS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This provides a clear indicator as to where to look in the IBC for the information. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

S2-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee determined this proposal would unnecessarily eliminate an entire class of products from use. (Vote 13-0).

Assembly Motion:

NONE

S3-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee determined this change would help advance the code without making any technical changes. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

S4-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1505.9 Roof top mounted photovoltaic panel systems. Rooftop rack-mounted photovoltaic panel systems shall be tested, listed and identified with a fire classification in accordance with UL 1703 and UL 2703. ~~Listed systems shall include roof mounting hardware.~~ Listed systems shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions and its listing. The fire classification shall comply with Table 1505.1 based on the type of construction of the building.

Committee Reason: The committee determined this language is needed to ensure systems are installed properly and that the modification addressed the questions and concerns about the proposal. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

S5-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee determined this changed would eliminate an existing needed and informative consensus standard. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

S6-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee determined this proposal would not correct the broken text. (Vote 10-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

S7-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee concluded this clarification should be made in Chapter 6, not as proposed. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

S8-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Errata: This proposal includes no errata

-

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved based on the disapproval of S7. (13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

S9-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposed change made an excellent clarification. (Vote 12-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

S10-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC GENERAL CODE COMMITTEE

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: What is an occupied roof structure? This is a problem because penthouses and mechanical structures on the roof are not always under 10 percent. A structure is not always and enclosed space. This would put a limitation on structures that are currently allowed on rooftops. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

S11-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC GENERAL CODE COMMITTEE

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This does a very good job of clarifying the code. It is much more precise that we're going to a definition. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

S12-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC GENERAL CODE COMMITTEE

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval based on the committees approval of S13-18. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

S13-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC GENERAL CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is a good cleanup. Having requirements in multiple sections leads to confusion. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

S14-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Errata: This proposal includes the following errata

1705.14 Sprayed fire-resistant materials. Special inspections and tests of sprayed fire-resistant materials applied to floor, roof and wall assemblies and structural members shall be performed in accordance with Sections 1705.14.1 through 1705.14.6. Special inspections shall be based on the fire-resistance design as designated in the approved construction documents. The tests set forth in this section shall be based on samplings from specific floor, roof and wall assemblies and structural members. Special inspections and tests shall be performed after the rough installation of electrical, automatic sprinkler, mechanical and plumbing systems and suspension systems for ceilings, and before ~~concealed~~ concealment, where applicable.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved based on the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

S15-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Errata: This proposal includes the following errata

1705.14 Sprayed fire-resistant materials. Special inspections and tests of sprayed fire-resistant materials applied to floor, roof and wall assemblies and structural members shall be performed in accordance with Sections 1705.14.1 through 1705.14.6. Special inspections shall be based on the fire-resistance design as designated in the approved construction documents. The tests set forth in this section shall be based on samplings from specific floor, roof and wall assemblies and structural members. Special inspections and tests shall be performed during construction with an ~~addition~~ additional visual inspection after the rough installation of electrical, automatic sprinkler, mechanical and plumbing systems and suspension systems for ceilings, where applicable.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee determined this change provides a useful tool. (Vote 7-6)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

S16-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Errata: This proposal includes no errata

1705.14 Sprayed fire-resistant materials. Special inspections and tests of sprayed fire-resistant materials applied to floor, roof and wall assemblies and structural members shall be performed in accordance with Sections 1705.14.1 through 1705.14.6. Special inspections shall be based on the fire-resistance design as designated in the approved construction documents. The tests set forth in this section shall be based on samplings from specific floor, roof and wall assemblies and structural members. Special inspections and tests shall be performed after the rough installation of electrical, automatic sprinkler, mechanical and plumbing systems and suspension systems for ceilings, where applicable. The required sample size shall not exceed 110% of that specified by the referenced standards in Sections 1705.14.4.1 through ~~1704.14.4.9~~ 1705.14.4.9.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee determined the change would provide guidance on sample size. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

S17-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee deemed it inappropriate to reference a draft standard. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

S18-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Errata: This proposal includes published errata

Standard reference corrected to Draft ASTM Standard WK54767.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved based on the action taken on S17. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

S19-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1705.15 Mastic and intumescent fire-resistant coatings. Special inspections and tests for mastic and intumescent fire-resistant coatings applied to structural elements and decks shall be performed in accordance with AWCI 12-B. Special inspections and tests shall be based on the fire-resistance design as designated in the approved construction documents. Special Inspections and tests shall be performed during construction with an additional visual inspection after the rough installation of electrical, automatic sprinkler, mechanical and plumbing systems and suspension systems for ceilings, and before concealed, where applicable.

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposal ensures fire proofing in places as required after all trades have finished. The committee found the modification was consistent with prior approvals. (Vote 8-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

S20-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found the language unclear and confusing. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

S21-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee determined the proposal offered a means to improve fire stopping. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

S22-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE INTERNATIONAL FIRE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was seen as being too broad and would apply special inspection requirements to very small buildings and homes outside the scope of the IRC that do not warrant such review. (Vote 12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

2018 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL FIRE CODE

FIRE CODE COMMITTEE

Dan Weed, CBO, Chair

Rep: City of Victor, CO
Building Official
Colorado Code Consulting, LLC
Denver, CO

Michael E. Whalen, Vice Chair

Construction Official
New Jersey Department of Community Affairs
Codes and Standards
Trenton, NJ

Michael W. Evans

Rep: International Association of Fire Chiefs
Deputy Fire Chief
Brighton Area Fire Authority
Brighton, MI

Sam Francis

National Programs Director
American Wood Council
West Grove, PA

Barry Grieve, CBO

Bldg. Regulatory & Strategy Lead
Target Corporation
Minneapolis, MN

Howard Hopper, FPE

Regulatory Services Program Manager
UL LLC
Fremont, CA

Randall Metz

Rep: Southern California Fire Prevention
Officers Association-ICC Chapter
Fire Marshal
Carlsbad Fire Department
Carlsbad, CA

Derek Murgatroyd, PE

Rep: National Association of State Fire
Marshals
Fire Protection Engineer
Office of the Maryland State Fire Marshal/
Southern Regional Office
Prince Frederick, MD

David R. Owens, CBO, C. I.

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Managing Member
Owens Inspection Services, LLC
Palmer, AK

Sarah A. Rice, CBO

Project Manager/Partner
The Preview Group Inc.
Cincinnati, OH

Greg Rogers, FMD

Rep: International Association of Fire Chiefs
Fire Marshal
Division Chief/Fire Marshal
Spokane Valley Fire Department
Spokane Valley, WA

Stephen Rondinelli, AIA

Rondinelli Life Safety
Lakewood, CO

Heather Roth, PE

Rep: National Association of State Fire
Marshals
Fire Protection Engineer 2
NYS Office of Fire Prevention and Control
Rochester, NY

Marc Sampson

Assistant Fire Marshal
Longmont Fire Department
Longmont, CO

Scott Stookey

Engineer A-Hazardous Materials
Austin Fire Department
Austin, TX

Staff Secretariats:

Beth Tubbs, PE, FSFPE

Senior Staff Engineer
Codes and Standards Development
ICC - Boston Field Office
Boston, MA

Keith Enstrom, PE
Staff Engineer
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hills, IL

International Fire Code

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

F1-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it was felt too broad and having an operational permit would put a burden on fire code officials to inspect annually. This is seen as excessive as these facilities are already highly regulated. (Vote: 12-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F2-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: These definitions were seen as necessary to better assist the fire code official with the application of Section 510. There were some concerns raised that the definitions could be simplified. Some of these definitions appeared to contain requirements. Finally, there were concerns that the definitions were not written in mandatory language and confusion would result in stating a DAQ of 3.4 where Section 510 and NFPA 1221 require 3.0. (Vote: 8-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F3-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F4-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IFC COMMITTEE, PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-FS COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. This is also consistent with the action taken on Part II by the IBC Fire Safety Committee. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F4-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The term is used throughout the code. The definition is needed. (Vote 11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F5-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the reason statement had flaws such as it omits high hazard commodities and also that definitions should not contain requirements. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F6-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the scope of the new definition needed to be expanded. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F7-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they did not agree with the language of "planned" and that there should not be code requirements in definitions. (Vote:: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F8-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the definition of mulch varies by location. They also had concerns with the distance requirement, occupancy group and the difficulty with enforcement. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F9-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the exception was incorrect and that no size is given for the ticket rooms and toilet rooms. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F10-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the new proposed standard contains unacceptable language regarding specific labeling and listing requirements. (Vote: 12-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F11-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the scope of the new definition and section is too broad and overly

restrictive. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F12-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F13-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that, similar to F8-18, they had concerns with the distance requirement, occupancy group and the difficulty with enforcement. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F14-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IFC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

2018 International Fire Code

311.2.2 Fire protection. Fire alarm, automatic sprinkler systems and stand-pipe systems shall be maintained in an operable condition at all times.

Exceptions:

1. Where the premises have been cleared of all combustible materials and debris and, in the opinion of the fire code official, the type of construction, fire separation distance and security of the premises do not create a fire hazard.
2. Where approved by the fire code official, buildings that will not be heated and where fire protection systems will be exposed to freezing temperatures, fire alarm and automatic sprinkler systems are permitted to be placed out of service and standpipes are permitted to be maintained as dry systems (without an automatic water supply), provided that the building does not have contents or storage, and windows, doors and other openings are secured to prohibit entry by unauthorized persons.
3. Where approved by the fire code official, fire alarm and automatic sprinkler systems are permitted to be placed out of service in seasonally occupied buildings: that will not be heated; where fire protection systems will be exposed to freezing temperatures; where fire areas do not exceed 12,000 square feet (1115 m²); and that do not store motor vehicles or hazardous materials.

403.11.1.2 Lease plan. In addition to the requirements of Section 404.2.2, a lease plan that includes the following information shall be prepared for each covered and open mall building:

1. Each occupancy, including identification of tenant.
2. Exits from each tenant space.
3. Fire protection features, including the following:
 - 3.1. Fire department connections.
 - 3.2. Fire command center.
 - 3.3. Smoke management system controls.
 - 3.4. Elevators, elevator machine rooms and controls.
 - 3.5. Hose valve outlets.
 - 3.6. Sprinkler and standpipe control valves.
 - 3.7. Areas protected with automatic sprinkler systems and automatic fire-extinguishing

systems.

3.8. Automatic fire detector zones.

3.9. ~~Fire walls, fire barriers, fire partitions~~

903.1.1 Alternative protection. Alternative automatic fire-extinguishing systems complying with Section 904 shall be permitted instead of automatic sprinkler system protection where recognized by the applicable standard and approved by the fire code official.

903.5 Testing and maintenance. Automatic sprinkler systems shall be tested and maintained in accordance with Section 901.

1010.3.2 Security access turnstiles. Security access turnstiles that inhibit travel in the direction of egress utilizing a physical barrier shall be permitted to be considered as a component of the means of egress, provided that all of the following criteria are met:

1. The building is protected throughout by an approved, supervised automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1.
2. Each security access turnstile lane configuration has a minimum clear passage width of 22 inches (559 mm).
3. Any security access turnstile lane configuration providing a clear passage width of less than 32 inches (810 mm) shall be credited with a maximum egress capacity of 50 persons.
4. Any security access turnstile lane configuration providing a clear passage width of 32 inches (810 mm) or more shall be credited with a maximum egress capacity as calculated in accordance with Section 1005.
5. Each secured physical barrier shall automatically retract or swing to an unobstructed open position in the direction of egress, under each of the following conditions:
 - 5.1. Upon loss of power to the turnstile or any part of the access control system that secures the physical barrier.
 - 5.2. Upon actuation of a clearly identified manual release device with ready access that results in direct interruption of power to each secured physical barrier, after which such barriers remain in the open position for not less than 30 seconds. The manual release device shall be positioned at one of the following locations:
 - 5.2.1. On the egress side of each security access turnstile lane.
 - 5.2.2. At an approved location where it can be actuated by an employee assigned to the area at all times that the building is occupied.
 - 5.3. Upon actuation of the building fire alarm system, if provided, after which the physical barrier remains in the open position until the fire alarm system is manually reset.
Exception: Actuation of a manual fire alarm box.
 - 5.4. Upon actuation of the building automatic sprinkler system or fire detection system, after which the physical barrier remains in the open position until the fire alarm system is manually reset.

2018 International Building Code

428.3.9 Automatic sprinkler systems. Buildings containing laboratory suites shall be equipped throughout with an approved automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1.

506.2.2.1 Group H-2 or H-3 mixed occupancies. For a building containing Group H-2 or H-3 occupancies, the allowable area shall be determined in accordance with Section 508.4.2, with the automatic sprinkler system increase applicable only to the portions of the building not classified as Group H-2 or H-3.

506.2.4.1 Group H-2 or H-3 mixed occupancies. For a building containing Group H-2 or H-3 occupancies, the allowable area shall be determined in accordance with Section 508.4.2, with the automatic sprinkler system increase applicable only to the portions of the building not classified as Group H-2 or H-3.

1705.12.6 Plumbing, mechanical and electrical components. Periodic special inspection of plumbing, mechanical and electrical components shall be required for the following:

1. Anchorage of electrical equipment for emergency and standby power systems in structures assigned to Seismic Design Category C, D, E or F.
2. Anchorage of other electrical equipment in structures assigned to Seismic Design Category E or F.
3. Installation and anchorage of piping systems designed to carry hazardous materials and their associated mechanical units in structures assigned to Seismic Design Category C, D, E or F.
4. Installation and anchorage of ductwork designed to carry hazardous materials in structures assigned to Seismic Design Category C, D, E or F.
5. Installation and anchorage of vibration isolation systems in structures assigned to Seismic Design Category C, D, E or F where the approved construction documents require a nominal clearance

- of 1/4 inch (6.4 mm) or less between the equipment support frame and restraint.
6. Installation of mechanical and electrical equipment, including duct work, piping systems and their structural supports, where automatic sprinkler systems are installed in structures assigned to Seismic Design Category C, D, E or F to verify one of the following:
- 6.1. Minimum clearances have been provided as required by Section 13.2.3 ASCE/SEI 7.
 - 6.2. A nominal clearance of not less than 3 inches (76 mm) has been provided between automatic sprinkler system drops and sprigs and: structural members not used collectively or independently to support the sprinklers; equipment attached to the building structure; and other systems' piping.

Where flexible sprinkler hose fittings are used, special inspection of minimum clearances is not required.

2603.3 Surface-burning characteristics. Unless otherwise indicated in this section, foam plastic insulation and foam plastic cores of manufactured assemblies shall have a flame spread index of not more than 75 and a smoke-developed index of not more than 450 where tested in the maximum thickness intended for use in accordance with ASTM E84 or UL 723. Loose fill-type foam plastic insulation shall be tested as board stock for the flame spread and smoke-developed indices.

Exceptions:

- 1. Smoke-developed index for interior trim as provided for in Section 2604.2.
- 2. In cold storage buildings, ice plants, food plants, food processing rooms and similar areas, foam plastic insulation where tested in a thickness of 4 inches (102 mm) shall be permitted in a thickness up to 10 inches (254 mm) where the building is equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1. The approved automatic sprinkler system shall be provided in both the room and that part of the building in which the room is located.
- 3. Foam plastic insulation that is a part of a Class A, B or C roof-covering assembly provided that the assembly with the foam plastic insulation satisfactorily passes NFPA 276 or UL 1256. The smoke-developed index shall not be limited for roof applications.
- 4. Foam plastic insulation greater than 4 inches (102 mm) in thickness shall have a maximum flame spread index of 75 and a smoke-developed index of 450 where tested at a minimum thickness of 4 inches (102 mm), provided that the end use is approved in accordance with Section 2603.9 using the maximum thickness and density intended for use.
- 5. Flame spread and smoke-developed indices for foam plastic interior signs in covered and open mall buildings provided that the signs comply with Section 402.6.4.

3104.5.3 Open sides on walkway. Where the distance between the connected buildings is more than 10 feet (3048 mm), the walls at the intersection of the pedestrian walkway and each building need not be fire-resistance rated provided that both sidewalls of the pedestrian walkway are not less than 50 percent open with the open area uniformly distributed to prevent the accumulation of smoke and toxic gases. The roof of the walkway shall be located not more than 40 feet (12 160 mm) above grade plane, and the walkway shall only be permitted to connect to the third or lower story of each building.

Exception: Where the pedestrian walkway is protected with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1, the roof of the walkway shall be located not more than 55 feet (16 764 mm) above grade plane and the walkway shall only be permitted to connect to the fifth or lower story of each building.

2606.7.4 Automatic sprinkler system. In buildings that are equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1, plastic light-diffusing systems shall be protected both above and below unless the sprinkler system has been specifically approved for installation only above the light-diffusing system. Areas of light-diffusing systems that are protected in accordance with this section shall not be limited.

2018 International Existing Building Code

1203.4 Transoms. In buildings equipped throughout with automatic sprinkler systems of Group R-1, R-2 or R-3 , existing transoms in corridors and other fire-resistance-rated walls may be maintained if fixed in the closed position. A sprinkler shall be installed on each side of the transom.

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the improvement of the language consistent with the proposals intent. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F14-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

P2902.5.4 Connections to automatic fire sprinkler systems. The potable water supply to automatic fire sprinkler systems shall be protected against backflow by a double-check backflow prevention assembly, a double-check fire protection backflow prevention assembly, a reduced pressure principle backflow prevention assembly or a reduced pressure principle fire protection backflow prevention assembly.

Exception: Where automatic sprinkler systems are installed in accordance with Section P2904.1, backflow protection for the water supply system shall not be required.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: This is simply for consistency with the proposals intent. For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F15-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 12-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F16-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the test standard was inappropriate and there was a lack of requirements for these pallets. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F17-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that there are issues regarding the definition and interpretation of combustible storage, temporary vs. permanent, and rooms that are open to the corridor. (Vote: 9-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F18-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that there are issues with the package and container types, thermal runaway, ignition potential, unlimited area buildings, the relation to IBC incidental use and gathering areas to occupancy group. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F19-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F20-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F21-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the requirement would be difficult to enforce and does not include other elements. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F22-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 8-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F23-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the requirements should not be conditional on if the furniture is affixed due to inconsistency. In addition there is no criteria provided for the distance of 5 feet, the type of exterior wall is not addressed and the heat release requirement does not take into account the type of furniture material. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F24-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it more appropriately locates the ambulatory care facility requirements within the Group B requirements as such facilities are Group B occupancies. Also, the proposal removes unnecessary references in Section 403.8.2 for Group I-2 occupancies to be consistent with other healthcare occupancies. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F25-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal makes the provisions for healthcare related occupancies more consistent in terminology and more comprehensive. The fire safety and evacuation plans are more comprehensive and consistent. Also the terminology of employee versus staff is addressed. Staff is more encompassing. (Vote 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F26-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

403.8.2.2 Fire safety plan. A copy of the plan shall be maintained at the facility at all times. The plan shall include all of the following in addition to the requirements of Section 404.2.2:

1. Location and number of care recipients sleeping rooms and operating rooms.
2. Location of special locking ~~control~~ arrangements.

Committee Reason: This proposal addresses the correct terminology "care recipient" versus "patient." In addition this proposal removes duplicative language that is already provided in Section 404 for smoke compartments. Section 403.8.2.2 was modified to remove "control" from item 4 to be consistent with the revisions in sections 403.3.2 and 403.10.3.1.1. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F27-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as the term staff more appropriately captures all those who should be participating in drills. This will include volunteers and contracted staff where the term "employee" will not. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F28-18

Errata: This proposal includes the following errata

405.2 Occupant participation. Emergency fire and evacuation drills shall involve the actual evacuation of occupants to a selected assembly point and shall provide occupants with experience in exiting through all required exits. All required exits shall be used during emergency evacuation drills.

Exceptions:

1. In Ambulatory Care Facilities and Group I-2 the movement of care recipients to a safe area or to the exterior of the building is not required.
2. In Group I-1, Condition 2 the assembly point for residents is permitted to be within an adjacent smoke compartment.
3. In Group R-4, actual exiting from emergency escape and rescue openings shall not be required. Opening the emergency escape and rescue opening and signaling for help shall be an acceptable alternative.
4. In Group I-3, Conditions 2 through 5 where a defend-in-place response is permitted, the assembly point for detainees is permitted to be within an adjacent smoke compartment.
5. In Group I-3, Conditions 2 through 5, movement of detainees is not required to an assembly point ~~is not required~~ where there are security concerns.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This was disapproved as it was felt that Section 405.2 as proposed would apply too broadly to all occupancies and requires all available exits to be used during drills which is seen as excessive. In addition, the term "patient" needs to be revised to "care recipients." (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F29-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was seen as too restrictive as it applies to all Group H occupancies. It was felt that such requirements were unnecessary and potentially dangerous for Group H-1 occupancies and that Group H-5 occupancies already have specific reason for such requirements. It was suggested a more refined lists is necessary focused on higher risks situations is necessary to apply this section more generally such as looking at situations where 2 or more exits are required. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F30-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: These sections are intended for Group I-1 Condition 2 occupancies and the deletion addresses concern that this may have unintended consequences to require such training for care recipients. It is unclear the intent of having such a requirement for training in this regard. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F31-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it addresses the more appropriate terminology of "staff" versus "employee" as it includes volunteers and contract workers. This is also consistent with the action taken on F25-18 and F27-18. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F32-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This reorganization was seen as appropriate and will consolidate the exceptions for fire drill timing in one location. This also retains the fire code officials discretion with regard to inclement weather. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F33-18

Errata: This proposal includes unpublished errata

403.8.2.4 Fire loss prevention in operating rooms. Fire protection features and procedures for fire loss prevention in surgical operating rooms shall comply with NFPA 99, Section 16.13 ~~15.13~~.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as the reference to NFPA 99 provides necessary detail to address surgery fire hazards such as electrical and use of alcohol rub. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F34-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it addresses both styles of dormitories. Dormitories are no longer limited to sleeping units but now often include dwelling units. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F35-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval of the proposal was based on the more appropriate term "opening" versus "window."

Opening is more inclusive. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F36-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it was too restrictive in reducing the number below 1000 and will apply to small events. In addition there was concern with determining what qualifications are associated with weather monitoring. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F37-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This was disapproved with concern that it will apply the lockdown provisions where they were not intended. Currently the lockdown section applies where lockdown plans are formed but are not required. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F38-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based on the need for more specific information such as stroke size for the identification. Also, there was concern that, as written, this proposal only addresses the plans and not the building itself. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F39-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

404.2.3 Lockdown plans. Lockdown plans shall only be permitted where such plans are approved by the fire code official and are in compliance with Sections 404.2.3.1 and 404.2.3.2.

Committee Reason: This proposal strengthens lockdown plans by placing reference to the requirements within the sections related to maintenance and availability of fire safety and evacuation plans. In addition, the lockdown provisions are added to Section 405 dealing with drills. There was some concern that deleting Section 404.2.3 may lose the fire code officials approval therefore a modification to retain that section was approved. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F40-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it takes the authority away from the fire code official in terms of what is specifically approved. For instance without this authority it is possible a dry system will be installed where a wet system would have been more appropriate. It was suggested that in cases where a specific standard is not referenced either a pointer be made back to Section 903 or the term needs to stay. Also the term "approved" was added in code change proposal F14-18 and to be consistent the term should remain. (Vote: 14-0)

F41-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This was disapproved as it appeared too subjective and may create decreased access. These revisions may make it more difficult for the fire code official to justify the need for proper access. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****F42-18****Committee Action:****Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:**

508.1.1 Location and access. The location and access to the fire command center shall be ~~provided with access from fire apparatus access roads and shall have direct access from the building exterior at the lowest level of fire department access~~ approved by the fire code official.

911.1.1 Location and access. The location and access to the fire command center shall be ~~provided with access from fire apparatus access roads and shall have direct access from the building exterior at the lowest level of fire department access~~ approved by the fire code official.

Committee Reason: The need for a fire command center in these larger Group F-1 and S-1 occupancies was felt necessary as such buildings are getting more complex and need space within the building to operate during a fire. There were some concerns that a dedicated room is not necessary and a room with protection such as fire pump room would be adequate. Concern also with where the number 500,000 square feet came from. Also concern with how the distance is measured and that travel distance may be a better way to determine. Depending on where the incident is located within the building the fire command center location may not be practical. Potentially providing a more defined list as to what will be included in the fire command center that possibly differs from what is necessary for a high rise building may be necessary. There were two modifications to this proposal. The first was to retain the language in Section 508.1.1 and 911.1.1 as the term direct access was seen as problematic. Additionally the term "accessibility" although existing language conflicts with the concept of "accessibility" as used in Chapter 11 of the IBC. This issue has been addressed throughout the I-Codes and for consistency the terms "accessibility of" was revised to "access to." (Vote: 8-6)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****F43-18****Errata: This proposal includes the following errata**

[F] 911.1.6 Required features. The fire command center shall comply with NFPA 72 and shall contain all of the following features:

(Items 1-17 unchanged)

18. Elevator emergency or standby power selector switch(es) (labelled "elevator emergency power"), where emergency or standby building power is ~~provided~~ provided and the emergency or standby building power is not sufficient to operate all elevators and associated equipment simultaneously.

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as more justification was needed from the proponent and specifically there was concern with how this would work with Occupant evacuation elevators (OEE) since those elevators would need to be available during an entire event. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****F44-18**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as standards such as NFPA 72 already address. In addition, the fire command center is already secured and another level of locking was not seen as necessary. (Vote: 14-0)

F45-18**Committee Modification:****510 EMERGENCY RESPONDER COMMUNICATION COVERAGE**

510.1 Emergency responder communication coverage in new buildings. Approved in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage for emergency responders shall be provided in all new buildings. In-building 2 way emergency responder communication coverage within the building shall be based on the existing coverage levels of the public safety communication systems utilized by the jurisdiction, measured at the exterior of the building. This section shall not require improvement of the existing public safety communication systems.

Exceptions:

1. Where approved by the building official and the fire code official, a wired communication system in accordance with Section 907.2.12.2 shall be permitted to be installed or maintained instead of an approved radio coverage system.

2. Where it is determined by the fire code official that the radio coverage system is not needed.

3. In facilities where emergency responder radio coverage is required and such systems, components or equipment required could have a negative impact on the normal operations of that facility, the fire code official shall have the authority to accept an automatically activated emergency responder radio coverage system.

510.2 Emergency responder communication coverage in existing buildings. Existing buildings shall be provided with approved in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage for emergency responders as required in Chapter 11.

510.3 Permit required. A construction permit for the installation of or modification to in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage systems and related equipment is required as specified in Section 105.7.6. Maintenance performed in accordance with this code is not considered a modification and does not require a permit.

510.4 Technical requirements. Systems, components and equipment required to provide the in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system shall comply with Sections 510.4.1 through 510.4.2.8.

510.4.1 Emergency responder communication coverage system signal strength. The building shall be considered to have acceptable in-building 2-way emergency responder communication system coverage when signal strength measurements in 95 percent of all areas on each floor of the building meet the signal strength requirements in Sections 510.4.1.1 through 510.4.1.3.

510.4.2 System design. The in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system shall be designed in accordance with Sections 510.4.2.1 through 510.4.2.8 and NFPA 1221.

510.4.2.1 Amplification systems and components. Buildings and structures that cannot support the required level of in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage shall be equipped with systems and components to enhance the radio signals and achieve the required level of in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage specified in Sections 510.4.1 through 510.4.1.3. In-building 2-way emergency responder communication systems utilizing radio-frequency-emitting devices and cabling shall be approved by the fire code official. Prior to installation, all RF-emitting devices shall have the certification of the radio licensing authority and be suitable for public safety use.

510.4.2.2 Technical criteria. The fire code official shall maintain a document providing the specific technical information and requirements for the in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system. This document shall contain, but not be limited to, the various frequencies required, the location of radio sites, the effective radiated power of radio sites, the maximum propagation delay in microseconds, the applications being used and other supporting technical information necessary for system design.

510.4.2.3 Standby power. In-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage systems shall be provided with dedicated standby batteries or provided with 2-hour standby batteries and connected to the facility generator power system in accordance with Section 1203. The standby power supply shall be capable of operating the in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system at 100-percent system capacity for a duration of not less than 12 hours.

510.4.2.4 Signal booster requirements. If used, signal boosters shall meet the following requirements:

1. All signal booster components shall be contained in a National Electrical Manufacturer's Association (NEMA) 4-type waterproof cabinet.
2. Battery systems used for the emergency power source shall be contained in a NEMA 3R or higher-rated cabinet.
3. Equipment shall have FCC or other radio licensing authority certification and be suitable for public safety use prior to installation.
4. Where a donor antenna exists, isolation shall be maintained between the donor antenna and all inside antennas to not less than 20dB greater than the system gain under all operating conditions.
5. Bi-Directional Amplifiers (BDAs) used in in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage systems shall have oscillation prevention circuitry.
6. The installation of amplification systems or systems that operate on or provide the means to cause interference on any in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage network shall be coordinated and approved by the fire code official.

510.4.2.5 System monitoring. The in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system shall be monitored by a listed fire alarm control unit, or where approved by the fire code official, shall sound an audible signal at a constantly attended on-site location. Automatic supervisory signals shall include the following:

1. Loss of normal AC power supply.
2. System battery charger(s) failure.
3. Malfunction of the donor antenna(s).
4. Failure of active RF-emitting device(s).
5. Low-battery capacity at 70-percent reduction of operating capacity.
6. Failure of critical system components.
7. The communications link between the fire alarm system and the in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system.

510.4.2.6 Additional frequencies and change of frequencies. The in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system shall be capable of modification or expansion in the event frequency changes are required by the FCC or other radio licensing authority, or additional frequencies are made available by the FCC or other radio licensing authority.

510.4.2.7 Design documents. The fire code official shall have the authority to require "as built" design documents and specifications for in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage systems. The documents shall be in a format acceptable to the fire code official.

510.4.2.8 Radio communication antenna density. Systems shall be engineered to minimize the near-far effect. In-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system designs shall include sufficient antenna density to address reduced gain conditions.

Exceptions:

1. Class A narrow band signal booster devices with independent AGC/ALC circuits per channel.
2. Systems where all portable devices within the same band use active power control features.

510.5 Installation requirements. The installation of the in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system shall be in accordance with NFPA 1221 and Sections 510.5.1 through 510.5.4.

510.5.3 Acceptance test procedure. Where an in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system is required, and upon completion of installation, the building owner shall have the radio system tested to verify that two-way coverage on each floor of the building is not less than 95 percent. The test procedure shall be conducted as follows:

1. Each floor of the building shall be divided into a grid of 20 approximately equal test areas.
2. The test shall be conducted using a calibrated portable radio of the latest brand and model used by the agency talking through the agency's radio communications system or equipment approved by the fire code official.
3. Failure of more than one test area shall result in failure of the test.
4. In the event that two of the test areas fail the test, in order to be more statistically accurate, the floor shall be permitted to be divided into 40 equal test areas. Failure of not more than two nonadjacent test areas shall not result in failure of the test. If the system fails the 40-area test, the system shall be altered to meet the 95-percent coverage requirement.

5. A test location approximately in the center of each test area shall be selected for the test, with the radio enabled to verify two-way communications to and from the outside of the building through the public agency's radio communications system. Once the test location has been selected, that location shall represent the entire test area. Failure in the selected test location shall be considered to be a failure of that test area. Additional test locations shall not be permitted.

6. The gain values of all amplifiers shall be measured and the test measurement results shall be kept on file with the building owner so that the measurements can be verified during annual tests. In the event that the measurement results become lost, the building owner shall be required to rerun the acceptance test to reestablish the gain values.

7. As part of the installation, a spectrum analyzer or other suitable test equipment shall be utilized to ensure spurious oscillations are not being generated by the subject signal booster. This test shall be conducted at the time of installation and at subsequent annual inspections.

8. Systems incorporating Class B signal-booster devices or Class B broadband fiber remote devices shall be tested using two portable radios simultaneously conducting subjective voice quality checks. One portable radio shall be positioned not greater than 10 feet (3048 mm) from an indoor antenna. The second portable radio shall be positioned at a distance that represents the farthest distance from any indoor antenna. With both portable radios simultaneously keyed up on different frequencies within the same band, subjective audio testing shall be conducted and comply with DAQ levels as specified in Sections 510.4.1.1 and 510.4.1.2.

510.5.4 FCC compliance. The in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system installation and components shall comply with all applicable federal regulations including, but not limited to, FCC 47 CFR Part 90.219.

510.6 Maintenance. The in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system shall be maintained operational at all times in accordance with Sections 510.6.1 through 510.6.4.

510.6.1 Testing and proof of compliance. The owner of the building or owner's authorized agent shall have the in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system shall be inspected and tested annually or where structural changes occur including additions or remodels that could materially change the original field performance tests. Testing shall consist of the following:

1. In-building coverage test as described in Section 510.5.3.
2. Signal boosters shall be tested to verify that the gain is the same as it was upon initial installation and acceptance or set to optimize the performance of the system.
3. Backup batteries and power supplies shall be tested under load of a period of 1 hour to verify that they will properly operate during an actual power outage. If within the 1-hour test period the battery exhibits symptoms of failure, the test shall be extended for additional 1-hour periods until the integrity of the battery can be determined.
4. All active components shall be checked to verify operation within the manufacturer's specifications.

At the conclusion of the testing, a report, which shall verify compliance with Section 510.5.3, shall be submitted to the fire code official.

510.6.2 Additional frequencies. The building owner shall modify or expand the in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system at his or her expense in the event frequency changes are required by the FCC or other radio licensing authority, or additional frequencies are made available by the FCC or other radio licensing authority. Prior approval of an in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system on previous frequencies does not exempt this section.

510.6.3 Nonpublic safety system. Where other nonpublic safety amplification systems installed in buildings reduce the performance or cause interference with the in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system, the nonpublic safety amplification system shall be corrected or removed.

105.7.6 Emergency responder communication coverage system. A construction permit is required for installation of or modification to in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage systems and related equipment. Maintenance performed in accordance with this code is not considered to be a modification and does not require a construction permit.

907.2.12.2 Fire department communication system. Where a wired communication system is approved in lieu of an in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system in accordance with Section 510, the wired fire department communication system shall be designed and installed in accordance with NFPA 72 and shall operate between a fire command center complying with Section 508, elevators, elevator lobbies, emergency and standby power rooms, fire pump rooms, areas of refuge and inside interior exit stairways. The fire department communication device shall be provided at each floor level within the interior exit stairway.

914.3.6 Emergency responder communication coverage. In-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage shall be provided in accordance with Section 510.

1103.2 Emergency responder communication coverage in existing buildings. Existing buildings other than Group R-3, that do not have approved communication coverage for emergency responders in the building based on existing coverage levels of the public safety communication systems, shall be equipped with such coverage according to one of the following:

1. Where an existing wired communication system cannot be repaired or is being replaced, or where not approved in accordance with Section 510.1, Exception 1.
2. Within a time frame established by the adopting authority.

Exception: Where it is determined by the fire code official that the in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system is not needed.

1203.2.3 Emergency responder communication coverage systems. Standby power shall be provided for in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage systems as required in Section 510.4.2.3. The standby power supply shall be capable of operating the in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system for a duration of not less than 24 hours.

2018 International Building Code

403.4.5 Emergency communication coverage. In-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage shall be provided in accordance with Section 510 of the International Fire Code.

907.2.12.2 Fire department communication system. Where a wired communication system is approved in lieu of a n in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system in accordance with Section 510 of the International Fire Code, the wired fire department communication system shall be designed and installed in accordance with NFPA 72 and shall operate between a fire command center complying with Section 911, elevators, elevator lobbies, emergency and standby power rooms, fire pump rooms, areas of refuge and inside interior exit stairways. The fire department communication device shall be provided at each floor level within the interior exit stairway.

918 EMERGENCY RESPONDER COMMUNICATION COVERAGE

918.1 General. In-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage shall be provided in all new buildings in accordance with Section 510 of the International Fire Code.

2702.2.3 Emergency responder communication coverage systems. Standby power shall be provided for in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage systems required in Section 918 and the International Fire Code. The standby power supply shall be capable of operating the in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system for a duration of not less than 12 hours at 100-percent system operation capacity.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as the revision throughout Section 510 makes the terminology consistent to one term "emergency communication coverage system." There were two modifications. The first modification makes it clear that this section is focused on "emergency responders" not "emergency communication" in general. This is addressed through the revision throughout to "in-building 2-way emergency responder communication coverage system." The second modification is found in Section 510.1, which retains the fire code official's authority to approve the system. The term "approved" was added back into the beginning of Section 510.1. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F46-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved for several reasons. The first being concern with the definition of fire service access point being too subjective with issues associated with inside or outside the building. Secondly, there was concern that the reduction in requirements is based only upon suppression requirements since the distance is related to handline length which may not always be appropriate. Section 510.5.1 removes the term fire code official and replaces with licensee which was felt inappropriate in losing that approving authority. Finally, the revisions to the qualification requirements in Section 510.5.2 limit those qualified to those with radiotelephone operator licenses issued by the FCC which would not allow an electrical engineer to design such a system. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F47-18

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as this requirement seemed excessive and would apply to all buildings regardless of size or features. In addition, it was noted that perhaps Section 510.5.1.1 dealing with installation may be a better location for such a requirements. Also, NFPA 1221 does not establish when pathway survivability is required and a sprinklered building is already considered to have level 1 pathway survivability. Therefore a level of protection is already provided in many buildings without conduit. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F48-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it will eliminate or reduce the need to have a professional engineer to review all designs and provides an appropriate listing for such equipment. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F49-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon concern that requiring 99 percent will do little to improve the performance from the current criteria of 95%. In addition the definition uses the term "other areas" and it is unclear as to how those areas will be determined. (Vote 11-3)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F50-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as designers need the inbound signal of -95dBm in addition to DAQ. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F51-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal seems unnecessary as this information is already available on websites and is in the public domain. (Vote 11-3)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F52-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal clarifies the purpose of bi-directional amplifiers which is essentially an active RF emitting device. This will appropriately apply this requirement more broadly. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F53-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the reason statement and also for consistency with the action on code change proposal F52-18. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F54-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This was approved as the near far affect needs to be addressed and this will eliminate a potential gaps caused by the exception. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F55-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Since the antenna has the potential to be moved the need for signage was seen as necessary to maintain the signal. (Vote 11-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F56-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Near far effect needs to be addressed for all systems. This also correlates with the action taken on code change proposal F54-18. (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F57-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it better arranges the chapter by subject. In addition it acknowledges that it is not just hazards but systems that are addressed. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F58-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it better explains what is addressed in Chapter 6 and removes unnecessary defined terms that are related to Chapter 12. The concept of having hazard abatement in the beginning of Chapter 6 was felt to be beneficial however some were concerned that Sections 601.3 and 601.3.1 were unnecessary as these issues are already addressed in Chapter 1. It was pointed out that information technology server rooms was part of the list in Section 601.1 but is not currently addressed in Chapter 6. (Vote: 8-6)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F59-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F60-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F61-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

603.2 Chimneys and vents. Masonry chimneys shall be constructed in accordance with the International Building Code. Factory-built chimneys and vent systems servicing solid-fuel-fired appliances or oil-fired appliances shall be installed in accordance with the International Mechanical Code. Metal chimneys shall be constructed and installed in accordance with the International Mechanical Code. ~~Gas vents~~ Factory-built chimneys and vent systems servicing gas-fired appliances shall be installed in accordance with the International Fuel Gas Code.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it correlates the provisions more appropriately for chimney and vents with the IMC and IFGC. The modification better defines what types of fuels associated with the types of chimneys and vents as regulated by the IMC and IFGC. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F62-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it better aligns the technical term vent with the IMC and IFGC and is consistent with the action taken on F61-18. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F63-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

603.3 Fuel oil storage systems. Fuel oil storage systems ~~for building heating systems~~ shall be installed and maintained in accordance with this code. Tanks and fuel-oil piping systems shall be installed in accordance with Chapter 13 of the International Mechanical Code.

603.3.1.1 Approval. Outside Fuel oil storage tanks shall be in accordance with UL142 ~~or~~ UL 2085, or UL 80.

603.3.2.7 Tanks in basements. Tanks in basements shall be ~~in accordance with UL 80 and shall be located~~ not more than two stories below grade plane.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved for a couple reasons. First it provides a more specific reference to Chapter 13 of the IMC for fuel oil piping. Next it references the appropriate referenced standards with regard to underground tanks. The modifications address several issues. The first is the removal of "building heating systems" as this section is intended to be more broadly scoped to other fuel oil applications. The second addressed a standard that was overlooked when assembling the proposal that is appropriate for outside storage tanks UL 80. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F64-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it was felt necessary that if secondary containment is provided that it needs to be monitored. (Vote: 11-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F65-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

603.4.2.2.3 Tip-over switch. Portable outdoor gas-fired heating appliances shall be equipped with a tilt or tip-over switch that automatically shuts off the flow of gas if the appliance is tilted more than 15 degrees (0.26 rad) from the vertical.

603.4.2.2.4 Guard against contact. The heating element or combustion chamber of portable outdoor gas-fired heating appliances shall be permanently guarded so as to prevent accidental contact by persons or material.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon proponents reason. There was some concern that the reference to the standard may lose the provisions related to tip over and therefore the proposal was modified to retain Section 603.4.2.2.3 and 603.4.2.2.4 which are existing IFC sections. Note there was some concern with the reference to a cooking standard (ANSI Z21.58/CSA 1.6-2015: Outdoor Cooking Gas Appliances) within a section focused upon heating requirements. (Vote: 10-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F66-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it provides correlation between the IMC and the IFC with the reference to UL 791. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F67-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon concerns that the enforcement will be problematic. In addition, there was concern as to determining how often it would need to be inspected. The reference to the manufacturers instructions may be subjective. It was also pointed out that this is not specific to any occupancy and should be narrowed down. There was some support by the committee with some modification to reflect exhaust systems. It was also felt that potentially this could be a necessary tool for enforcement as this is a fire hazard. (Vote: 7-6)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F68-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved for consistency with NFPA 70 scoping and terminology. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F69-18

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This was disapproved as it does not correlate with the essential electrical requirements in chapter 4 of the of the IBC. This reference to NFPA 99 in this proposal has broader application in the IFC which seems beyond the scope of application of this code.. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F70-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is consistent with other abatement proposals and the language is an improvement with the removal of the phrase "brought to the attention." Also this proposal makes a necessary reference to NFPA 70. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F71-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it coordinates the working space requirements with NFPA 70. NFPA 70 has more specific requirements based upon the voltage rating of the equipment. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F72-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:**

604.4.2 Application and use. Relocatable power taps and current taps shall be directly connected to a permanently installed receptacle.

Exceptions:

1. Where approved for use ~~used~~ use in a Group A Occupancy or in a meeting room in a Group B Occupancy, no more than five relocatable power taps shall be permitted to be connected together or connected to an extension cord for temporary use to supply power to electronic equipment.
2. Current taps and relocatable power taps shall not be required to connect directly to a permanently installed receptacle outlet where used for 90 days or less for the purpose of testing the performance of such devices.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it provides necessary terms that are currently not defined. In addition, it addresses a realistic application of relocatable power taps. The modification recognizes not only meeting rooms in group B occupancies but also adds Group A occupancies which is a typical use of relocatable power taps. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F73-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it better aligns the standards required by the IFC for relocatable power taps with what is required by CMS and the healthcare industry. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F74-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

604.5 Extension cords. Extension cords shall not be a substitute for permanent wiring and shall be listed and labeled in accordance with UL 817. Extension cords ~~and flexible cords~~ shall not be affixed to structures, extended through walls, ceilings or floors, or under doors or floor coverings, nor shall such cords be subject to environmental damage or physical impact. Extension cords shall be used only with portable appliances. Extension cords marked for indoor use shall not be used outdoors.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it revises terms to be consistent with NFPA 70. The modification provides more clean up by removing another instance of "and flexible cords" to be consistent with the revision to the first sentence in Section 604.5. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F75-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the rewording to provide more mandatory limit on the use of temporary wiring and provides more direction on how to address protection of temporary wiring. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F76-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal based upon the need for the maintenance and inspection standard. The proposal also corrects the title to existing standard IAR 2 which is necessary. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F77-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved to fix the change in scope to the referenced standard IAR 2 which no longer deals with installation. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F78-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it adds necessary requirements for existing ammonia refrigeration systems through the reference to the new standard IAR9. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F79-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IFC COMMITTEE, PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE. PLEASE SEE THE TENTATIVE HEARING ORDERS FOR THE RESPECTIVE COMMITTEES.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon a request from the proponent that the standard is not yet complete to address this issue. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F79-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Should not remove the exhaust rate table and rely solely on the standards. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F80-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it clarifies the intent that such systems are located in machinery rooms and does not address exterior installations. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F81-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the action taken on F79-18 Part I which also deals with A2L refrigerants. This may be a viable option but more information is needed. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F82-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement. In addition there was agreement that such analysis do not always require an engineering analysis. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F83-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IFC COMMITTEE, PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE. PLEASE SEE THE TENTATIVE HEARING ORDERS FOR THE RESPECTIVE COMMITTEES.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement. In addition this proposal also clarifies the ventilation systems is required to be activated. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F83-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F84-18**Errata: This proposal includes the following errata**

606.5.2 Occupant evacuation elevators and lobbies. Where occupant evacuation elevators are provided in accordance with Section 3008 of the International Building Code, the occupant evacuation elevator fireprotection and safety features and lobbies required by Section 3008 of the International Building Code shall be maintained ~~and maintained~~ free of storage and furniture.

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as the IFC does not require elevators and does not address conveying systems. It was also suggested that Section 606.1 be clarified that Sections 606.2 through 606.6 are sections within the IFC not IBC. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F85-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as determining what is considered storage as often these spaces will contain furniture. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F86-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon concern that the fire code official could already allow such keys therefore the reference is unnecessary. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F87-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved but was felt to have merit. More language regarding combustibility of furniture needs to be worked into the proposal to make it viable. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F88-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F89-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F90-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F91-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the new proposed section goes beyond what is expected for an inspection and they had issues with the language, specifically regarding what test method is required, "fireproofing thicknesses" and "where known." (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F92-18 Part I

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they had multiple issues with the proposal including: concern with the maintenance and enforcement, some of the requirements are electrical in scope, the term "permanent" is not specified, there is no size limit, the distance requirement is too high and no justification was provided, construction types are not included and there is no account for weather conditions. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F92-18 Part II

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F93-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the proposal has enforcement and misinterpretation issues and there is currently no requirement to have the treatment. It was suggested to add the language of "where applied" to improve the clarity of the requirement. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F94-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they disagreed with the deletion of the exception description heading and the deletion would create unintended consequences. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F95-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they did not agree with the proposed revised reference to the table and that it was incorrect. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F96-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

808.5 Children's play Play structures added to existing buildings. Where children's play structures that exceed 10 feet (3048 mm) in height or 150 square feet (14 m²) in area are added inside an existing building they shall comply with Section 424 of the International Building Code.

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the improvement of the language consistent with the change to the IBC. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason and that it gives the fire code official the ability to require protection. (Vote: 11-3).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F97-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F98-18

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F99-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the proposed section is not needed and it would cause conflicts with state law. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F100-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason regarding the clarification of the language in the sections. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F101-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

901.7 Systems out of service. Where a required fire protection system is out of service, the fire department and the fire code official shall be notified immediately and, where required by the fire code official, the building shall be either evacuated or an approved fire watch shall be provided for all occupants left unprotected by the shutdown until the fire protection system has been returned to service.

Where utilized, fire watches shall be provided with not less than one approved means for notification of the fire department and their only duty shall be to perform constant patrols of the protected premises and keep watch for fires.

Exception: Facilities with an approved notification and impairment management ~~procedures program. The notification and impairment program for water-based fire protection systems shall comply~~ ~~complying with NFPA 25 or NFPA 72.~~

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the improvement of the language to address the concern that NFPA 72 does not have enough impairment provisions. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason and that it gives additional clarity to the section requirements. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F102-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

903.2.4.2 Group F-1 upholstered furniture or mattresses. An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout a Group F-1 fire area that exceeds 2,500 square feet (232 m²) used for the manufacture of upholstered furniture or mattresses ~~that exceeds 2,500 square feet (232 m²).~~

903.2.7.2 Group M upholstered furniture or mattresses. An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout a Group M fire area that exceeds 5,000 square feet (464 m²) used for the display and sale of upholstered furniture or mattresses ~~that exceeds 5,000 square feet (464 m²).~~

903.2.9.3 Group S-1 upholstered furniture and mattresses. An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout a Group S-1 fire area that exceeds 2,500 square feet (232 m²) used for the storage of upholstered furniture or mattresses ~~that exceeds 2,500 square feet (232 m²).~~

Exception: Self-service storage facilities (~~mini-storage~~) no greater than one story above grade plane where all storage spaces can be accessed directly from the exterior.

Committee Reason: Approval of the modifications is based on the improvement to the language readability and clarity. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F103-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the revisions to the sections would prohibit potential negotiations for exceptions or reductions with code officials. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F104-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they had issues with the section revision including: the area threshold has already been reduced from 20,000 square feet to 12,000 square feet, new vs. existing occupancies and small private schools. In addition there could be other unintended consequences such as change of occupancy applications and projects involving small additions. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F105-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the disapproval was based on the preference for F102-18 and the focus of the language on "fire area" instead of "occupancy area." (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F106-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason and that the current language is overly restrictive as written. The addition of "where the area" provides clarification that it is the area used that determines the condition. (Vote: 8-6)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F107-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that there was no justification provided for the proposed area threshold requirement. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F108-18

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F109-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the new proposed text is misplaced in the Group S-1 section and that if it is just intended for fueling operations, it belongs in the fueling chapter. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F110-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

2018 International Building Code

[F] 403.3 Automatic sprinkler system. Buildings and structures shall be equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 and a secondary water supply where required by Section 403.3.3.

Exception: An automatic sprinkler system shall not be required in spaces or areas of:

- ~~1. Open parking garages in accordance with Section 406.5.~~
2. Telecommunications equipment buildings used exclusively for telecommunications equipment, associated electrical power distribution equipment, batteries and standby engines, provided that those spaces or areas are equipped throughout with an automatic fire detection system in accordance with Section 907.2 and are separated from the remainder of the building by not less than 1-hour fire barriers constructed in accordance with Section 707 or not less than 2-

hour horizontal assemblies constructed in accordance with Section 711, or both.

2018 International Fire Code

914.3.1 Automatic sprinkler system. Buildings and structures shall be equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 and a secondary water supply where required by Section 914.3.2.

Exception: An automatic sprinkler system shall not be required in spaces or areas of:

- ~~1. Open parking garages in accordance with Section 406.5 of the International Building Code.~~
2. Telecommunications equipment buildings used exclusively for telecommunications equipment, associated electrical power distribution equipment, batteries and standby engines, provided that those spaces or areas are equipped throughout with an automatic fire detection system in accordance with Section 907.2 and are separated from the remainder of the building by not less than 1-hour fire barriers constructed in accordance with Section 707 of the International Building Code or not less than 2-hour horizontal assemblies constructed in accordance with Section 711 of the International Building Code, or both.

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the need to revise the high-rise sections in order to be consistent with the revision to Section 903.2.11.3. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F111-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they had issues with the available water supply in every area in regards to taking water from the fire service as well as high winds reducing effectiveness of the sprinklers. In addition it was noted that the requirement belongs in the IWUIC. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F112-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F113-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the proposed revision conflicts with the hydraulic elevator provisions in NFPA 13. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F114-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the separation of molten materials that are used as part of a process is problematic or impractical. It was also noted that molten minerals are used for heat treatment and in energy storage systems and these should not be exempted from the requirement. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F115-18**Committee Action:****Withdrawn****Assembly Motion:****NONE**

F116-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that their preference was to use the requirements of NFPA 13 for occupancies using materials such as molten and other incompatible materials and noted that in some situations a process analysis is required. It was additionally pointed out that Section 904.2 already addresses this. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F117-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F118-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the disapproval was based on the action taken on F117-18. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F119-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F120-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F121-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the disapproval was based on the action taken on previous proposals F117-18 and F120-18. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F122-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IFC COMMITTEE, PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IFGC COMMITTEE. PLEASE SEE THE TENTATIVE HEARING ORDERS FOR THE RESPECTIVE COMMITTEES.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason and that the addition to the section provides clarity. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F122-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F123-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F124-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F125-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F126-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F127-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the disapproval was based on the lack of testimony that was desired to provide the necessary clarity. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F128-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that there are situations where the proposed exception would not be acceptable. The specific example given was a large building under construction that has commingled parts of the building that have dry or wet standpipes that are used as manual means for fire fighting that would need to be electrically supervised. (Vote: 8-7)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F129-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the proposed revision does not provide more clarity, does not address vacant buildings and mixes up the current language. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F130-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that: the removal would be a hindrance to community risk reduction, the size and cost of fires would increase, it is a huge step backwards and that the statistics do not support the change. (Vote: 11-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F131-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

906.1 Where required. Portable fire extinguishers shall be installed in all of the following locations

1. In new and existing Group A, B, E, F, H, I, M, R-1, R-2, R-4 and S occupancies.

Exceptions:

1. In Group R-2 occupancies, portable fire extinguishers shall be required only in locations specified in Items 2 through 6 where each dwelling unit is provided with a portable fire extinguisher having a minimum rating of 1-A:10-B:C.

2. In Group E occupancies, portable fire extinguishers shall be required only in locations specified in Items 2 through 6 where each classroom is provided with a portable fire extinguisher having a minimum rating of 2-A:20-B:C.

3. In storage areas of Group S Occupancies where forklift, powered industrial truck or powered cart operators are the primary occupants, fixed extinguishers, as specified in NFPA 10, shall not be required where in accordance with all of the following:

3.1. Use of vehicle mounted extinguishers shall be approved by the fire code official.

3.2. Each vehicle shall be equipped with a 10-pound, 40-A:80-B:C extinguisher affixed to the vehicle using a mounting bracket approved by the extinguisher manufacturer or the fire code official for vehicular use.

3.3. Not less than two spare extinguishers of equal or greater rating shall be

available onsite to replace a discharged extinguisher.

3.4.Vehicle operators shall be trained in the proper operation, use and inspection of extinguishers.

3.5.Inspections of vehicle mounted extinguishers shall be performed daily.

2.Within 30 feet (9144 mm) distance of travel from commercial cooking equipment and from domestic cooking equipment in Group I-1; I-2, Condition 1; and R-2 college dormitory occupancies.

3.In areas where flammable or combustible liquids are stored, used or dispensed.

4.On each floor of structures under construction, except Group R-3 occupancies, in accordance with Section 3315.1.

5.Where required by the sections indicated in Table 906.1.

6.Special-hazard areas, including but not limited to laboratories, computer rooms and generator rooms, where required by the fire code official.

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the improvement of the language to clarify that the new exception applies to carts that are powered. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F132-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that: the language needed improvement to be clear, it is in the wrong location, it should focus on Group U telecommunication facilities, needs "where approved" added and it should address other Group U occupancies. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F133-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the language was missing an "approved" wording. Additionally there are issues with extending the travel distance including a lack of a guideline for distance and that visitors are not trained in the fire safety plan are not aware of the locations in order to have immediate access. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F134-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the proposed addition of "and detection" creates conflicts with manual systems and that it implies that it requires both types of systems. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F135-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that occupant notification is not currently required for open air assembly bleacher seating and the proposed exception is not needed . (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F136-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

F137-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved****Committee Reason:** This proposal was disapproved based upon a modification to code change proposal F203-18 that added a footnote to Table 1206.7 which would address this concern. In addition, Table 1206.7 was felt a more appropriate location for such an allowance. (Vote: 14-0)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

F138-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved****Committee Reason:** The committee stated that they had concern with the proposed new Section 907.2.3.1 not having a reference to the existing Section 907.2 regarding the requirement to provide not fewer than one manual fire alarm box. Additionally it was noted that the format is cumbersome, hard to read and needs more refinement. (Vote: 14-0)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

F139-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote:14-0)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

F140-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved****Committee Reason:** The committee stated that they issues with the new proposed language of "or" to require only one condition vs. using "and" to require the exception to apply to buildings meeting both of the size conditions. In addition there was concern with the reason statement in regards to the audible alarm effectiveness based on the number of rooms and that the examples were buildings without an automatic sprinkler system. The current code requires an automatic sprinkler systems for all Group R occupancies (Vote: 14-0)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

F141-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:****907.2.10 Group S.** A manual fire alarm system that activates the occupant notification system in accordance with Section 907.5 shall be installed in Group S public- and self-storage occupancies three stories or greater in height for interior corridors and interior common areas. Visible notification appliances are not required within storage units.

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

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the improvement of the language to narrow the scope of the proposal to taller buildings and clarified where visible alarms would be required. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason and the varying hazards in these occupancies without the control of the owners. (Vote: 9-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F142-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that there are technical issues with the proposal including: smoke alarms are not listed for use in attics spaces other than dwelling or sleeping units, there are problems with references to either smoke alarms and smoke detectors and the connection of initiation devices to smoke alarms which is not a listed use. In addition there was concern with maintenance issues in one and two family dwellings. It was noted that mass notification may be more appropriate. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F143-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that: the proposal is based on a misunderstanding of the requirements, it would set a bad precedence, lead to false alarms and the IMC only requires supervisory alarms. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F144-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that although there are technical issues this is needed due to an aging population and the research shows that low frequency devices are more effective. In addition it was noted that there are devices that are currently available that can meet the requirement. (Vote: 9-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F145-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the disapproval was based on the action taken on F144-18. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F146-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

907.4.2.4 Signs. Where fire alarm systems are not required to be monitored by an approved supervising station in accordance with Section 907.6.6, an approved permanent sign shall be installed adjacent to each manual fire alarm

box that reads: WHEN ALARM SOUNDS CALL FIRE DEPARTMENT.

Exception: Where the manufacturer has permanently provided this information on the manual fire alarm box.

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the improvement of the language to clarify the scope of the requirement to any system that is not monitored. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F147-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F148-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F149-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

2018 International Fire Code

907.5.2.2.5 Standby Emergency power. Emergency voice/ alarm communications systems shall be provided with ~~emergency standby~~ power in accordance with ~~section 1203~~ NFPA 72.

1203.2.4 Emergency voice/alarm communication systems. ~~Emergency Standby~~ power shall be provided for emergency voice/alarm communication systems ~~as required~~ in accordance with NFPA 72.

2018 International Building Code

2702.2.4 Emergency Voice Alarm Communication Systems. ~~Standby~~Emergency power shall be provided for emergency voice/alarm communication systems ~~as required~~ in accordance with ~~NFPA72~~ 907.5.2.2.5.

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the improvement of the language to clarify that the requirements are for standby power. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason that it is appropriate to the leave the requirements in the NFPA 72 referenced standard. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F150-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they did not agree the proposed approach for future capability and that it does not agree with the requirements of A117.1 if you run in the unit. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F151-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated there does need to be a resolution to how accessibility is provided for fire alarm notification but the proponents need to work on it together. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F152-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they liked the concept of requiring future design capability but the proposed language does not provide the necessary level of information and the wording is incomplete. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F153-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they had issues with the sign requirements and that it should say "other approved means." Additionally there was confusion about the link between the access and visibility requirements and noted that they are stated as separate requirements. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F154-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 12-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F155-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:**

~~**907.6.6.2.1 Telephone calls.** Requests for emergency service shall only be made via live voice to a public safety answering point (PSAP), unless approved by the fire code official.~~

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the deletion of the section which resolves conflicts and issues with public safety answering points and fire alarm control units sending electronic signals. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F156-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason and that it streamlines the code requirements while maintaining the intent. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F157-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that: the existing requirements of the code regarding making the system work should be enough for enforcement, they had concern about the lack of defined criteria for chronic alarms that would lead to nonuniform enforcement. There was some concern about the cost impact this new requirement would have. (Vote: 8-6)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F158-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the new proposed language of "deemed" and "newly installed" makes the new section more confusing and does not add clarity to the existing section requirements. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F159-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 9-5)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F160-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that proposed revision would not work and it conflicts with NFPA 99. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F161-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F162-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F163-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they disagreed with the need to duplicate these sections in the IFC. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F164-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the disapproval was based on the proponent's request, a technical omission and that it is already addressed in the code. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F165-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F166-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F167-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the proposed deletion of a manual means of operation was not acceptable and that both manual or automatic options should be available to the designer. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F168-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F169-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they had concerns about the proposed deletion of all Class 1B

flammable liquids from the table in relation to NFPA 30. It was noted that in there are class IB liquids that can also be classified as an unstable reactive. It was suggested that a closer look at NFPA 30 is needed to make sure they are in alignment. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F170-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason and that it clarifies that the technical report determine when a combustible dust is hazardous.. (Vote: 12-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F171-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the preference was for proposal F172-18. (Vote: 11-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F172-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 12-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F173-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they had issues with the language regarding the inclusion of the generator room into the fire pump room and the 1 hour vs. 2 hour rating requirement. The preference was for proposal F174-18. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F174-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F175-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F176-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they concerns with the written schedule for the routine maintenance and testing requirement and that there was conflicts with having information for all the equipment from each of the manufacturers. Additionally it was stated that this already exists and it should be a part of the design and approval process. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F177-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they had the following concerns with the proposed new section: there are currently no listed duct mounted carbon monoxide detectors, it is not applicable to shut down the entire HVAC system upon activation and it does not specifically address different occupancies such as a parking garage. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F178-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the proposed addition of corridor to the requirement was too restrictive and it would create a conflict with other occupancies that allow items in the corridor as long as they do not interfere with the minimum required width. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F179-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason and that it gives the fire code official the ability to require exterior access to existing fire escapes. (Vote: 9-5)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F180-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they had concerns with the new exception provision for a facility to have a plan to remove wheeled equipment in that it could require going into a more hazardous area to remove it and it could be impractical. Additionally a conflict was noted between the new exception and the existing one that would follow it in the list. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F181-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F182-18**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 9-5)**Assembly Motion:** **NONE****F183-18****Committee Action:** **Disapproved****Committee Reason:** This proposal was disapproved as the current requirements are consistent with the federal requirements for hospitals. Additionally this would take the date for full compliance away. (Vote: 13-1)**Assembly Motion:** **NONE****F184-18****Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** This proposal was approved as it addresses the needs of existing buildings with high challenge fires. This provides more specific requirements than Appendix M and 10 years appears to be a reasonable timeframe. There was some concern that the time frame be established by the state or local government. (Vote: 13-1)**Assembly Motion:** **NONE****F185-18****Committee Action:** **Disapproved****Committee Reason:** The committee stated that the proposed requirements are more restrictive than those for new construction and could result in newly occupied buildings having to add a system after the certificate of occupancy is issued. (Vote: 9-5)**Assembly Motion:** **NONE****F186-18****Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** This proposal was approved as it clarifies which occupancies this is intended to apply and also adds Group E occupancies. There was some concern that the loss history in Group E is very low however it was felt that it was fairly easy to comply. In addition, many states have already mandated coverage in Group E occupancies. The use of detection versus alarms makes more methods of compliance possible since CO alarms are limited by their listing to sleeping units and dwelling units. (Vote: 9-5)**Assembly Motion:** **NONE****F187-18****Committee Action:** **Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:****TABLE 1104.18****COMMON PATH, DEAD-END AND TRAVEL DISTANCE LIMITS (by occupancy)**

(no change to table)

NR = No Requirements.

For SI: 1 foot = 304.8 mm, 1 square foot = 0.0929 m².

- a. See Section 1029.9.5 for dead-end aisles in Group A occupancies.
- b. This dimension is for the total travel distance, assuming incremental portions have fully utilized their allowable maximums. For travel distance within the room, and from the room exit access door to the exit, see the appropriate occupancy chapter.
- c. See Section 412.7 of the International Building Code for special requirements on spacing of doors in aircraft hangars.
- d. Separation of exit access doors within a care recipient sleeping room, or any suite that includes care recipient sleeping rooms, shall comply with Section 1105.5.6.
- e. In smoke compartments containing care recipient sleeping rooms and treatment rooms, dead-end corridors shall comply with Section 1105.5.5.
- f. In Group I-2, Condition 2, care recipient sleeping rooms or any suite that includes care recipient sleeping rooms shall comply with Section 1105.6.
- g. Where a tenant space in Group B, S and U occupancies has an occupant load of not more than 30, the length of a common path of egress travel shall not be more than 100 feet.
- h. Where the building, or portion of the building, is limited to one story and the height from the finished floor to the bottom of the ceiling or roof slab or deck is 24 feet or more, the exit access travel distance is increased to 400 feet.
- i. For covered and open malls, the exit access travel distance is increased to 400 feet.
- j. Buildings equipped ~~throughout~~ with an approved automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1
- k Buildings equipped ~~throughout~~ with an approved automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.2
- l. Group H occupancies equipped ~~throughout~~ with an approved automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.2.5

Committee Reason: This proposal appropriately links back to the type of automatic sprinkler system intended to provide the increase in common path of travel, dead end limits and travel distance. A modification was provided to add the term "approved" as it relates to the sprinkler system. This provides the ability for the fire code official to make sure the sprinkler system installation is appropriate to the application. In addition, the modification is consistent with actions taken on other proposals with respect to the term "approved." (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F188-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it clarifies as to how to address existing conditions. Also, any new installations of protective plates on doors would need to go through the permitting process. This only addresses existing installations. (Vote: 13-1).

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F189-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it provides consistency with the Center for Medicare Services (CMS) and IBC requirements for exiting from a smoke compartment. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F190-18

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F191-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it provides a necessary pointer to the electrical requirements in Chapter 6. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F192-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it appropriately captures ambulatory care facilities in regards to emergency and standby powers. This is consistent with CMS. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F193-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as there were concerns with what separations are appropriate. Discussions surrounded 5 and 10 feet but also concern those may not be correct as well. Also there was concern that the fire extinguisher was not required to have a Class A rating. A reference to NFPA 37 was suggested. (Vote: 9-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F194-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1204.2.1 Photovoltaic (PV) panel~~Solar photovoltaic (PV) panel~~**Solar photovoltaic (PV) systems for Group R-3 buildings.** Photovoltaic (PV) panel Solar PV systems for Group R-3 buildings shall comply with Sections 1204.2.1.1 through 1204.2.2.

Exceptions:

1. These requirements shall not apply to structures designed and constructed in accordance with the International Residential Code.
2. These requirements shall not apply to roofs with slopes of 2 units vertical in 12 units horizontal or less.

Committee Reason: This proposal appropriately includes the emergency escape and rescue opening requirements as part of the Group R-3 requirements. The modification places the terminology back to the original code language - "Solar photovoltaic (PV) systems" which is consistent with industry terminology. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F195-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1204.1 General. ~~Building-mounted Solar~~ photovoltaic systems shall be installed in accordance with Sections ~~1204.2 through 1204.3 and Section 1204.5, and~~ the International Building Code or International Residential Code. The electrical portion of solar PV systems shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 70. Rooftop-mounted solar photovoltaic systems shall be installed in accordance with Sections 1204.2 through 1204.3 and Section 1204.5. Ground-mounted solar photovoltaic systems shall comply with Section 1204.4.

1204.4 Ground-mounted photovoltaic panel systems. Ground-mounted photovoltaic panel systems shall be installed in accordance with this section. Setback requirements shall not apply to ground-mounted, free-standing

~~photovoltaic arrays, this section and the International Building Code. The electrical portion of solar PV systems shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 70.~~

1204.4.1 Vegetation control. A clear, brush-free area of 10 feet (3048 mm) shall be required around the perimeter of the ground-mounted photovoltaic arrays. A ~~non-combustible base of gravel or a maintained vegetative surface~~ or a non-combustible base, approved by the fire code official, shall be installed and maintained under the photovoltaic arrays and associated electrical equipment installations.

~~**1204.4.2 Security.** Ground-mounted photovoltaic arrays shall be secured against unauthorized access and safeguarded in an approved manner.~~

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it clarifies the difference between building mounted and ground mounted solar photovoltaic systems. There were a couple modifications. The security section 1204.4.2 was deleted as this is both difficult to comply with and NFPA 70 already addresses these concerns. In Section 1204.4.1 more flexibility was provided by removing the specific requirement for gravel and simply allowing a non-combustible base.

Additionally, Section 1204.1 was revised to more appropriately capture both rooftop and ground mounted systems and the requirement for compliance with NFPA 70. Finally, the exception from setback requirements were reinstated into Section 1204.4 as this allowance is necessary. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F196-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it provides another method of compliance for protection of fuel lines. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F197-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1204.2 Access and pathways. Roof access, pathways, and spacing requirements shall be provided in accordance with Sections 1204.2.1 through 1204.3.3. Pathways shall be over areas capable of supporting fire fighters accessing the roof. Pathways shall be located in areas with minimal obstructions, such as vent pipes, conduit or mechanical equipment.

Exceptions:

1. Detached, nonhabitable Group U structures including, but not limited to, detached garages serving Group R-3 buildings, parking shade structures, carports, solar trellises and similar structures.
2. Roof access, pathways and spacing requirements need not be provided where the fire code official has determined that rooftop operations will not be employed.
3. ~~Designated pathways are not required for~~ Building integrated photovoltaic (BIPV) systems where the BIPV systems are approved, integrated into the finished roof surface and are listed in accordance with a national test standard developed to address Section 690.12(B)(2) of NFPA 70. The removal or cutting away of portions of the BIPV system during specific firefighting operations shall not expose a firefighter to ~~slipping hazards, fall hazards, or electrical shock hazards that are not common to similar traditional roofing systems.~~

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it recognizes that BIPV systems do not create the same roof access issues. The modification removes requirements that are already addressed in the standard. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F198-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the action on F197-18. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F199-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved with concern that is difficult to know which emergency escape rescue opening would be needed in a fire and would reduce safety. The removal of Group R-3 was seen as beneficial to apply the provisions more generally. (Vote: 8-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F200-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1204.2.3 Building Integrated Photovoltaic (BIPV) systems. Where building integrated photovoltaic (BIPV) systems are installed in a manner that creates areas with electrical hazards to be hidden from view, markings shall be provided to identify the hazardous areas to avoid. The markings shall be reflective and be visible from grade.

Exception: BIPV systems listed in accordance with Section 690.12(B)(2) of NFPA 70, where the removal or cutting away of portions of the BIPV system during firefighting operations have been determined to not expose a firefighter to electrical shock hazards.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it provides the guidance for dealing with a new technology of building integrated photovoltaics (BIPV) and provides a requirement for the identification of such systems. The modification recognizes systems that are specifically listed to address shock hazards and would not require such markings. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F201-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement related to clarifying that gravity dropout smoke and heat vents always need a pathway in addition to the pathways needed between array sections. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F202-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon a consistent approach approved for ESS in code change proposal F203-18. This does not mandate the use of fuel cell but instead allows temporary use of fuel cell powered vehicles for power. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F203-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

105.6.14 Energy storage systems, ~~mobile~~. An operational permit is required for stationary and mobile energy storage systems regulated by Section 1206.

1201.3 Mixed system installation. Where approved, the aggregate nameplate kWh energy of all energy storage systems in a fire area shall not exceed the maximum quantity specified for any of the energy systems in this chapter. Where required by the fire code official, a hazard mitigation analysis shall be provided and approved in accordance with Section 104.7.2 to evaluate any potential adverse interaction between the various energy systems and technologies.

1206.1 General. The provisions in this section are applicable to stationary and mobile electrical energy storage systems (ESS).

Exception: ESS in Group R-3 and R-4 occupancies shall comply with Section 1206.11.

1206.1.2 Permits. Permits shall be obtained for ESS as follows:

1. Construction permits shall be obtained for stationary ESS installations and for mobile ESS charging and storage installations covered by 1206.10.1. Permits shall be obtained in accordance with Sections 105.7.7.

2. Operational permits shall be obtained for stationary ESS installations and for mobile ESS deployment operations covered by Section 1206.10.3. Permits shall be obtained in accordance with Sections 105.6.14.

1206.1.2.1 Communication utilities. Operational permits shall not be required for lead acid and nickel cadmium battery systems at facilities under the exclusive control of communications utilities that comply with NFPA 76 and operate at less than 50 VAC and 60 VDC.

TABLE 1206.7

INDOOR ESS INSTALLATIONS

1206.5.4 Smoke and automatic fire detection^f

NA = Not allowed.

a. See Section 1206.7.1.

b. See Section 1206.7.2.

c. Where approved by the fire code official, alarm signals are not required to be transmitted to a central station, proprietary or remote station service in accordance with NFPA 72, or a constantly attended location where local fire alarm annunciation is provided and trained personnel are always present.

d. Where approved by the fire code official, fire suppression systems are permitted to be omitted in dedicated use buildings located more than 100 feet (30.5 M) from buildings, lot lines, public ways, stored combustible materials, hazardous materials, high piled stock and other exposure hazards.

f. Lead-acid and nickel cadmium battery systems installed in Group U buildings and structures less than 1500 ft² (140 m²) under the exclusive control of communications utilities, and operating at less than 50 VAC and 60 VDC in accordance with NFPA 76 are not required to have an approved automatic smoke or fire detection system.

1206.8 Outdoor installations. Outdoor installations shall be in accordance with Sections 1206.8.1 through 1206.8.3. Exterior wall installations for individual ESS units not exceeding 20 kWh shall be in accordance with Section 1206.8.4.

1206.8.4 Exterior wall installations. ESS shall be permitted to be installed outdoors on exterior walls of buildings when all of the following conditions are met:

1. The maximum energy capacity of individual ESS units shall not exceed 20 kWh.

2. The ESS shall comply with applicable requirements in Section 1206.

3. The ESS shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and their listing.

4. Individual ESS units shall be separated from each other by at least three feet (914 mm).

5. The ESS shall be separated from doors, windows, operable openings into buildings, or HVAC inlets by at least five feet (1524 mm).

Exception: Where approved smaller separation distances in items 4 and 5 shall be permitted based on large scale fire testing complying with Section 1206.1.5.

1206.11 ESS in Group R-3 and R-4 Occupancies. ESS in Group R-3 and R-4 occupancies shall be installed and maintained in accordance with Sections 1206.11.1 through 1206.11.9. The temporary use of an owner or occupant's electric powered vehicle as an ESS shall be in accordance with Section 1206.4.10

1206.11.1 Equipment listings. ESS shall be listed and labeled for residential use in accordance with UL 9540.

Exceptions:

1. Where approved, repurposed unlisted battery systems from electric vehicles are allowed to be installed outdoors or in detached dedicated cabinets located not less than 5 feet (1524 mm) from exterior walls, property lines and public

ways.

2. ESS less than 1 kWh (3.6 megajoules).

1206.11.2 Installation. ESS shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and their listing.

1206.11.2.1 Spacing. Individual units shall be separated from each other by at least three feet of spacing unless smaller separation distances are documented to be adequate based on large scale fire testing complying with Section 1206.1.5.

1206.11.3 Location. ESS shall only be installed in the following locations:

1. Detached garages and detached accessory structures.

2. Attached garages separated from the dwelling unit living space and sleeping units in accordance with Section 406.3.2 of the International Building Code.

3. Outdoors on exterior walls located a minimum 3 ft. from doors and windows.

4. Utility closets and storage or utility spaces within dwelling units and sleeping units.

1206.11.4 Energy ratings. Individual ESS units shall have a maximum rating of 20 kWh. The aggregate rating structure shall not exceed:

1. 40 kWh within utility closets and storage or utility spaces.

2. 80 kWh in attached or detached garages and detached accessory structures.

3. 80 kWh on exterior walls.

4. 80 kWh outdoors on the ground.

1206.11.5 Electrical installation. ESS shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 70. Inverters shall be listed and labeled in accordance with UL 1741 or provided as part of the UL 9540 listing. Systems connected to the utility grid shall use inverters listed for utility interaction.

1206.11.6 Fire detection. Rooms and areas within dwellings units, sleeping units and attached garages in which ESS are installed shall be protected by smoke alarms in accordance with Section 907.2.10. A heat detector listed and interconnected to the smoke alarms shall be installed in locations within dwelling units, sleeping units and attached garages where smoke alarms cannot be installed based on their listing.

1206.11.7 Protection from impact. Stationary storage battery systems installed in a location subject to vehicle damage shall be protected by approved barriers. Appliances in garages shall also be installed in accordance with Section 304.3 of the International Mechanical Code.

1206.11.8 Ventilation. Indoor installations of ESS that include batteries that produce hydrogen or other flammable gases during charging shall be provided with ventilation in accordance with Section 1206.6.1.

1206.11.9 Toxic and highly toxic gas. ESS that have the potential to release toxic or highly toxic gas during charging, discharging and normal use conditions shall not be installed within Group R-3 or R-4 occupancies.

1206.11.10 Electric vehicle use. The temporary use of an owner or occupant's electric powered vehicle to power a dwelling unit or sleeping unit while parked in an attached or detached garage or outside shall comply with the vehicle manufacturer's instructions and NFPA 70.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as the provisions of the 2018 Section 1206 need refinement and does not offer the flexibility and understanding of the different types of installations in use such as standalone systems or systems within a high rise building. There are a series of modification that work to integrate concepts from other proposals within code change proposal F203-18.

- **Section 1201.3.** - The modification to Section 1201.3 of the 2018 IFC pulls all energy systems together to better determine what can be included in a fire area and appropriately requires the nameplate kWh to determine the size of the systems. This concept is found in code change proposal F190-18.
- **Sections 1206.1.2, 1206.1.2.1.** Section 1206.1.2 of the proposal was revised along with the addition of a new section 1206.1.2.1 allowing the exception from operational permits for the telecommunications utilities. As part of this revision the permit requirements proposed in 105.6.14 were broadened to both mobile and stationary ESS. This is consistent with F204-18 which was written with the intent to be integrated with the revised provisions in Section 1206. This is also appropriate since the telecommunication industry must comply with NFPA 76.
- **Table 1206.7.** This table was modified to include a footnote providing an exception for lead acid and nickel cadmium installations for the communication utilities from smoke and automatic fire detection due to the good safety history and nature of the installations. This modification originates in F208-18 and due to the nature of the revisions to Section 1206 was better addressed in the new format of F203-18.
- **Section 1206.8.4.** The addition of Section 1206.8.4 and associated revisions to proposed Section

1206.8 recognize wall mounted ESS. These provisions were originally proposed in F210-18 and were intended to be integrated into the rewrite of Section 1206.

- **Section 1206.11.** The addition of Section 1206.11 recognizes the use of ESS in a residential setting and provides appropriate requirements for the fire code official. These provisions were originally proposed in code change proposal F211-18 and were intended to be integrated into the rewrite of Section 1206. Note that as part of this modification Section 1206.1 was revised to add a new exception for Group R-3 and R-4 occupancies that comply with new section 1206.11. (Vote: 12-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F204-18

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F205-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the action on F203-18. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F206-18

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F207-18

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F208-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the actions on code change proposals F137-18 and F203-18. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F209-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved because the volume allowed by this proposal without spill control and secondary containment is excessive. This would change the number from 50 gallons to 1000 gallons. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F210-18

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F211-18

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F212-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

2201.1 Scope. The equipment, processes and operations involving dust explosion hazards and use or handling of combustible dust shall comply with the provisions of this chapter

Exceptions:

- ~~1. In an unsprinklered building, dust production or use, including use open and use closed systems, where the quantity does not exceed 5 pounds (2.3 kg) or 0.7 cu ft. (0.019822 m³).~~
- ~~2. In a building equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1, dust production or use, including use open and use closed systems, where the quantity does not exceed 10 pounds (4.5 kg) or 1.4 cu ft. (0.039644 m³).~~
3. Storage and use of consumer materials in Group B or R occupancies.
4. Storage and use of commercially packaged materials in Group M occupancies.
5. Materials displayed in original packaging in Group M occupancies and intended as building materials or for personal or household use.
6. Storage of sealed containers of combustible dust at facilities not associated with an operation that uses, handles or generates combustible dust.
7. Materials stored or used in farm buildings or similar occupancies intended for on-premises agricultural purposes.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it provides more flexibility as the provisions provide practical tools to assess dust hazards along with exceptions that provide quick guidance on applicability. The modification removes the first two footnotes from proposed section 2201.1 which sets the scope for the chapter. These two footnotes are removed as they do not have a scientific basis to address based simply on weight and whether or not sprinklers are provided. (Vote: 10-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F213-18

Errata: This proposal includes the following errata

2203.4 Housekeeping. Accumulation of combustible dust shall be kept to a minimum in the interior of buildings. Accumulated combustible dust shall be collected by vacuum cleaning or other means that will not place combustible dust into suspension in air. Forced air or similar methods shall not be used to remove dust from surfaces.

Exception: Forced air or similar methods shall be permitted to remove dust in accordance with ~~per~~ NFPA 652, NFPA 654, or NFPA 664.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved since it allows the use of forced air remove dust that the main section prohibits. The allowance provides direct reference to the relevant standards. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F214-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it deals with typical practices at larger facilities. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F215-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponent reason statement and on the action taken on code change proposal FG22-18. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F216-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it adds necessary detailed requirements related to dispensing and generation by referencing NFPA 2. However, there were a number of concerns noted with the standard. NFPA 2 does not appear to have requirements for dispensing nozzles to be listed. Section 6.11.1 of NFPA 2 requires a manual fire alarm system which is not currently allowed in the IFC for motor vehicle dispensing. Outdoor refueling only requires that the fire department be notified that such activities are occurring. Finally, there was concerns as to what is intended by the term "light duty vehicle" in NFPA 2. . (Vote: 9-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F217-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it provides the proper pointer for fueling operations within NFPA 2. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F218-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement. Safety provisions need to be provided for both self service and attended dispensing. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F219-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement which notes that this is the appropriate terminology. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F220-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved to allow the limited filling of containers not permanently mounted to a vehicle. The exception clearly identifies the type of container to be dispensed into and why such filling is permitted. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F221-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The approval of this proposal was based upon the appropriate reference to Section 2311.8.11 for refueling. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F222-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved with several concerns. Latch open devices will allow unattended fueling. Another concern was with not having at a minimum a tank vehicle approved to NFPA 385. There was also concern as to how the grounding requirements were to be applied. It was also viewed that this type of fueling would be equivalent to fueling in a public way which was seen as hazardous. Often time the water is not calm and the occupants of the boat are not fully focused on the fueling. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F223-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement. This proposal provides a realistic method of purging. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F224-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as the committee agreed vehicles do not need to be defueled to fix other portions of the vehicle. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F225-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement and the amount of fuel will stay below the maximum allowable quantities (MAQs). (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F226-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved with concern that even with analysis the flammable mixture may be too high. The committee would like to see more details on what the analysis includes or possibly a standard that addresses this allowance. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F227-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the concern that it would be hard to obtain and review the standard due to cost. Also concern that it was difficult to review the standard. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F228-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement. Additionally, larger booths are easier to keep below the LFL. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F229-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it conflicts with limited spray area concept. When limited spray area provisions were reviewed the issue of limited finishing workstations was incorporated into that concept. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F230-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

2404.4 Fire protection. Spray booths and spray rooms shall be protected by an approved automatic sprinkler system or approved automatic fire-extinguishing system complying with Chapter 9. Protection shall extend to exhaust plenums, exhaust ducts and both sides of dry filters where such filters are used.

2404.5.2 Protection of sprinklers. Automatic sprinklers installed in flammable vapor areas shall be protected from the accumulation of residue from spraying operations in an approved manner. Bags used as a protective covering shall be 0.003-inch-thick (0.076 mm) cellophane or shall be thin paper. Automatic sprinklers contaminated by overspray particles shall be replaced with new automatic sprinklers.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the reason statement. It was also recognized that NFPA 13 no longer allows polyethylene covers. The modification simply adds the term "approved" to Section 2404.4 so that the appropriate sprinkler system based upon the specific hazard is installed. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F231-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved primarily related to the language used in the exception. As currently worded it needs more specific criteria and it is unclear how to apply the exception. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F232-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it is a necessary revision for the semi-conductor industry and is a reasonable increase in quantities. The controls within Chapter 27 control the risks. A request was made to the proponent to change the terminology "tool" to "workstation." (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F233-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it recognizes a storage method not currently acknowledged by the fire code but presents a unique fire hazard. There was some concern with determining how often routine inspections as required by the proposal would occur. Also the proposal requires special facilities and equipment but it is somewhat unclear what those are and whether the fire department will be trained to use such facilities and equipment. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F234-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

2810.2 Site plan. Each site shall maintain a current site plan. The site plan shall be submitted to the fire code official ~~and for~~ approval and ~~include~~ contain all of the following:

1. Lot Lines
2. Utilities.
3. Size, location, and type of construction of the buildings on the property
4. Presence of fire protection systems
5. Water supply sources for fire-fighting purposes.
6. Location of hazardous material storage areas.
7. Location of pallet storage.
8. Equipment protected with a dust collection system.
9. Fire apparatus access roads.
10. Designated smoking areas.
11. Location of fire alarm control panels.

Committee Reason: The revisions add clarity for enforcement with more specific language on how the provisions are to be applied and to provide the correct values within the table. The modification addresses the need to add the term "shall" to provide direction on enforcement, change the term "and" to "for" and add the word "contain" to make the verbiage read correctly in Section 2810.2 (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F235-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it is consistent with language in Chapter 4 of the IFC and also consistent with the action taken on code change proposal F234-18. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F236-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement. There was some concern that a size should be associated with small tabletop ovens. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F237-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F238-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they had concerns about the proposed size ranges and that the wind speeds should based on location and time of year. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F239-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the proposed section reference expansion was too far reaching for the design requirements. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F240-18

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F241-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the new proposed reference standard does not include air-inflated structures. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F242-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F243-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

3104.2 Flame propagation performance treatment. Before a permit is granted, the owner or agent shall file with the fire code official a certificate ~~executed~~ provided by the product manufacturer certifying the materials have been tested by an approved testing laboratory. The certificate shall indicate that the floor coverings, tents, membrane structures and their appurtenances, which include sidewalls, drops and tarpaulins, are composed of materials meeting the flame propagation performance of Test Method 2 of NFPA 701. Additionally, it shall indicate that the bunting and combustible decorative materials and effects are composed of material meeting the flame propagation performance criteria of Test Method 1 or Test Method 2 of NFPA 701, as applicable. Alternatively, the materials shall be treated with a flame retardant in an approved manner and meet the flame propagation performance criteria of the applicable test method of NFPA 701. The flame propagation performance criteria shall be effective for the period specified by the permit.

3104.4 Certification. An affidavit or affirmation shall be submitted to the fire code official and either a copy retained on the premises on which the tent or air-supported structure is located or label affixed to the tent or air supported structure. The affidavit shall attest to the names and address of the manufacturers of the tent or air-supported structure and either of the following information relative to the flame propagation performance criteria of the fabric:

- ~~1. Names and address of the manufacturers of the tent or air supported structure.~~
- ~~1.2. Either with €~~The date the fabric was last treated with flame-retardant solution, the trade name or kind of chemical used in treatment, name of person or firm treating the material and name of testing agency and test standard by which the fabric was tested, or
- ~~2.3.~~ The material meets NFPA 701 test Method 1 or 2 without treatment.

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the improvement of the language to match the intent of the requirements. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason and that it provides specific guidance on older and newer tents. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F244-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the proposed section deletion goes too far and the current required information is necessary. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F245-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that they had issues with the proposal regarding indoor vs. outdoor uses, time period, fire extinguishers, and the location of portable generators. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F246-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the language for the designated responsible person is inappropriate and better language is needed. There was also some confusion on determining what construction documents are to be provided. There was also some confusion on determining what construction documents are to be provided (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F247-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the 35 mph requirement is subjective and that the requirement should be designated by a knowledgeable person other than the fire code official. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F248-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that there was no basis for the reduction in the requirement and that it was overly restrictive. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F249-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the change allows for the current technology of vehicles that disconnecting the batteries causes the deactivation of many functions and the previous action on F15-18. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F250-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the commodity classification should be specified by the designer and owner. Additionally, the use of a Class IV classification as a minimum criteria could be inaccurate and insufficient in the event that the actual stored commodity classification is higher than a Class IV. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F251-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F252-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F253-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. There was concern with the annual requirement and who would need to address the fire code official or owner. (Vote: 8-6)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

F254-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:**

3205.4 Aisle maintenance. When restocking is not being conducted, aisles shall be kept clear of storage, waste material and debris. Fire department access doors, aisles and exit doors shall not be obstructed. During restocking operations using manual stocking methods, a minimum unobstructed aisle width of 24 inches (610 mm) shall be maintained in 48-inch (1219 mm) or smaller aisles, and a minimum unobstructed aisle width of one-half of the required aisle width shall be maintained in aisles greater than 48 inches (1219 mm). During mechanical stocking operations, a minimum unobstructed aisle width of 44 inches (1118 mm) shall be maintained in accordance with Section 3206.10.

Exception: In high-piled single- and double-row rack storage of combustible storage materials protected by automatic sprinkler systems designed and installed to deliver 0.60 gpm/sq ft over the most remote 2,000 sq ft and not less than 0.70 gpm/sq ft from the four most demanding sprinklers in accordance with 903.3.1.1, in accordance with the requirements of NFPA 13 governing the use of k=25.2 (360) sprinklers, displays and wing stacks not exceeding 48-inches in height provided they do not obstruct or reduce the clear width of the aisle to less than 48-inches...

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the improvement of the language to elaborate that it applies to both single and double row racks and is tied to the performance of the type of fire sprinkler that is being used.. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason and that the addition of the exception provides a method by which the actual use of a aisle can be addressed by a heightened fire sprinkler system design. (Vote: 12-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F256-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 13-0)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

F258-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 8-4)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

F259-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 13-0)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

F260-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

3209.4 Automated rack storage. High-piled storage areas with ~~greater than 500 square feet (46m²)~~ of automated rack storage shall be provided with a manually activated emergency shutdown switch and automatic shutdown in accordance with Sections 3209.4.1 and 3209.4.2.

3209.4.1 Manual Activated Shut Down. A manually activated switch shall be provided to initiate the approved automatic shutdown process. The switch shall be clearly identified and shall be in a location approved by the fire code official.

3209.4.2 Automatic Shut Down. Automatic shut down shall be required for high-piled combustibile storage areas greater than 500 square feet (46m²). The approved automatic shutdown process shall commence upon any of the following events:

1. Water flow is detected in the automatic sprinkler system, if present.
2. Activation of the fire detection system, if present.

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the alignment of the language that further clarifies the requirement. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F261-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

3210.1.1 Alternative Fire Protection. The design and installation of the ~~automatic sprinkler fire extinguishing systems in archives, vaults, and record storage rooms~~ shall be in accordance with ~~NFPA 13 and~~ NFPA 232.

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the improved clarity of the language that addresses fire protection more generally versus limiting it to an automatic sprinkler system. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F262-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IFC COMMITTEE, PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-GENERAL COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon concern that these provisions are already referenced in the IBC and relocation of requirements is not necessary. In addition this is consistent with the action taken on Part II of this proposal. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F262-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal would be difficult to enforce and time consuming. Some jurisdictions do not have a fire department. Putting the burden on the owner and the construction manager is the proper way to handle this situation. This complicates and muddies the code and makes the construction manager's job more difficult. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F263-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

3303.3 Daily fire safety inspection. The fire prevention program superintendent shall be responsible for completion of a daily fire safety inspection at the project site. Each day, all building and outdoor areas shall be inspected to ensure compliance with the inspection list in this section. The results of each inspection shall be documented and maintained on site until a certificate of occupancy has been issued. Documentation shall be immediately available on site for presentation to the fire code official upon request.

Failure to properly conduct, document and maintain documentation required by this section shall constitute an unlawful act in accordance with Section 110.1 and shall result in the issuance of a notice of violation in accordance with Section 110.3 to the fire prevention program superintendent. ~~Upon the third offence in any 30-day period, offense, the fire code official is authorized to issue a stop work order shall be issued~~ in accordance with Section 112, and work shall not resume until satisfactory assurances of future compliance have been presented to and approved by the fire code official.

1. Any contractors entering the site to perform hot work each day have been instructed in hot work safety requirements in Chapter 35 and hot work is only performed in areas approved by the fire prevention superintendent.
2. Temporary heating equipment is maintained away from combustible materials in accordance with the equipment manufacturer's instructions.
3. Combustible debris, rubbish and waste material is removed from the building in areas where work is not being performed.
4. Temporary wiring does not have exposed conductors.
5. Flammable liquids and other hazardous materials are stored in locations that have been approved by the fire prevention superintendent when not involved in work that is being performed.
6. Fire apparatus access roads required by Section 3310 are maintained clear of obstructions that reduce the width of the usable roadway to less than 20 feet.
7. Fire hydrants are clearly visible from access roads and are not obstructed.
8. The location of fire department connections to standpipe and in-service sprinkler systems are clearly identifiable from the access road and such connections are not obstructed.
9. Standpipe systems are in service and continuous to the highest work floor, as specified in Section 3313.
10. Portable fire extinguishers are available in locations required by Section 3315 and 3317.3.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved based upon the need for more tools for the code official to address hazards on construction sites. This provides a daily emphasis on the jobsite that they have a plan in place that needs to be followed. The checklist was felt to be helpful especially for alterations where the building may be occupied. The modification simply provides the authority to the fire code official to issue a stop work order versus it being mandatory after 30 days. This gives more flexibility to address each situation individually. There was some concern that this should be focused upon larger projects. There is a concern with movement of administrative provisions outside of Chapter 1. Some concern that projects may be shutdown based upon paperwork not being complete. There was also a suggestion that this be refined to coordinate the checklist with what is already required in Chapter 33. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F264-18

Errata: This proposal includes the following errata

3304.5.2.2 T raining. Personnel shall be trained ~~in~~ to serve as an on-site fire watch. Training shall include the use of portable fire extinguishers. Fire extinguishers and fire reporting shall be in accordance with Section 3309.

3304.5.3 Fire watch location and records. The fire watch shall include areas specified by the prefire site safety plan ~~plan~~ established in accordance with Section 3308.

3308.5.4 3304.5.4 Fire Watch Records. Fire watch personnel shall keep a record of all time periods of duty, including the log entry each time the site was patrolled, and each time a structure was entered and inspected. Records shall be made available for review by the fire code official upon request.

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it was seen a good companion change to code change proposal F263-18. In addition, the term "site safety plan" was seen as better terminology than "pre-fire plan." It was agreed that requiring the site safety plan to be approved by the fire code official is necessary. Allowing security to be used for fire watch was seen as a good use of resources. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****F265-18****Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it provides a tool for enforcement to maintain fire resistance ratings during construction. For example, this will allow corridor ratings to be maintained. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****F266-18****Committee Action:****Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:**

3308.4 Fire safety requirements for buildings of Types IV-A, IV-B, and IV-C construction. Buildings of Types IV-A, IV-B, and IV-C construction designed to be greater than six stories above grade plane shall comply with the following requirements during construction unless otherwise approved by the fire code official.

1. Standpipes shall be provided in accordance with Section 3313.
2. A water supply for fire department operations, as approved by the fire chief.
3. Where building construction exceeds six stories above grade plane, at least one layer of noncombustible protection where required by Section 602.4 of the International Building Code shall be installed on all building elements more than 4 floor levels, including mezzanines, below active mass timber construction before erecting additional floor levels.

Exception: Shafts and vertical exit enclosures shall not be considered a part of the active mass timber construction.

4. Where building construction exceeds six stories above grade plane required exterior wall coverings shall be installed on all floor levels more than 4 floor levels, including mezzanines, below active mass timber construction before erecting additional floor level.

Exception: Shafts and vertical exit enclosures shall not be considered a part of the active mass timber construction.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as part of the tall wood building proposals and provides the necessary construction fire safety related provisions. The modification merely makes it clear as to how the exceptions are to apply. The intention is that they only affect items 3 and 4. Shafts and vertical exit enclosures are not constructed with CLT and are not considered when reviewing the progress of construction. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****F267-18 Part I**

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IFC COMMITTEE, PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IBC-GENERAL COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:**Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Although the intent of the proposal was clear it would be cost prohibitive to require this level of protection during construction. The provisions are too broadly applied to smaller buildings. Finally, this proposal would require protection from rain and snow to allow this concept to work in most cases which is not practical. The revisions in code change proposals F263-18 and F264-18 were preferred over this proposal.(Vote: 14-0)

F267-18 Part II**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is a problem that needs a solution, but this is not it. It is a significant change to construction methods. Not sure how this would work with light frame construction. The moisture issue is significant and need to be addressed. The comparison of light frame wood construction to mass timber construction is incorrect. There is a need to address construction fires in all construction types, and especially wood construction. There are other proposals that may better address these concerns. A dry wall crew would have to continuously come in and out of the job site. This would substantially increase the cost of construction. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****F268-18****Committee Action:****Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:****2018 International Fire Code****SECTION 3312 WATER SUPPLY FOR FIRE PROTECTION**

3312.1 When required. An approved water supply for fire protection, either temporary or permanent, shall be made available as soon as combustible ~~building materials structural elements~~ arrives on the site, upon commencement of vertical combustible construction, and upon installation of a standpipe system in buildings under construction, in accordance with Sections 3312.2 through 3312.5.

Exception: The fire code official is authorized to reduce the fire-flow requirements for isolated buildings or a group of buildings in rural areas or small communities where the development of full fire-flow requirements is impractical.

3312.2 Combustible ~~building materials structural elements~~. When combustible ~~building materials structural elements~~ of the building under construction are delivered to a site, a minimum fire flow of 1,000 gpm shall be provided. The fire hydrant used to provide this fire flow supply shall be within 500 feet of the combustible ~~building materials structural elements~~, as measured along an approved fire apparatus access lane. Where the site configuration is such that one fire hydrant can not be located within 500 feet of all combustible ~~building materials structural elements~~, additional fire hydrants shall be required to provide coverage in accordance with this section.

3312.3 Vertical construction of Types III, IV, and V construction. Prior to commencement of vertical construction of Type III, IV, or V buildings that utilize any combustible ~~building materials structural elements~~, the fire flow required by Sections 3312.3.1 through 3312.3.3 shall be provided, accompanied by fire hydrants in sufficient quantity to deliver the required fire flow and proper coverage.

3312.3.1 Fire separation up to 30 feet. Where a building of Type III, IV, or V construction has a fire separation distance of less than 30 feet from property lot lines, and an adjacent property has an existing structure or otherwise can be constructed upon, the water supply shall provide either a minimum of ~~500 1,000~~-gpm, or the entire fire flow required for the building when constructed, whichever is greater.

3312.3.2 Fire separation of 30 feet up to 60 feet. Where a building of Type III, IV, or V construction has a fire separation distance of 30 feet up to 60 feet from property lot lines, and an adjacent property has an existing structure or otherwise can be constructed upon, the water supply shall provide a minimum of ~~500 1,000~~-gpm, or 50% of the fire flow required for the building when constructed, whichever is greater.

3312.3.3 Fire separation of 60 feet or greater. Where a building of Type III, IV, or V construction has a fire separation of 60 feet or greater from a property lot line, a water supply of ~~500 1,000~~-gpm shall be provided.

3312.4 Vertical Construction, Type I and II construction. If combustible ~~building construction~~ materials are delivered to the construction site, water supply in accordance with Section 3312.2 shall be provided. Additional water supply for fire flow is not required prior to commencing vertical construction of Type I and II buildings.

3312.5 Standpipe supply. Regardless of the presence of combustible ~~building construction~~ materials, the construction type or the fire separation distance, where a standpipe is required in accordance with Section 3313, a water supply providing a minimum flow of 500 gpm shall be provided. The fire hydrant used for this water supply shall be located within 100 feet of the Fire Department Connection supplying the standpipe.

2018 International Building Code

SECTION 3313 WATER SUPPLY FOR FIRE PROTECTION

3313.1 Where required. An approved water supply for fire protection, either temporary or permanent, shall be made available as soon as combustible building materials ~~structural elements~~ arrive on the site, upon commencement of vertical combustible construction, and upon installation of a standpipe system in buildings under construction, in accordance with Sections 3312.2 through 3312.5.

Exception: The fire code official is authorized to reduce the fire-flow requirements for isolated buildings or a group of buildings in rural areas or small communities where the development of full fire-flow requirements is impractical.

[F] 3313.2 Combustible building materials ~~construction elements~~. When combustible building materials ~~structural elements~~ of the building under construction are delivered to a site, a minimum fire flow of 1,000 gpm shall be provided. The fire hydrant used to provide this fire flow supply shall be within 500 feet of the combustible building materials ~~structural elements~~, as measured along an approved fire apparatus access lane. Where the site configuration is such that one fire hydrant can not be located within 500 feet of all combustible building materials ~~structural elements~~, additional fire hydrants shall be required to provide coverage in accordance with this section.

[F] 3313.3 Vertical construction of Types III, IV, and V construction. Prior to commencement of vertical construction of Type III, IV, or V buildings that utilize any combustible building materials ~~structural elements~~, the fire flow required by Sections 3312.3.1 through 3312.3.3 shall be provided, accompanied by fire hydrants in sufficient quantity to deliver the required fire flow and proper coverage.

[F] 3313.3.1 Fire separation up to 30 feet. Where a building of Type III, IV, or V construction has a fire separation distance of less than 30 feet from property lot lines, and an adjacent property has an existing structure or otherwise can be constructed upon, the water supply shall provide either a minimum of 500 ~~1,000~~ gpm, or the entire fire flow required for the building when constructed, whichever is greater.

[F] 3313.3.2 Fire separation of 30 feet up to 60 feet. Where a building of Type III, IV, or V construction has a fire separation distance of 30 feet up to 60 feet from property lot lines, and an adjacent property has an existing structure or otherwise can be constructed upon, the water supply shall provide a minimum of 500 ~~1,000~~ gpm, or 50% of the fire flow required for the building when constructed, whichever is greater.

[F] 3313.3.3 Fire separation of 60 feet or greater. Where a building of Type III, IV, or V construction has a fire separation of 60 feet or greater from a property lot line, a water supply of 500 ~~1,000~~ gpm shall be provided.

[F] 3313.4 Vertical Construction, Type I and II construction. If combustible building ~~construction~~ materials are delivered to the construction site, water supply in accordance with Section 3312.2 shall be provided. Additional water supply for fire flow is not required prior to commencing vertical construction of Type I and II buildings.

[F] 3313.5 Standpipe supply. Regardless of the presence of combustible building ~~construction~~ materials, the construction type or the fire separation distance, where a standpipe is required in accordance with Section 3313, a water supply providing a minimum flow of 500 gpm shall be provided. The fire hydrant used for this water supply shall be located within 100 feet of the Fire Department Connection supplying the standpipe.

2018 International Existing Building Code

SECTION 1509 WATER SUPPLY FOR FIRE PROTECTION

1509.1 When required. An approved water supply for fire protection, either temporary or permanent, shall be made available as soon as combustible building ~~material~~ ~~structural elements~~ arrives on the site, upon commencement of vertical combustible construction, and upon installation of a standpipe system in buildings under construction, in accordance with Sections 3312.2 through 3312.5.

Exception: The fire code official is authorized to reduce the fire-flow requirements for isolated buildings or a group of buildings in rural areas or small communities where the development of full fire-flow requirements is impractical.

[F] 1509.2 Combustible building materials ~~structural elements~~. When combustible building materials ~~structural elements~~ of the building under construction are delivered to a site, a minimum fire flow of 1,000 gpm shall be provided. The fire hydrant used to provide this fire flow supply shall be within 500 feet of the combustible building materials ~~structural elements~~, as measured along an approved fire apparatus access lane. Where the site configuration is such that one fire hydrant can not be located within 500 feet of all combustible building materials ~~structural elements~~, additional fire hydrants shall be required to provide coverage in accordance with this section.

[F] 1509.3 Vertical construction of Types III, IV, and V construction. Prior to commencement of vertical construction of Type III, IV, or V buildings that utilize any combustible building materials ~~structural elements~~, the fire flow required by Sections 3312.3.1 through 3312.3.3 shall be provided, accompanied by fire hydrants in sufficient quantity to deliver the required fire flow and proper coverage.

[F] 1509.3.1 Fire separation up to 30 feet. Where a building of Type III, IV, or V construction has a fire separation distance of less than 30 feet from property lot lines, and an adjacent property has an existing structure or otherwise can be constructed upon, the water supply shall provide either a minimum of 500 ~~1,000~~ gpm, or the entire fire flow required for the building when constructed, whichever is greater.

[F] 1509.3.2 Fire separation of 30 feet up to 60 feet. Where a building of Type III, IV, or V construction has a fire separation distance of 30 feet up to 60 feet from property lot lines, and an adjacent property has an existing structure or otherwise can be constructed upon, the water supply shall provide a minimum of 500 ~~1,000~~ gpm, or 50% of the fire flow required for the building when constructed, whichever is greater.

[F] 1509.3.3 Fire separation of 60 feet or greater. Where a building of Type III, IV, or V construction has a fire separation of 60 feet or greater from a property lot line, a water supply of 500 ~~1,000~~ gpm shall be provided.

[F] 1509.4 Vertical Construction, Type I and II construction. ~~Type I and II construction.~~ If combustible construction materials are delivered to the construction site, water supply in accordance with Section 3312.2 shall be provided. Additional water supply for fire flow is not required prior to commencing vertical construction of Type I and II buildings.

[F] 1509.5 Standpipe supply. Regardless of the presence of combustible building construction materials, the construction type or the fire separation distance, where a standpipe is required in accordance with Section 3313, a water supply providing a minimum flow of 500 gpm shall be provided. The fire hydrant used for this water supply shall be located within 100 feet of the Fire Department Connection supplying the standpipe.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it provides more specific guidance on when and to what extent a water supply is required. There are two sets of modifications to this proposal. First throughout "structural elements" was revised to "building materials" as not all "combustible building materials" are structural. The proposal was trying o focus on combustible materials having to do with the actual construction versus elements such as construction trailers. The second set of modifications throughout dealt with a reduction of minimum fire flow to a more reasonably achievable number. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F269-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The requirement for standpipes to comply with pressure requirements during construction was seen as problematic. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F270-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This concept was felt to be impractical and costly for wood construction. In addition, there would be concern for requiring such protection for colder climates. The temporary sprinkler systems would be an added modification that would need to be removed later. Also, there was some concern that the temporary measures used for sprinkler activation may create a false sense of security of the effectiveness of such systems. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F271-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon concern that the chapter was originally developed for higher education laboratory and this would go beyond that scope. There was concern that the safety shower requirements are not consistent with the IBC. The concept of "clinical labs" needs to be better defined. Finally, there was concern with a global adoption of NFPA 45. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F272-18

Errata: This proposal includes the following errata

3805.2.1 Restricted materials storage. Where approved by the fire code official, storage of the following hazardous materials prohibited by Table 5003.1.1(1) in buildings not equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 shall be allowed within a laboratory control area at 25 percent of Table 5003.1.1(1) limits for a building equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system.

1. Class 4 Oxidizers.
2. Pyrophorics.

The percentage of the maximum allowable quantity per control area shown in Table 3805.4 shall be applied to 25 percent of Table 5003.1.1(1) limits for Class 4 Oxidizers or pyrophoric materials.

Additional quantity increases shall be prohibited, and such materials shall be stored in accordance with all of the following:

1. Containers shall be completely sealed and stored in accordance with the manufacturers' recommendations.
2. Storage shall be within approved hazardous material storage cabinets in accordance with Section 5003.8.7, or shall be located in an inert atmosphere glove box in accordance with NFPA 45, Section 7.11.
3. The storage cabinet or glove box shall not contain any storage of incompatible materials.

TABLE 3805.4

DESIGN AND NUMBER OF CONTROL AREAS IN EXISTING NONSPRINKLERED LABORATORIES

a. Percentages shall be of the maximum allowable quantity per control area shown in Tables 5003.1.1(1) and 5003.1.1(2), excluding all increases allowed in the footnotes to those tables.

b. Fire barriers shall include walls, floors and ceilings necessary to provide separation from other portions of the building.

c. Vertical fire barriers separating control areas from other spaces on the same floor are permitted to be 1-hour fire-resistance rated.

d. See Section 414.2.4 of the International Building Code for additional requirements.

e. The percentage of the maximum allowable quantity per control area shown in Table 3805.4 shall be applied to 25 percent of Table 5003.1.1(1) limits for Class 4 Oxidizers or pyrophoric materials.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as appropriately clarifies that the maximum quantity is based upon 25% of the amounts allowed in Table 5003.1.1(1) when applying Table 3805.4. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F273-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it is important to have the ability to re-evaluate the process any time there is a change to avoid a potential hazard. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F274-18

Errata: This proposal includes the following errata

UL 1389—~~17-18~~:

Outline of Investigation for Plant Oil Extraction Units—Equipment

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it provides another path to approve systems and equipment for the extraction of oils. This new standard is necessary and will lessen the burden for compliance. (Vote: 14-0)

F275-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:****3905.1.2 Operation.** Activation of the gas detection system shall result in all the following:

1. Initiation of distinct audible and visual alarm signals in the extraction room.
2. Deactivation of all heating systems located in the extraction room.
3. Activation of the mechanical ventilation system, where the system is interlocked with gas detection.
4. ~~Activation of the gas detection system shall disable~~ De-energize all light switches and electrical outlets.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it correlates with revisions made in F75-16 addressing gas detection provisions. The primary gas detection provisions were moved to Section 916 in the 2018 IFC. The modification uses more appropriate industry terminology addressing removing power from light switches and electrical outlets. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****F276-18****Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as the exceptions for Group H occupancies are needed and the chapter addressing the specific hazards is necessary. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****F277-18****Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it would be difficult to enforce as building and fire officials are already overburdened. The standard has provisions that seem difficult to enforce such as facilitating the safe movement of animals out of a building during emergencies and inspecting for animal waste removal. In general the standard is actually more restrictive than certain portions of the building code. The code was written with the primary intention of protecting people. In addition, there was concern that the definition animal housing facility was too broad. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****F278-18****Errata: This proposal includes unpublished errata**

(Only the title of the definitions were shown in the original. This shows how the definitions were originally submitted)

COMBUSTIBLE LIQUID. A liquid having a closed cup flash point at or above 100°F (38°C). Combustible liquids shall be subdivided as follows:

The category of combustible liquids does not include compressed gases or cryogenic ~~fluids~~ fluids or liquids that do not have a fire point when tested in accordance with ASTM D92.

Class II. Liquids having a closed cup flash point at or above 100°F (38°C) and below 140°F (60°C).

Class IIIA. Liquids having a closed cup flash point at or above 140°F (60°C) and below 200°F (93°C).

Class IIIB. Liquids having closed cup flash points at or above 200°F (93°C).

FLAMMABLE LIQUID. A liquid having a closed cup flash point below 100°F (38°C). Flammable liquids are further categorized into a group known as Class I liquids. The Class I category is subdivided as follows:

The category of flammable liquids does not include compressed gases or cryogenic ~~fluids~~ fluids , or liquids that do not have a fire point when tested in accordance with ASTM D92.

Class IA. Liquids having a flash point below 73°F (23°C) and having a boiling point below 100°F (38°C).

Class IB. Liquids having a flash point below 73°F (23°C) and having a boiling point at or above 100°F (38°C).

Class IC. Liquids having a flash point at or above 73°F (23°C) and below 100°F (38°C).

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

5001.1 Scope. Prevention, control and mitigation of dangerous conditions related to storage, dispensing, use and handling of hazardous materials shall be in accordance with this chapter.

This chapter shall apply to all hazardous materials, including those materials regulated elsewhere in this code, except that where specific requirements are provided in other chapters, those specific requirements shall apply in accordance with the applicable chapter. Where a material has multiple hazards, all hazards shall be addressed.

Exceptions:

1. In retail or wholesale sales occupancies, medicines, foodstuff, cosmetics and commercial or institutional products containing not more than 50 percent by volume of water-miscible liquids and with the remainder of the solutions not being flammable , provided that such materials are packaged in individual containers not exceeding 1.3 gallons (5 L).

2. Alcoholic beverages in retail or wholesale sales occupancies provided that the liquids are packaged in individual containers not exceeding 1.3 gallons (5 L).

3. Application and release of pesticide and agricultural products and materials intended for use in weed abatement, erosion control, soil amendment or similar applications where applied in accordance with the manufacturers' instructions and label directions.

4. The off-site transportation of hazardous materials where in accordance with Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations.

5. Building materials not otherwise regulated by this code.

6. ~~Refrigerant liquids and oils in~~ Refrigeration systems (see Section 605).

7. Stationary storage battery systems regulated by Section 1206.2.

8. The display, storage, sale or use of fireworks and explosives in accordance with Chapter 56.

9. Corrosives utilized in personal and household products in the manufacturers' original consumer packaging in Group M occupancies.

10. The storage of distilled spirits and wines in wooden barrels and casks.

11. The use of wall-mounted dispensers containing alcohol-based hand rubs classified as Class I or II liquids where in accordance with Section 5705.5

12. Specific provisions for flammable liquids in motor fuel-dispensing facilities, repair garages, airports and marinas in Chapter 23.

13. Storage and use of fuel oil in tanks and containers connected to oil-burning equipment. Such storage and use shall be in accordance with Section 603. For abandonment of fuel oil tanks, Chapter 57 applies.

14. Storage and display of aerosol products complying with Chapter 51.

15. Storage and use of flammable or combustible liquids that do not have a fire point when tested in accordance with ASTM D92, not otherwise regulated by this code.

16. Flammable or combustible liquids with a flash point greater than 95°F (35°C) in a water-miscible solution or dispersion with a water and inert (noncombustible) solids content of more than 80 percent by weight, which do not sustain combustion, not otherwise regulated by this code.

17. Commercial cooking oil storage tank systems located within a building and designed and installed in accordance with Section 608 and NFPA 30.

5701.2 Nonapplicability. This chapter shall not apply to liquids as otherwise provided in other laws or regulations or chapters of this code, including:

1. Specific provisions for flammable liquids in motor fuel-dispensing facilities, repair garages, airports and marinas in Chapter 23.

2. Medicines, foodstuffs, cosmetics and commercial or institutional products containing not more than 50 percent by volume of water-miscible liquids and with the remainder of the solution not being flammable, provided that such materials are packaged in individual containers not exceeding 1.3 gallons (5 L).

3. Quantities of alcoholic beverages in retail or wholesale sales or storage occupancies, provided that the liquids are packaged in individual containers not exceeding 1.3 gallons (5 L).

4. Storage and use of fuel oil in tanks and containers connected to oil-burning equipment. Such storage and use shall be in accordance with Section 603. For abandonment of fuel oil tanks, this chapter applies.

5. ~~Refrigerant liquids and oils in~~ Refrigeration systems (see Section 605).

6. Storage and display of aerosol products complying with Chapter 51.

7. Storage and use of liquids that do not have a fire point when tested in accordance with ASTM D92.

8. Liquids with a flash point greater than 95°F (35°C) in a water-miscible solution or dispersion with a water and inert (noncombustible) solids content of more than 80 percent by weight, which do not sustain combustion.

9. Liquids without flash points that can be flammable under some conditions, such as certain halogenated hydrocarbons and mixtures containing halogenated hydrocarbons.

10. The storage of distilled spirits and wines in wooden barrels and casks.

11. Commercial cooking oil storage tank systems located within a building and designed and installed in accordance with Section 608 and NFPA 30.

12. Application and release of pesticide and agricultural products and materials intended for use in weed abatement, erosion control, soil amendment or similar applications where applied in accordance with the manufacturers' instructions and label directions.

13. The off-site transportation of flammable or combustible liquids where in accordance with Department of Transportation (DOTn) regulation.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it correlates the exception to the scopes of Chapters 50 and 57. The modification revises the exception for refrigeration systems to acknowledge that the refrigeration may be a gas versus a liquid. The exceptions for flammable liquids at motor fuel dispensing facilities was revised back to current code language to reflect that in some cases such liquids would still be addressed by Chapters 50 and 57. An example may be flammable liquids in a cabinet. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F279-18

Committee Action:

Withdrawn

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F280-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it conflicts with proposal F212-18 and more work needs to be done to correlate with that proposal. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F281-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved related to the fact that the testing has not yet occurred to justify the increase in quantities. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F282-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was concern that this proposal waves the maximum allowable quantities but does not provide additional controls. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F283-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal seemed reasonable although often the materials will have other hazard characteristic that will need to be addressed. Therefore this increase may not be applicable due to the application of the code provisions related to the other hazardous properties of the material. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F284-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it clarified the intent with the terms ready access that signage is to properly identify the emergency shutoff . (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F286-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is felt to be an appropriate pointer to NFPA 99 with regard to respiratory therapy. (Vote: 9-5)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F287-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it advances the semi-conductor industry to address the production of larger wafers and provides further protection features to address the increased amounts of gases within the building. These protections are related to the experiences we have had with the regulation of silane. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F288-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal fixed an unintended consequences of that occurred clarifying the fire wall requirements for the 2018 code that appeared to not allow the use of fire walls for other than building height and area. This will allow the fire wall to create a separate building for the application of control areas. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

F289-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as this allowance seemed reasonable given the conditions specified. There was a comment that potentially the amount could be unlimited under these conditions. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F290-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it cleans up the application of outdoor control areas throughout the code to be more consistent. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F291-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it appropriately points the code user to Chapter 53 for the more specific requirements for ventilation required in Chapter 53 for medical gases. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F292-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as Section 5004 applies to Group H occupancies and IMC Section 509 would require hazardous exhaust. It was suggested that potentially the charging language contain reference to the IMC requirements. (Vote: 9-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F293-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the fact that test data supports these conditions and allowances for level 3 aerosols. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F294-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it provides an appropriate limit for cooking spray in healthcare and institutional occupancies similar to those occupancies already noted. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F295-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it is appropriate to require training. It was suggested however that the proposal also make a better connection to the standard and use the correct terminology of "staff" as used in

other proposals related to healthcare. There was some concern that Section 5305.7 already addresses this issue. (Vote: 8-6)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F296-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal appropriately aligns the language in both sections on one hour interior rooms within the IFC and IBC. Some felt the wording to be somewhat redundant. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F297-18 Part I

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it further correlates the medical gas requirements with NFPA 99. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F297-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The terms used are more appropriate and in line with the standard. NFPA 99 addresses installation and testing versus design. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F298-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal does not correlate with NFPA 55 and trying to achieve this requirement would be more complex for low pressure CO. Also this section was recently revised based upon a large collaborative effort and it is felt based upon that effort the current provisions are adequate. (Vote: 11-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F299-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There were several issues of concern with this proposal. First, it was felt that this is an exception needed for not just federal agencies. Second the core of this standard as it relates to this issue is Sub part K. Finally it is difficult to determine how this would be applied when such agencies are located in buildings with a mixture of leased occupancies not all of them to the federal government. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F300-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

5601.1.3 Fireworks. The possession, manufacture, storage, sale, handling and use of fireworks are prohibited.

Exceptions:

1. Storage and handling of fireworks as allowed in Section 5604.
2. Manufacture, assembly and testing of fireworks as allowed in Section 5605.
3. The use of fireworks for fireworks displays as allowed in Section 5608.
4. The possession, storage, sale, handling and use of specific types of Division 1.4G fireworks where allowed by applicable laws, ordinances and regulations, provided that such fireworks and facilities comply with the 2006 edition of NFPA 1124, Section 5609, CPSC 16 CFR Parts 1500 and 1507, and DOTn 49 CFR Parts 100-185, as applicable for consumer fireworks.

Add new standard as follows:

NFPA 1124-06: Code for the Manufacture, Transportation, and Storage of Fireworks and Pyrotechnic Articles

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved with a modification to address the needs of firework sales. Although the current edition of NFPA 1124 does not address such sales jurisdictions need guidance on how to regulate. The committee felt that by referencing the 2006 edition of NFPA 1124 would provide the necessary requirements to regulate the sale of fireworks where such sales are legal. (Vote: 8-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F301-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was seen as a logical location to specifically prohibit smoking along with warning of explosives being present. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F302-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponents reason statement and due to the fact that reloading is currently not addressed by the IFC. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F303-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the action taken on code change proposal F300-18. There was some discussion regarding the verbiage in this proposal that it needs to better clarify how to deal with new and existing buildings. In addition, there was concern with the application of the provisions for temporary sales. Finally, Section 5609.4.5 of the proposal does not reference Chapter 10 of the coded for means of egress. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F304-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon the proponent's reason statement and would allow for another type of double contained pipe. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

F305-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal captures too many buildings into this requirement which seems overly restrictive. Also the reference to NFPA 13R seems contradictory to the level of risk and importance of III or IV buildings. (Vote: 12-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F306-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Where leak detection is required a method of knowing there is a leak is necessary. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F307-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal appropriately removes a standard that is not applicable to underground tanks. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F308-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as the provisions would conflict with Chapter 9 of NFPA 30 and may be preempted by the DOT. (Vote: 11-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F309-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the concern that the area of the storage does not have relevance on the hazard. Also the exception to section 5704.3.7.3 is for metal containers and was only tested to 18 feet and this proposal does not have a limit on ceiling height. Finally, there was concern that the types of systems should not be limited to ESFR as there are various other automatic sprinkler strategies that may also work. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F310-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This concept was disapproved as mobile fueling is not a fixed facility as addressed in Chapter 23. (Vote: 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F311-18

Committee Modification:

5707.2 Mobile fueling vehicle. An on-demand mobile fueling vehicle shall be ~~one of the following that~~ which is utilized in on-demand fueling operations for the dispensing of Class I, II or III liquids into the fuel tanks of motor vehicles.

5707.2.1 Mobile fueling vehicle classifications. An on-demand mobile fueling vehicle shall be characterized as one of the following:

1. Tier 1 Mobile Fueling Vehicle - A tank vehicle in accordance that complies with NFPA 385 and that has chassis-mounted tanks where the aggregate ~~carge~~ capacity does not exceed 1,600 gallons (6057 L).

2. Tier 2 Mobile Fueling Vehicle - A vehicle with one or more chassis-mounted tanks or chassis-mounted containers ~~that do~~, not exceed 110 gallons (415 L) individual capacity and having an aggregate capacity that does not exceed ~~1200~~800 gallons (~~4592~~3028 L) or the weight capacity of the vehicle in accordance with DOT_n.

3. Tier 3 Mobile Fueling Vehicle - A vehicle that carries a maximum aggregate capacity of 60 gallons (227 L) of motor fuel in metal safety cans listed in accordance with UL 30 or other approved metal containers, each not to exceed 5 gallons (19 L) in capacity.

4. ~~The~~ **5707.2.2 Mobile fueling vehicle requirements.** Each mobile fueling vehicle shall comply with all local, state and federal requirements, as well as the following:

~~5-1.~~ Mobile fueling vehicles with a chassis-mounted tank in excess of 110 gallons (415 L) shall also comply with the requirements of Section 5706.6, ~~Section 5707,~~ and NFPA 385.

~~6-2.~~ The mobile fueling vehicle and its equipment shall be maintained in good repair.

~~7-3.~~ Safety cans and approved metal containers shall be secured to the mobile fueling vehicle except when in use.

~~8-4.~~ Fueling a motor vehicle from tanks or containers mounted in a trailer connected to a mobile fueling vehicle shall be prohibited.

5707.3.3 Site plan. Where required by the fire code official, a site plan shall be developed for each location at which mobile fueling occurs. The site plan shall be in sufficient detail to indicate the following:

1. All buildings and structures
2. Lot lines or property lines
3. Electric car chargers
4. Solar photovoltaic parking lot canopies
5. Appurtenances on site and their use or function
6. All uses adjacent to the lot lines of the site
7. Fueling locations
8. Locations of all storm drain openings, ~~bioswales~~ and adjacent waterways or wetlands
9. Information regarding slope, natural drainage, curbing, impounding
10. How a spill will be kept on the site property
11. Scale of the site plan.

5707.4.1 Separation. The point of connection of the vehicle being fueled shall not take place within 25 feet (7620 mm) of buildings, lot lines, property lines or combustible storage. Mobile fueling vehicles shall not park within 10 feet (3048 mm) of buildings, lot lines, property lines, or combustible storage.

Exceptions:

1. The fire code official shall be authorized to decrease the separation distance for dispensing from metal safety cans or other approved metal containers in accordance with Section 5707.2.

2. The point of fueling shall not take place within 10 feet (3048 mm) of buildings, lot lines, property lines, or combustible storage when the mobile fueling vehicle has an approved vapor recovery system or is servicing vehicles with on board refueling vapor recovery.

Where dispensing operations occur within 15 feet (4572 mm) of a storm drain ~~or bioswale~~, an approved storm drain cover or an approved equivalent method that will prevent any fuel from reaching the drain ~~or bioswale~~ shall be used.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it is making the provisions more consistent with industry practice and terminology addressing the 3 tiers of fueling. This generally addresses the quickly evolving industry and changes that have occurred since the publication of the 2018 IFC. The modifications clarify the types of fueling that

occur and removes bioswales from the site plan requirements as they present a low impact with regard to spills and are easy to remediate. (Vote: 11-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F312-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

5707.1.1 Approval required. Mobile fueling operations shall not be conducted without first obtaining a permit and approval from the fire code official. Mobile fueling operations shall occur only at approved locations ~~or areas~~. The fire code official is authorized to approve individual locations or geographic areas where mobile fueling is allowed.

Committee Reason: This proposal as approved allows the fire code official to designate certain locations or areas more broadly to avoid having to approve each fueling operation. The modification deletes the proposed addition of "areas" in the first sentence and instead adds a new sentence that focuses on authorizing the fire code official to approve such locations and areas. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F313-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as the revisions provided do not add further clarity to this section. In addition, there was concern that the site plan should not be solely developed by the mobile fueling operator. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F314-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon concerns related to the potential for the accumulation of vapors. A modification was presented that provided more detail regarding issues such as ventilation, location and spill control but further review is necessary. In particular it needs to be clear that all conditions presented by the modification would apply. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F315-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was viewed as too restrictive on the types of locations where mobile fueling can occur. Such fueling is already occurring in parking lots and in fields. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F316-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was general concern for dispensing fuel on a public way. In particular there is concern for such operations occurring in residential neighborhoods without additional data to better understand the risks. It was pointed out that the language appears to limit time of day but not location. There was a sense from some that the fire code official should be allowed some discretion to allow fueling in public ways under certain conditions. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F317-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproval as it was felt that the intent was to capture releases both inside and outside of buildings and this proposal would limit application to within buildings only. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F318-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as the concerns are addressed with proper ventilation and this is already allowed with other heavier than air gases in pits. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F319-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal provides better clarification on temporarily versus permanently removing LPG containers from service. More streamlining of the proposal based upon the somewhat repetitive result of the revisions is suggested. (Vote 13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F320-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it clarifies the application of Class II and III oxidizers in tabular form. Also, the revisions appropriately link back to NFPA 400 for sprinkler requirements. Finally where the amounts are below the MAQs a reference back to Chapter 50 is provided. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F321-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the new proposed requirement is overly restrictive and is already covered in Section 503.2.7. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F322-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F323-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the new proposed language adds an unnecessary complexity to the section and that the term "average grade" is not a defined term. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F324-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

D105.1 Where required. Where the vertical distance between the grade plane and the highest roof surface exceeds 30 feet (9144 mm), approved aerial fire apparatus access roads shall be provided. For purposes of this section, the highest roof surface shall be determined by measurement to the eave of a pitched roof, the intersection of the roof to the exterior wall, or the top of parapet walls, whichever is greater.

Exception: Where approved by the fire code official, buildings of Type IA, Type IB, or Type IIA Construction, equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance to Section 903.3.1.1; and having firefighter access through an enclosed stairway with a Class I Standpipe from the lowest level of fire department vehicle access to all roof surfaces.

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the improvement of the language with the addition that allows the fire code official to use the exception. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason and it was stated that it doesn't make sense to require it if it is not going to be used. (Vote: 8-7)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F325-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the proposed language addition is a good clarification that homes do not need to be directly on the fire apparatus road, which is open to interpretation. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F326-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it addresses necessary security requirements for certain types of hazardous materials facilities. Homeland security would require compliance with this standard for high risk facilities. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F327-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved to correlate this appendix with Chapter 61 and NFPA 58. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

F328-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it was felt better addressed by human resources. In addition, there was not a direct connection made by NIST from the Charleston fire regarding qualification requirements by the jurisdiction. The state fire marshal's office may have specific requirements which may conflict with this appendix. Also, the legal language regarding termination appears beyond the scope of the IFC. Some did support the concept since this provides some guidance and as this is an appendix would have to be specifically adopted to apply. (Vote: 8-6)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

2018 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL FUEL GAS CODE

FUEL GAS CODE COMMITTEE

Michael D. Redifer, MCP, Chair

Building Official
City of Newport News
Newport News, VA

Paul W. Cabot, CGE, Vice Chair

Administrator National Fuel Gas Code
American Gas Association
Washington, DC

Mike Deegan

Rep: American Gas Association
Safety & Regulatory Compliance
Clearwater Gas System
Clearwater, FL

Ralph E. Euchner

Rep: American Gas Association
Operations Manager
PSNC Energy/AGA
Gastonia, NC

William T. Hamilton, CGI

Rep: American Gas Association
Manager, Technical Training
UGI Utilities, Inc.
Reading, PA

Wendell Heyen, MCP

Building Inspector IV
City of Thornton
Thornton, CO

Randy Lee

Code Inspector
City of Decatur
Tuscumbia, AL

Andrea Lanier Papageorge, JD, MBA

Rep: American Gas Association
Manager, Building and Gas Codes and
Standards
Southern Company Gas
Atlanta, GA

Kathleen Patterson, RA

Code Development Architect
New York City Department of Buildings
New York, NY

Mark Riley

Mechanical Inspector
City of Royal Oak Building Department
Royal Oak, MI

Jason Stanek, PE

Rep: American Gas Association
Manager, Commercial & Contractor Services
Metropolitan Utilities District
Omaha, NE

Timothy H. Swanson, CBCO, CFCO

Chief Building Official
City of Greeley
Greeley, CO

Staff Secretariat:

Gregg Gress

Senior Technical Staff
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hills, IL

AGA Liaison

Jim Ranfone, Managing Director
American Gas Association
Washington, DC

International Fuel Gas Code

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

FG1-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FG2-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FG3-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. Such valves are allowed but not defined. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FG4-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed text clarifies where such valves are located. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FG6-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FG7-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies what is under the control of the gas utility. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

FG8-18**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** Approval is based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)**Assembly Motion:** **NONE****FG9-18****Committee Action:** **Disapproved****Committee Reason:** Adding a Chapter 16 reference will cause confusion. This will not allow the IRC earthquake provisions and instead will require one and two family dwellings to comply with the IRC. The IBC allows the IRC as an optional code and this proposal negates that. (Vote 11-0)**Assembly Motion:** **NONE****FG10-18****Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** There is a safety issue that all agree needs to be addressed. This proposal should move forward and receive feedback from the public comment phase of the process. (Vote 6-5)**Assembly Motion:** **Disapproved****Online Vote Results:** Successful - Support: 82.8% (111) Oppose: 17.2% (23)**Assembly Action:** **Disapproved****FG11-18****Committee Action:** **Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:**

307.2 Fuel-burning appliances.

Liquid combustion byproducts of condensing appliances shall be collected and discharged to an approved plumbing fixture or disposal area in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. Condensate piping shall be of approved corrosion-resistant material and shall be not smaller than the drain connection on the appliance. Such piping shall maintain a minimum slope in the direction of discharge of not less than one-eighth unit vertical in 12 units horizontal (1-percent slope).

~~Where condensate piping is concealed, and the primary and secondary drain system pipes serving the same appliance terminate together at a remote location, the terminations shall be identified as to which is the primary or secondary drain. The termination of concealed condensate piping shall be marked to indicate that the piping is connected to the primary drain or to the secondary drain.~~**Committee Reason:** Approval is based on proponent's published reason statement. The modification makes the text apply more generally to all concealed piping. (Vote 10-1)**Assembly Motion:** **NONE****FG12-18****Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** The proposed text is consistent with ANSI LC 1/CSA 6.26. (Vote 10-1)**Assembly Motion:** **NONE**

FG14-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

404.5 Fittings in concealed locations.

Fittings installed in concealed locations shall be limited to the following types:

1. ~~Threaded~~ ~~Right hand~~ ~~threaded~~ elbows, tees, couplings, plugs and caps.
2. Brazed fittings.
3. Welded fittings.
4. Fittings listed to ANSI LC-1/CSA 6.26 or ANSI LC-4.

Committee Reason: Couplings and plugs needed to be added. Right/left couplings are still being used and should be allowed. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion:

Approved as Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 57.8% (63) Oppose: 42.2% (46)

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

FG15-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on proponent's published reason statement. Gas can enter building through other pipe penetrations. Above ground pipe is subject to damage. (Vote 7-4)

Assembly Motion:

Disapproved

Online Vote Results:

Successful - Support: 58.8% (67) Oppose: 41.2% (47)

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

FG16-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The text would apply to steel pipe, not just CSST and would therefore allow uncoated black steel pipe to be installed underground in PVC conduit. The listing for CSST already allows encasement systems for CSST. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FG17-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on proponent's published reason statement (Vote 9-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FG18-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on proponent's published reason statement (Vote 9-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FG20-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Such valve is defined by the text in Proposal FG3-18 and is allowed to be installed, but should not be mandated. Such valve should not be located indoors. Shutoff valves should be the choice of the gas supplier. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FG21-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on proponent's published reason statement (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FG22-18

THIS CODE CHANGE WAS HEARD BY THE FIRE CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon both the alignment it provides with the requirements with NFPA 52 and the proponents reason statement. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FG23-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FG24-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FG25-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FG26-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

FG27-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved****Committee Reason:** There was no technical justification provided for banning a listed product. (Vote 10-1)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

FG28-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted****Committee Reason:** The exception assumes that the appliance users will be trained and no children will be around the appliance. A kitchen within a dwelling unit is still domestic use, regardless of the size of the kitchen. An engineer should not be able to disregard the concerns for such installations. Commercial ranges do not have anti-tip devices. The code official can already allow special cases under the Chapter 1 alternate approval provisions. (Vote 10-1)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

FG29-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved****Committee Reason:** Such appliances still exist in the marketplace. (Vote 11-0)**Assembly Motion:****NONE**

2018 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL MECHANICAL CODE

MECHANICAL CODE COMMITTEE

Robert J. Schutz, PE, PS, CBO, Chair

Retired
City of Columbus (OHIO)
Columbus, OH

Brent Ursenbach, CBO, LEED-AP, Vice Chair

Mechanical & Energy Code Official
Salt Lake County, Planning & Dev. Services
Salt Lake City, UT

Edward Allat IV

Fire Subcode Official
Hillsborough Township
Somerville, NJ

David C. Beahm, CBO

Building Official
County of Warren
Front Royal, VA

Donald H. Chaisson, LEED AP

Rep: Air Conditioning Association of New England
Sr. Field Representative
APA HVAC Technologies
Canton, MA

Carl Chretien, LPI

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
CEO, President
Chretien Construction Inc.
Saco, ME

Thomas R. Frost

3rd Party Commissioning
Silverthorne, CO

Eli Howard, III

Executive Director, Technical Services
Sheet Metal & Air Conditioning National Contractors
Association
Chantilly, VA

Amanda Hickman

President/Consultant
The Hickman Group
Plantation, FL

Marshall Kaminer, PE

Executive Engineer of Technical Affairs & Code
Development
New York City Department of Buildings
New York, NY

Jason Phelps

Plans Examiner II
City of Hillsboro
Hillsboro, OR

Janine Snyder

Building Inspector IV
City of Thornton
Thornton, CO

Staff Liaison:

Gregg Gress

Senior Technical Staff
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hill, IL

International Mechanical Code

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

M1-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The text is vague; storage is variable and hard to define. Should address storage area within walls, not open warehouse. Who designates an area as storage? (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: NONE

M2-18

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: NONE

M3-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal is redundant with the IECC. Code officials should not be required to make such calculations. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: NONE

M4-18

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 9-2)

Assembly Motion: NONE

M5-18

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: NONE

M6-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Code officials already know how to apply the IBC. (Vote 6-5)

Assembly Motion: NONE

M7-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The spacing should be as required by the more conservative existing table. It is not clear how the 180 degree F temperature is applied to hanger spacing. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

M8-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: A door through the foundation at grade is not addressed. It is not clear where the ladder is required and how it is to be placed. Needs to be cleaned up in a public comment. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

M9-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Screens on the terminus of the drain will clog from debris and bio-growth. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

M10-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:**

307.1.2 Identification.

~~Where condensate piping is concealed, primary and secondary drain pipes that serve the same appliance and terminate together at a remote location shall be identified. The termination of concealed condensate piping shall be marked to indicate whether the piping is connected to the primary or to the secondary drain.~~

307.2.3.3 Identification.

~~Where condensate piping is concealed, primary and secondary drain pipes that serve the same appliance and terminate together at a remote location shall be identified. The termination of concealed condensate piping shall be marked to indicate whether the piping is connected to the primary or to the secondary drain.~~

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification more broadly addresses all concealed condensate piping. (Vote 8-3)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

M11-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. It is often difficult to find disposal locations in multiple-family dwelling buildings. (Vote 8-3)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

M12-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The standard is a risk management document for installed systems, it contains no design requirements, it is too broad and would be too difficult to enforce. It is not necessary for closed loop hydronic systems. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M13-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: 10% is inappropriate. The proposal would negate some of the advances in building tightness. Balancing reports are not for system design. Removing the story limit makes the code less restrictive. Commercial ventilation requirements are needed for buildings above three stories. (Vote 9-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M14-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M15-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. BOTH PARTS WERE HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE. PLEASE SEE THE HEARING ORDER FOR THE IMC COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal removes the threshold for ventilation based on the IECC. More options for compliance are needed. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M15-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Triggers in the IECC are needed for requiring mechanical ventilation. Should not eliminate natural ventilation where it can work, such as in some net zero homes being built today. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M16-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: These devices need to be listed by a testing agency. (Vote 7-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M17-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 9-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M18-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. This will prevent water damage. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M19-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed thresholds conflict with ASHRAE 62.1. NIOSH and OSHA rules should be followed. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M20-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on proponent's published reason statement. Proposal adds option for ASHRAE 90.1 and connects the IMC to the IECC. (Vote 6-5)

Assembly Motion:

Disapproved

Online Vote Results:

Unsuccessful - Support: 49.1% (56) Oppose: 50.9% (58)

Assembly Action:

None

M21-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Section 502.20 already requires the 12 inch distance limit. Notes h and i appear to allow reduction of exhaust and outdoor air rates. Tying makeup air to commercial kitchens is not correct and balanced systems are already required. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M22-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Deck areas should be deleted from text. This should apply to indoor areas only. System needs to be controlled rather than 24/7 operation. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M23-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This would apply to rooms in single family dwellings, but, the code does not require fans in these

rooms. How long must the fan operate? Operation details are missing. (Vote 7-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M24-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M25-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This update is based on technical justification from the ASHRAE process and makes the table consistent with the exhaust rates in Section 403.3.2.3. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M26-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The text is not clear on what appliances are being addressed. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M27-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It would difficult for code officials to determine compliance with such a complex IAQ procedure. Compliance would have to be demonstrated by engineers. This would create a possible conflict with the action taken on M20-18. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M28-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M29-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 8-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M30-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M31-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M32-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The word "substantially" in the definition is vague. The "largest common area" in exception 2, part 2.1 is not defined. (Vote 6-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M33-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 9-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M34-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M35-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed text is needed to maintain a healthy environment. (Vote 7-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M36-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The additional cost for not using common ducts outweighs any benefit. Builders know how to design common ducts that will not cause a problem. Secondary fans can cause problems if not installed correctly. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M37-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The listing to the UL standard adequately addresses any concerns. The new text is confusing and redundant with Section 304.1. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M38-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The grille has the same potential for blockage as any other screen. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M39-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The relocation of the requirements to Section 504.8.2 makes them applicable only to domestic dryers and no longer applicable to commercial dryers. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M40-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Item # 3 is vague regarding an equivalent test. There is no consensus on the water test procedure. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M41-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the committee recommendation for M40-18. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M42-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is already covered in codes. This subject is not within the scope of the IMC. (Vote 7-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M43-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M45-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: A hood for extra heavy-duty appliances is not necessary for smokers. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M46-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M47-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M48-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: SMACNA standards require fasteners on at least 3 sides, not 2 sides. Tape is for sealing ducts, not fastening. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M49-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No technical justification was provided for allowing two appliances. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M50-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Group I-1 and I-2 occupancies should still have exhaust to outdoors. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M51-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was consistent with the recommendation for M50-18. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M52-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 8-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M53-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE AND PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC M/P COMMITTEE. PLEASE SEE THE HEARING ORDERS FOR THESE COMMITTEES.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M53-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 9-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M54-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M55-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Combining any other types of exhaust systems eliminates the potential for hazardous fumes to be spread. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M56-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The exception to 510.5 intends to allow defined lab occupancies to be designed in accordance with the listed items. A lab could have small amounts of incompatible materials exhausted at various times. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M57-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal is confusing. The exception says that it is not necessary to condition the air coming in, but, the main section requirement is to condition the air to maintain a maximum temperature difference of 10 degrees. (Vote 8-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M58-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 7-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M59-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 8-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M60-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The system should be required to be "approved." No criteria given for "an engineered system." (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M61-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Who makes the engineering analysis determination? Section 105.2 already allows for alternate approval. The code text should be prescriptive. No technical justification was provided for the change. Engineering analysis is vague regarding who and what. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M62-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M63-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal will prevent moisture in plenums. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M64-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 6-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M65-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproved in favor of M67-18. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M66-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproved in favor of M67-18. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M67-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M68-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The standard does not apply to this type of installation. All ducts that convey breathable air should meet the 25/50 flame spread and smoke development indices. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M69-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The standards do not apply to fiberglass ducts. The SMACNA standard is a design guide. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M70-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed standard is a design guide. (Vote 8-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M71-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

602.2.1.8 Pipe and duct insulation within plenums.

Pipe and duct insulation contained within plenums, including insulation adhesives, shall have a flame spread index of not more than 25 and a smoke developed index of not more than 50 when tested in accordance with ASTM E84 or UL 723, using the specimen preparation and mounting procedures of ASTM E2231. Pipe and duct insulation shall not flame, glow, smolder or smoke when tested in accordance with ASTM C411 at the temperature to which they are exposed in service. The test temperature shall not fall below 250°F(121°C). Pipe and duct insulation shall be listed and labeled. Pipe and duct insulation shall not be used to reduce the maximum flame spread and smoke-developed

~~indexes specified in Section 602.2.1.7 except where the pipe or duct and its related insulation, coatings, and adhesives are tested as a composite assembly in accordance with section 602.2.1.7. of the pipe, ducts, tubing, insulation, coatings and adhesives in accordance with ASTM E84 or UL 723.~~

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification references a code section instead of test standards. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M72-18

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IBC FIRE SAFETY CODE COMMITTEE

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal increases ability to inspect and service dampers. Approval is consistent with recommendation for FS66-18. The proposed text is more enforceable because it states dimensions instead of "large enough." (Vote 14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M73-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M74-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 7-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M76-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The reordering of sections did not accomplish the intent stated in the proponent's reason statement. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M77-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code intends to limit the spread of smoke through ducts beyond the room of smoke origin. This proposal could allow many rooms to connect and be subjected to smoke transfer. Small occupancies already allow the proponent's intent because the air handler is below the 2000 cfm threshold. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M78-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE AND PART II WAS HEARD BY

THE IRC M/P COMMITTEE. PLEASE SEE THE HEARING ORDERS FOR THESE COMMITTEES.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Stud wall cavities are currently allowed for interior walls. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M78-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No evidence was provided that these cavities cause a problem. Air leakage in these cavities is within the thermal envelope, thus there is no loss. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M80-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

801.21 Blocked vent switch.

The venting system for oil-fired appliances shall be equipped with a device that will stop burner operation in the event that the venting system is obstructed. Such device shall have a manual reset, and shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification puts the compliance burden on the appliance listing, rather than obligating the vent manufacturer. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M81-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This aligns the IMC with health care regulations to avoid conflicts. (Vote 9-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M82-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the committee recommendation for M84-18. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M83-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M84-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

LARGE-DIAMETER CEILING FAN. A ceiling fan that is greater than 7 feet (2134 mm) in diameter. These fans are sometimes also referred to as High-Volume, Low-Speed (HVLS) fans.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification is simply editorial. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M85-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 9-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M86-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE AND PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC M/P COMMITTEE. PLEASE SEE THE HEARING ORDERS FOR THESE COMMITTEES.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M86-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 9-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M87-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M88-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The ASHRAE 15 committee is still working on this text and should be allowed to complete its work before changing the code. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M89-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

CHEMICAL REFRIGERANT FORMULA CHEMICAL NAME OF BLEND REFRIGERANT CLASSIFICATION AMOUNT OF REFRIGERANT PER OCCUPIED SPACE [F] DEGREES OF HAZARD^a

Pounds per 1,000 cubic feet ppm/m³ OEL^e

R-463A

zeotrope

R-744/32/125/1234yf/134a (6.0/36.0/30.0/14.0/14.0)

A1

19

98,000

300

990

=

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification adds an update to the update proposal from ASHRAE 34. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M90-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The existing text is useful to get more caps in place for safety. Contractors use the code and comply with this requirement on their own. (VOTE 7-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M91-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the committee recommendation for M93-18. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M92-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the committee recommendation for M95-18. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M93-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M94-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the committee recommendation for M93-18. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M95-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

EQUIPMENT

STANDARDS

Refrigeration fittings, including press-connect, flared, and threaded

UL 109 and UL 207

Air conditioning equipment

UL 1995 or UL/CSA 60335-2-40

Packaged terminal air conditioners and heat pumps

UL 484 or UL/CSA 60335-2-40

Split-system air conditioners and heat pumps

UL 1995 or UL/CSA 60335-2-40

Dehumidifiers

UL 474 or UL/CSA 60335-2-40

Unit coolers

UL 412 or UL/CSA 60335-2-89

Commercial refrigerators, freezers, beverage coolers, and walk-in coolers

UL 471 or UL/CSA 60335-2-89

Refrigerating units and walk-in coolers

UL 427 or UL 60335-2-89

Refrigerant-containing components and accessories

UL 207

Committee Reason: This cleans up the table and adds current standards. The modification adds heat pumps. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M96-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal is not ready because the ASHRAE standard is still under development. Piecemeal fixes are premature. A public comment is encouraged after the ASHRAE work is complete. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M97-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There may be equipment listed for use with A2L refrigerants, but that doesn't mean that the equipment is safe. This proposal might lose some safety requirements. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M98-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There needs to be more industry consensus. We should not jump ahead without being certain. Service personnel are afraid of the risks. ASHRAE needs to complete its work. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M99-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This provides direction to the code officials to inspect for proper installations. Workers often braze without nitrogen purge, for example, and there is nothing to cite in current code. The code needs teeth to address bad practices. This adds safety provisions that are not in current code. The testing requirements are a worthy addition to the code. (Vote 6-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M100-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is unnecessary. The code already requires brazed joints. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M101-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M102-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M103-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M104-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M105-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee prefers other proposals that address all piping materials as opposing to a single material. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M106-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

Copper and copper alloys
B16.24;ASME B16.51; ASSE 1061; ASTM F1974

ASME B16.15;ASME B16.18; ASME B16.22;ASME B16.26; ASME

CPVC

ASSE 1061; ASTM D2846; ASTM F438; ASTM F439

Ductile iron and gray iron
A536; ASTM F1476; ASTM F1548

ANSI/AWWA C110/A21.10; AWWA C153/A21.53; ASTM A395;ASTM

Ductile iron

ANSI/AWWA C153/A21.53

Gray iron

ASTM A126

Malleable iron

ASME B16.3

PE-RT fittings
ASTM F2735; ASTM F2769;CSA B137.1; CSA B137.18

ASSE 1061;ASTM D3261;ASTM F1807; ASTM F2098; ASTM F2159;

PEX fittings
F2080; ASTM F2159

ASSE 1061;ASTM F877; ASTM F1807; ASTM F1960; ASTM

Plastic
F877; ASTM F2389; ASTM F2735

ASTM D2466; ASTM D2467; ~~ASTM F438~~; ~~ASTM F439~~; ASTM

Steel
ASTM A106;ASTM A234; ASTM A395;ASTM A420; ASTM A536; ASTM F1476; ASTM F1548

ASME B16.5; ASME B16.9;ASME B16.11; ASME B16.28;ASTM A53;

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification relocated standards specific to CPVC that were in the nonspecific "plastic" row. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M107-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 7-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M108-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is consistent with the committee recommendation for M107-18. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M109-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M110-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

M111-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee prefers M119-18, Part 1. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: NONE

M112-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed new standard is not yet published. (Vote 10-1)

Assembly Motion: NONE

M113-18

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: NONE

M114-18

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: NONE

M115-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The first sentence already requires compliance with the IECC, so this proposal is redundant. There needs to be temperature limit of 110 degrees. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: NONE

M116-18

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: NONE

M117-18

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: NONE

M118-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M119-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE AND PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC M/P COMMITTEE. PLEASE SEE THE HEARING ORDERS FOR THESE COMMITTEES.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The pressure should not be reduced to less than 100 psi. (Vote 7-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M119-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on proponent's published reason statement. The revision aligns with the material standard. Boilers have 30 to 50 PSI relief valves to prevent higher pressures. (Vote 9-1)

Assembly Motion: **Disapproved**

Online Vote Results: Successful - Support: 55.8% (63) Oppose: 44.2% (50)

Assembly Action: **Disapproved**

M120-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

1302.9 ~~Corrugated stainless steel tubing containment~~ Piping systems.

~~Corrugated stainless steel tubing that is factory installed within a non-metallic containment~~ Aboveground pipe systems shall be listed and labeled in accordance with UL 1369. Underground pipe systems shall be listed and labeled in accordance with ~~or~~ UL 971A.

Copper or copper-alloy pipe	ASTM B42; ASTM B43; ASTM B302
Copper or copper-alloy tubing (Type K, L or M)	ASTM B75; ASTM B88; ASTM B280; ASME B16.51
Labeled pipe	(See Section 1302.4)
Nonmetallic pipe	ASTM D2996
Steel pipe	ASTM A53; ASTM A106
Steel tubing	ASTM A254; ASTM A539
Stainless steel tubing	ASTM A240; UL1369; UL971A

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification corrects the problems that were inconsistent with the code currently. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M121-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

1302.8 Flexible connectors and hoses.

Flexible connectors and hoses shall be listed and labeled as being acceptable for the intended application for flammable and combustible liquids in accordance with UL 536.

UL

~~536-97:~~

~~Flexible Metallic Hose with revisions through December 2014~~

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification deletes an irrelevant standard in Section 1302.8. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M122-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the committee recommendation for M121-18. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M123-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the committee recommendation for M121-18. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M124-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the committee recommendation for M121-18. (Vote 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M127-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

1402.8.1.2 Rooftop-mounted solar thermal collectors and systems.

The roof shall be constructed to support the loads imposed by roof-mounted solar collectors. Where mounted on or above the roof covering, the collector array, stanchions-mounting systems and their attachments to the roof shall be constructed of noncombustible materials or fire-retardant-treated wood conforming to the International Building Code to the extent required for the type of roof construction of the building to which the collectors are accessory.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification replaced the not well understood term, "stanchions." (Vote 8-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

M128-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 8-3)

2018 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL PLUMBING CODE

PLUMBING CODE COMMITTEE

Charles E. Gerber, Chair
Plumbing Plans Reviewer
County of Henrico
Henrico, VA

James C. Finley, PE, Vice Chair
Rep: Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors
Association
President
C.N. Finley, Inc.
Destrehan, LA

Joseph Ackroyd, PE
Executive Director
New York City Department of Buildings
New York, NY

Michael Cudahy
Regulations and Sustainability Specialist
Plastic Pipe and Fittings Association
Glen Ellyn, IL

Scott J. Friesen, PE
Principal Consultant
Ivey Engineering, Inc.
San Diego, CA

McKenzie W. James
Chief Plumbing Inspector
City of Portland, Oregon
Portland, OR

Walt Krzyanowski
President/Executive Director
Plumbing & Heating Contractors Union
Affiliated Contractors, Local #690
Feasterville, PA

Joseph T. Madziar
Retired
State of Michigan
Lansing, MI

James Meyer
Vice President of Engineering
Norweco, Inc.
Norwalk, OH

James Pappas, CBO
Senior Plans Examiner
City of Scottsdale
Scottsdale, AZ

John A. Robitaille, CBO
Rep: Remington, Vernick and Beach Engineers
Construction Code Official
Wilmington, DE

James A. Richardson, Jr.
Plumbing Inspection Supervisor
City of Columbus-Building and Zoning Services
Columbus, OH

Matt Sigler
Technical Director
Plumbing Manufacturers International
Orlando, FL

John William Tye III, SMI
Construction Services Building Official,
State Mechanical Inspector
State of Connecticut Office of the State Building
Inspector
Hartford, CT

Gary Wickham
Senior Technical Manager, Codes and
Standards
AB&I Foundry
Oakland, CA

Staff Secretariat:
Fred Grable, PE
Senior Staff Engineer - Plumbing
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hills, IL

International Plumbing Code

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

P1-18 Part I

THIS IS A 6 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PARTS I and VI WERE HEARD BY THE IPC-IPSDC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE. PART III WAS HEARD BY THE IMC COMMITTEE. PART IV WAS HEARD BY THE IFGC COMMITTEE. PART V WAS HEARD BY THE ISPSC COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

COPPER ALLOY. A metal alloy where the principle component ~~homogeneous mixture of not less than two metals where not less than 50% of the finished metal~~ is copper.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: A less prescriptive copper requirement allows for a wider range of materials.

For the Proposal: The term is used in various locations of the code and needs to be defined. (Vote:12-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P1-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No definitions for materials are in the code now, so this is unneeded text. (Vote: 7-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P1-18 Part III

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is the only material definition for Chapter two and the code doesn't need definitions for every material addressed in the code. (Vote:11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P1-18 Part IV

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Aligns with the ISPSC. Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote: 11-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P1-18 Part V

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: A copper alloy complying with this definition can be used in many locations. (Vote: 12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P1-18 Part VI

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: A copper content as low as 50 percent is not an appropriate value for all applications covered by this code. (Vote:11-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P2-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The revised wording makes a clearer distinction between Public and Private fixture uses. (Vote:11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P3-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. Generally, the code can't control portable appliances that are not connected to plumbing system. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P4-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The Committee addressed the topic with its action on P3-18. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P5-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

308.2 Piping seismic supports. Where earthquake loads are applicable in accordance with the International Building Code, plumbing piping supports, anchorage, and bracing shall be designed and installed for seismic forces in accordance with Chapter 16 of the International Building Code.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: The clarification is necessary to indicate that the IBC is the building code indicating where earthquake loads are applicable.

For the Proposal: The change makes the code (the IBC) a little easier to navigate for finding the applicable seismic forces. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P6-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The determination of lower service temperatures could be very subjective. The field inspector

would have to investigate the system design documents and the piping manufacturer's instructions in order to inspect the a project. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P7-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This requirement would have an adverse effect on the field inspection process. The system designer is responsible for chemical compatibilities of materials. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P7-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recognizes that there have been problems with material incompatibilities however, a public comment should be submitted to make this proposal more specific to the field problems that have occurred. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P8-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Given that there was no evidence provided to show that there is a problem, this is an unnecessary increase in the cost of construction for many applications. The designer is responsible for identifying where and what applications require protection of piping materials and how that protection is to be provided. (Vote:12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P8-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agrees that piping deterioration could be possible under some circumstances and conditions but this language applies to everywhere. If piping deterioration was widespread then there would be problems with all vent terminals on roofs and rough-in plumbing stub ups for slab-on-grade buildings. There is not evidence of that occurring. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P9-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

308.9 Parallel water distribution systems. Piping bundles for manifold systems shall be supported in accordance with Table 308.5. Support at changes in direction shall be in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. Where hot

water piping is bundled with cold or hot water piping, hot water piping shall be insulated in accordance with Section 607.5.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: The clarification is needed to avoid the complications of individually insulating hot water tubing from the manifold of a "home run" distribution system.

For the Proposal: The addition of the section reference provides a needed clarification as to how the piping is to be insulated. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P10-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The change of "room" to "facility" could conflict with the language used in the IBC. (Vote:8-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P11-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is a conflict between at least one manufacturer's installation instructions (Charlotte) that states a pressure of -8.5 inches of mercury whereas the proposal states -10 inches of mercury (a greater vacuum). (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P11-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:8-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P12-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. It is extremely important that test gauges are accurate. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P13-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Coverage for hostels needs to begin by the IBC identifying the group classification that they fall under. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P14-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P15-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

6. Separate facilities shall not be required where rooms having both water closets and lavatory fixtures are designed for use by both sexes and privacy for water closets are installed in accordance with Section 405.3.4. Urinals shall be located in an area visually separated from the remainder of the facility or each urinal that is provided shall be located in a stall.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: For multi-user, both sex toilet facilities, urinals need to have similar visual separation.

For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:11-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P16-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:11-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P17-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The Committee preferred P16-18 for handling the topic. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P18-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The Committee preferred the language of P14-18 for this topic. (Vote:13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P19-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:8-6)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P20-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. BOTH PARTS OF THIS PROPOSAL WERE HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This language could lead to a lack of employee facilities where lease or control of buildings changes. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P20-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistency with Committee's action on P20-18 Part I. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P21-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P22-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. BOTH PARTS OF THIS PROPOSAL WERE HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Users will no longer be alarmed by "handle jiggling" by those on the outside checking to see if the door is locked. (Vote:8-6)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P22-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would result in a risk to life in healthcare facilities and is an unnecessary increase in the cost of construction. (Vote:8-6)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P23-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Transporting water for 300 feet in a mop bucket is going to create a slip hazard. The proposal needs expanded to include the requirement that the tenants have access to the service sink. (Vote:12-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P24-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

404.1 Where required. Accessible plumbing facilities and fixtures shall be provided in accordance with Chapter 11 of the International Building Code and ICC A117.1.

404.2 Accessible fixture requirements. Accessible plumbing fixtures shall be installed in accordance with ICC

A117.1.

404.3 Exposed pipes and surfaces. Water supply and drain pipes under accessible lavatories and sinks shall be covered or otherwise configured to protect against contact. Pipe coverings shall comply with ASME A112.18.9.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: Reference standard ASME A112.18.9 needs to be retained for the pipe coverings. The reference to standard A117.1 needs to be retained to point to the information needed for installation. For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P25-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P26-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The cost increase will be significant. This is an accessibility topic that needs to be covered by the A117.1 standard process. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P27-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language is not clear as to what is trying to be accomplished. (Vote:13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P28-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal addresses a specific medical condition which doesn't seem to be a plumbing code topic. Creating individual water closet compartments as described by this language will have a significant cost impact as additional sprinkler, ventilation ducting/supply outlets and lighting would be needed for each water closet compartment. The real cost increase is not justified by the need. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P29-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:7-6)

Assembly Motion: **Disapproved**

Online Vote Results: Successful - Support: 60.7% (68) Oppose: 39.3% (44)

Assembly Action: **Disapproved**

P30-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This standard should be referenced in the code because off-the-floor (wall-mounted) fixtures need supports complying with the standard. (Vote:13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P31-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The bathtub fixture standards do not require overflow outlets. The IRC does not require tub overflow outlets so change is necessary to coordinate the two codes. (Vote:11-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P32-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed standard is applicable to bidets that could be installed in buildings. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P33-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P33-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The code needs to keep up with what is happening in the standards. (Vote:9-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P35-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed standard is not yet complete. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P36-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P37-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Notes in tables are too difficult to see and should remain in code text for visibility. The restaurant exemption needs to stay in a text location where it can be easily seen and found. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

P38-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. BOTH PARTS OF THIS PROPOSAL WERE HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:**Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

P38-18 Part II**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

P39-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

P40-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This language could discourage the installation of emergency showers/eyewash stations or cause them to be located farther away. It is more important to reduce injuries to humans that have experienced a splash accident than it is to be concerned with the water on the floor at the emergency fixture location. In some applications, radioactive materials may be involved and those substances must not be allowed to enter the drain system. Leaving a decision to the code official as to whether the runoff will have chemicals or contaminants that could spread is not appropriate. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

P41-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There could be more harm than good for the code to indicate a water temperature, even if it is only an upper limit. Not indicating a temperature will hopefully cause the designer to seek out the information from the appropriate individuals. (Vote:12-2)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

P42-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: These water heating units are already being successfully used in the indicated application. The standard is necessary to control the manufacturing of these units. (Vote:8-6)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P44-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P44-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:9-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P45-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Devices complying with ASSE 1017 and ASSE 1062 do not have the capability to protect against thermal shock. (Vote:11-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P45-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: ASSE 1082 is not yet completed. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P46-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Showerhead and shower valve flow rates are already being coordinated when new shower valves are installed. (Vote:9-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P46-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: In residential settings, for a variety of reasons, the builder-supplied original showerheads are often replaced by the building occupants soon after initial occupancy of the building. Knowing this fact, the proposed requirement doesn't effectively provide for any real added level of safety after these types of buildings are occupied. (Vote:5-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P47-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This standard reference needs removed as the current version of CSA B125.3 no longer addresses water temperature compensating valves. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P47-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:9-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P48-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: These devices are already being successfully used. Including a standard in the code will make these devices safer. (Vote:8-7, Chair voted)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P48-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: ASSE 1082 is not yet completed. ASSE 1084 was submitted only in draft form. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P49-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The Committee acted on P51-18 so this proposal is no longer needed. (Vote:10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P50-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It is known that ASSE 1017 valves have a problem with temperature creep. The ASSE 1082 standard does not address the potential for temperature creep. (Vote:10-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P50-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: ASSE 1082 is not yet completed. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P51-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

412.10 Head shampoo sink faucets. Head shampoo sink faucets shall be supplied with hot water that is limited to not more than 120°F (49°C) . Each faucet shall have integral check valves to prevent crossover flow between the hot and cold water supply connections. The means for regulating the maximum temperature shall be one of the following:

1. A limiting device conforming to ASSE 1070/ASME A112.1070/CSA B125.70.

~~2. A thermostatic mixing valve conforming to ASSE 1017.~~

~~3. 2.~~ A water heater conforming to ASSE 1082.

~~4. A water heater conforming to ASSE 1084.~~

~~5. 3.~~ A temperature actuated flow reduction device conforming to ASSE 1062.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: ASSE 1084 is not yet completed and ASSE 1017 is not appropriate for the application.

For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P52-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The industry already makes pre-rinse spray valves to this standard. The standard needs to be in the code. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P53-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This requirement might not apply in some applications. The slope could result in an excessive amount of fall in the floor surface. The topic of this proposal (sloping floors towards floor drains) would be better suited to be proposed and evaluated for inclusion into the IBC. (Vote:13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P54-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P55-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: These fixtures do not need to have a drain point at every user station. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P56-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The application of an ASSE 1017 valve in this situation is incorrect. An ASSE 1070 valve cannot be set for 125°F: the standard requires that it can only be set as high as 120°F. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P57-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P58-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No lower temperature limit for tempered water begs the question of "how low of temperature is acceptable?" Incoming cold water could be nearly freezing at times. Does heating that temperature of water by only a few degrees provide an acceptable water temperature for any tempered water application? (Vote:12-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P58-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Raising this temperature will help in the reduction of potential locations for Legionella growth in piping systems. (Vote:8-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P60-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The Committee prefers the language of P61-18. The ASSE 1017 valve is incorrect for the application. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P61-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: ASSE 1082 is not a temperature limiting device. The ASSE 1084 standard is not yet completed. (Vote:10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P62-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P63-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: A standard is needed for these fittings. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P63-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P64-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The slope could be in excess of what ADA limitations are for shower floors. There are other methods that can be used to achieve the same result. Requiring this one method is too restrictive. (Vote:12-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P65-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There appears to be too many concerns of testifiers about the differences between ASSE 1017 and ASSE 1082 "devices". ASSE 1017 valves are not acceptable for point- of-use applications. The ASSE 1084 standard is not yet completed. (Vote:12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P66-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Modified****Committee Modification:**

423.3 Footbaths and pedicure baths. The water supplied to specialty plumbing fixtures, such as pedicure chairs having an integral foot bathtub and footbaths, shall be limited to not greater than 120°F (49°C) by a water-temperature-limiting device that conforms to ASSE 1070/ASME A112.1070/CSA B125.70 or CSA B125.3 or from a water heater complying with ASSE 1082 ~~or ASSE 1084~~.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: The ASSE 1084 standard is not yet completed.
For the Proposal: Devices that comply with the requirements of ASSE 1082 are being successfully used. The Committee approved a previous proposal for these devices to be used for head shampoo sinks. (Vote:10-4)

Assembly Motion:**NONE****Assembly Modification:**

P67-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

P68-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This definition is needed in the code for clarity. (Vote:13-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

P69-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: It is appropriate for the IPC to refer to the IMC for combination water heating/space heating units. (Vote:12-2)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

P70-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:7-6)

Assembly Motion:**Disapproved****Online Vote Results:**

Successful - Support: 75.5% (77) Oppose: 24.5% (25)

Assembly Action:**Disapproved**

P71-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P71-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Aligning terminology between the code and a standard is usually better for clarity. (Vote:9-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P72-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is language that is already in Section 607.1.1. There is no need to duplicate the requirement. (Vote:13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P73-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The requirements for seismic mounts are already in the IBC. (Vote:12-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P74-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This requirement would promote unpermitted replacements of water heaters. The requirements would be unenforceable. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P75-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The Committee is not aware of commercially available pans made for various tankless water heaters. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P76-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Scouring and cleaning are much different processes. Which process is required? Epoxy or epoxy resin, which is required? There is a typo:"interior service" should be "interior surface." (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P77-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Pumps are part of a potable water system and should comply with the same standard. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P77-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P78-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There would be difficulty in trying to apply this requirement to every building except residential dwellings. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P79-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There doesn't appear to be a legitimate reason for this proposal. The section language already indicates that the table is for design purposes. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P79-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is a needed clarification because these pressures and flows cannot be "inspected". This table is only intended to be used for calculation and pipe sizing purposes. (Vote:8-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P80-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistency with previous action on P78-18. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P81-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There doesn't seem to be enough water to carry waste in drainage systems. The code is a minimum standard. The 0.5 gpm is in several "above code"/green standards. This shouldn't be in a minimum code. Until federal law on maximum flow rates changes, this lower flow rate should not be in the code. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P82-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is a CalGreen requirement that should not be a minimum for everywhere else. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P82-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This requirement would limit the design possibilities for buildings and shower system manufacturers. (Vote:9-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P83-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P84-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P85-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: A justification for this proposal based on one example of failure is not sufficient grounds to eliminate a type of piping for the code. (Vote:12-2)

Assembly Motion: **Approved as Submitted**

Online Vote Results: Unsuccessful - Support: 28.2% (29) Oppose: 71.8% (74)

Assembly Action: **None**

P86-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P87-18 Part II

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS WITHDRAWN. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:9-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P88-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This requirement will provide more safety for soldered piping providing drinking water. Numerous manufacturers already have their products certified to this. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P88-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P89-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

605.13.7 Push-fit fitting joints. Push-fit fittings ~~joints~~ shall conform to ASSE 1061 and shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: Deleting the term "joints" clarifies that the standard applies only to the fittings.

For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P89-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

P2906.21 Push-fit fitting joints. Push-fit fittings ~~joints~~ shall be used only on copper-tube-size outside diameter dimensioned CPVC, PEX and copper tubing. Push-fit ~~joints~~ fittings shall conform to ASSE 1061 and shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: Clarifies that the standard is only for the fitting and not the joint. For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P90-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: These new requirements should be proposed to Chapter 3. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P91-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P92-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This technology already exists and is being used. However, it should only be an option and not required. (Vote:12-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P93-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P94-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The Committee is not against the concept however, the language in the exception is not clear and could conflict with Section 419.5. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **Approved as Submitted**

Online Vote Results: Unsuccessful - Support: 14.2% (15) Oppose: 85.8% (91)

Assembly Action: **None**

P95-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no general understanding about what is or is not tempered water. Sixty degrees F is too cold for washing hands. Also, this is a reason why hot water is required for certain applications such as culinary and cleaning. Allowing tempered water for such applications could lead to issues down the road. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **Approved as Modified**

Online Vote Results: Unsuccessful - Support: 34.3% (36) Oppose: 65.7% (69)

Assembly Action: **None**

Assembly Modification:

607.1 Where required. In residential and nonresidential occupancies, hot water or tempered water shall be supplied to plumbing fixtures and equipment utilized for bathing, washing, culinary purposes, cleansing, laundry or building maintenance.

Exception: Water having a temperature between 60°F (16°C) and 120°F (49°C) shall be supplied for hand washing to public toilet facilities.

P96-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

607.1.1 Temperature limiting means. A thermostat control for a water heater shall only serve as the temperature limiting means for the purposes of complying with the requirements of this code for maximum allowable hot or tempered water delivery temperature at fixtures where the water heater complies with ASSE 1082, ASSE-1084, or ASSE 1085.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: The ASSE 1084 standard is not yet completed.
For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-4)

Assembly Motion: **Disapproved**

Online Vote Results: Successful - Support: 58.3% (60) Oppose: 41.7% (43)

Assembly Action: **Disapproved**

P97-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P97-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P98-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P98-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Backflow preventers can discharge a significant flow of water. The receptor for capturing the water needs to be sized appropriately to avoid the potential for flooding inside of a building. (Vote:9-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P99-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is already taken care of by the definition of water service pipe. (Vote:13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P100-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Water services need to be sized appropriately. (Vote:9-5)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P101-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

609.2.1 Tracer. ~~A yellow~~ An insulated copper tracer wire listed ~~or a product designed for that the~~ purpose or other approved conductor shall be installed adjacent to underground nonmetallic piping serving as a water service for a hospital. Access shall be provided to the tracer wire or the tracer wire shall terminate above ground at each end of the nonmetallic piping. The tracer wire size shall be not less than 18 AWG and the wire insulation type shall be suitable for direct burial.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: A listed product should have better long term performance better than a product that is not listed for the application.

For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P102-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would disallow showering filters. The proposal should indicate that Section 611.1 is only for drinking water. (Vote:13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P103-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P103-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:9-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P104-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is too broad of approach. It is not enforceable. (Vote:12-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P105-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

705.2.4 Push-fit joints. ~~Push-fit joints~~ DWV fittings shall be listed and labeled ~~shall conform~~ to ASME A112.4.4 and shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: Clarifies that the standard is for the fittings and not the joint.
For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P106-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The Committee preferred the language on P105-18. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P106-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

P3003.3.4 Push-fit fitting joints. ~~Push-fit DWV fittings joints~~ shall conform be listed and labeled to ASME A112.4.4 and shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: Clarification is needed to to indicated that the standard is for DWV fittings and not the joint. Also, the fittings need to be listed and labeled for quality purposes.
For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P107-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Much too restrictive requirement that will add significant cost to construction. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P108-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

705.10.4 Push-fit joints. Push-fit ~~joints~~ DWV fittings shall be listed and labeled ~~shall conform~~ to ASME A112.4.4 and shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: Clarifies that the standard is for the fittings and not the joint.
For the Proposal: Consistency with action on P105-18. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P109-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The Committee already addressed this topic in P108-18. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P109-18 Part II

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

P3003.9.4 Push-fit joints. Push-fit ~~DWV fittings joints~~ shall conform be listed and labeled to ASME A112.4.4 and shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: Consistency with modifications made on P106-18 Part II.
For the Proposal: Consistency with action on P106-18 Part II. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P110-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The terminology "...as close to ...as possible" is too vague to be enforceable. (Vote:12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P111-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: New Sections 706.3.2 through 706.3.4 do not add clarification to the code. (Vote:13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P112-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Double pattern fittings have been commonly and successfully used everywhere for many years. (Vote:12-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P113-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P113-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P114-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Section 707.1 prohibits the use of saddle tees in drainage systems. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P115-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P115-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. Also, there has been successful projects using this method. (Vote:9-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P116-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

717.1 Building sewer and sewer service lateral rehabilitation. ~~Any Cured-in-place~~ rehabilitation of building sewer piping and sewer service lateral piping shall be in accordance with ASTM F2599. ~~Any Cured-in-place~~ rehabilitation of building sewer and sewer service lateral pipe and its connection to the main sewer pipe shall be in accordance with F2561. All ~~cured-in-place~~ rehabilitation of building sewer piping and sewer service laterals shall include the use of hydrophilic rings or gaskets meeting ASTM F3240 to assure water tightness and elimination of ground water penetration.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: Clarification is necessary to indicate that the process is only for cured-in-place rehabilitation.

For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P117-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:8-6)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P118-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Watching the video at the link provided in the reason statement was enough evidence to show that a food waste disposer connected to a combination waste and vent system will not create problems. (Vote:11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P119-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: It appears that that there would be too great of possibility that failure of the device would go unknown. This is a specialty device that is more appropriate for an engineered design of a system. (Vote:11-2)

Assembly Motion:

Approved as Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Unsuccessful - Support: 25.6% (31) Oppose: 74.4% (90)

Assembly Action:

None

P120-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

1002.1 Fixture traps. Each plumbing fixture shall be separately trapped by a liquid-seal trap, except as otherwise permitted by this code. The vertical distance from the fixture outlet to the trap weir shall not exceed 24 inches (610 mm), and the horizontal distance shall not exceed 30 inches (610 mm) measured from the centerline of the fixture outlet to the centerline of the inlet of the trap. The height of a clothes washer standpipe above a trap shall conform to Section 802.3.3. A fixture shall not be double trapped.

Exceptions:

1. This section shall not apply to fixtures with integral traps.

2. A combination plumbing fixture is permitted to be installed on one trap, provided that one compartment is not more than 6 inches (152 mm) deeper than the other compartment and the waste outlets are not more than 30 inches (762 mm) apart.

3. Floor drains in multilevel parking structures that discharge to a building storm sewer shall not be required to be individually trapped. Where floor drains in multilevel parking structures are required to discharge to a combined building sewer system, the floor drains shall not be required to be individually trapped provided that they are connected to a main trap in accordance with Section 1103.1.

4. Where a hydromechanical grease interceptor serves a food utensil, dishes, pots and pans sink, in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions. The branch drain serving the interceptor shall be provided with an emergency floor drain down stream of the interceptor connection, and the branch shall serve only the emergency floor drain and the interceptor. Where the interceptor serves combination sink of not more than three compartments where the vertical distance from the fixture outlet to the inlet of the interceptor does not exceed 30 inches (762 mm) and the developed length of the waste pipe from the most upstream fixture outlet to the inlet of the interceptor does not exceed 60 inches (1524 mm). The food utensil, dishes, pots and pans sink shall be required to connect directly with the interceptor.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: An emergency floor drain would relieve the pressure on the fixture drain to prevent backup into sink should the drain system back up.

For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P121-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Trap sizes vary and the minimal volume might not be enough for larger traps in some locations. (Vote:12-1)

Assembly Motion:

Approved as Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Unsuccessful - Support: 31.8% (34) Oppose: 68.2% (73)

Assembly Action:

None

P122-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P123-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This could create too much opportunity for too many solids to carry over to the interceptor. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P124-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Sizing is already covered by the code and by local departments. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P125-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal needs more coordination with the roofing contractor groups to develop a public comment that refines this proposal. (Vote:9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P126-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This will answer some questions about roof drains and storm drain system piping requirements in the code. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P127-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The section is necessary for its reference to Section 1106. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P129-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The equation will assist design professionals and code enforcement in making sure that the storm drain piping is properly sized. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P130-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: A testifier indicated that the proponent's calculations used the same diameters for both types of pipe materials which resulted in an incorrect conclusion. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

P131-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistency with action on P131 Part II. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion:

Approved as Submitted

Online Vote Results:

Unsuccessful - Support: 33.6% (37) Oppose: 66.4% (73)

Assembly Action:

None

Staff Analysis:

P131-18 Part II, an identical proposal to this proposal, was heard by the IRC-PM Committee. The reason for disapproval was "An alternative compliance path to use this standard instead of the code is available through Section R104.11 (alternative methods.)"

P131-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Alternative compliance paths are already provided for under Section R104.11 (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P132-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistency with action on P131 Part I. Also, Chapter 13 is for nonpotable water systems and this standard is involves potable water. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion: **Approved as Submitted**

Online Vote Results: Unsuccessful - Support: 31.5% (34) Oppose: 68.5% (74)

Assembly Action: **None**

P132-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Alternative compliance paths are already provided for under Section R104.11 (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P133-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IRC-PLUMBING COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

P133-18 Part II

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

International Private Sewage and Disposal Code

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

PSD1-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Evaluation of site and system by an arbitrary person seems too open. Removal of "engineered" is inappropriate as these systems require engineering input. (Vote:13-1)

Assembly Motion: NONE

PSD2-18

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:14-0)

Assembly Motion: NONE

PSD3-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: It is too specific to require a registered professional engineer from the specific state of province to design the tank. (Vote:11-3)

Assembly Motion: NONE

PSD4-18

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:11-3)

Assembly Motion: NONE

PSD5-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: It is recognized that there is need for these types of systems however, the requirements for these systems need additional vetting before they are approved for addition to the code. Also, some of the "policy" language needs to be removed from the proposed language. (Vote:11-3)

Assembly Motion: NONE

PSD6-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Much of the proposal concerns operation and maintenance of systems and as such, this needs to be in the Property Maintenance Code. (Vote:11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

**2018 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE
INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE / ZONING
CODE**

PROPERTY MAINTENANCE / ZONING CODE COMMITTEE

Richard G. Lambert, CBO, Chair
Director of Code Enforcement
City of Saco
Saco, ME

Teresa E. Gerber, CPMO, Vice Chair
Building Inspector III, Property Maintenance Div.
Chesterfield County, Department of Building
Inspections
Chesterfield, VA

Ted Bush, Jr., CBO
Plans Examiner
The City of Helena Montana
Helena, MT

John Christophe
Manager
City of Austin Code Department
Austin, TX

Jimmie Deer
Building Official
City of Fort Smith
Fort Smith, AR

Kyley Flynn
Building Inspector
SAFEbuilt
Firestone, CO

Glenn Holt
Building Official
Marple Township
Broomall, PA

Lucas Pump
Building Inspector/Code Enforcement
City of Cedar Rapids
Cedar Rapids, IA

Emily A. Ryan
President
Mt. Hermon Planning & Permitting Corp.
Chicago, IL

Fred T. Stokley, Jr., BI
Building Inspector Supervisor/Residential Plan
Reviewer
Lexington Fayette Urban County Government
Lexington, KY

Staff Secretariat:
Edward Wirtschoreck, RA
Manager, Standards
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
County Club Hills, IL

International Property Maintenance Code

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

PM1-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that a specific definition in the code for "hazard" was not warranted. The common definition is sufficient. (Vote: 9-0)

Assembly Motion: NONE

PM2-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The commonly understood definition of "safe" is sufficient and a specific definition in the IPMC is not warranted. (Vote 9-0)

Assembly Motion: NONE

PM3-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed language does not require maintenance until a property is developed. This limits the ability of the code official to require maintenance on undeveloped lots. (Vote: 8-1)

Assembly Motion: NONE

PM4-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this item because they felt that there should be a time limitation for allowing one vehicle in disrepair on a lot. Without this limitation the code official has no authority to require the vehicle to be removed. (Vote: 6-3)

Assembly Motion: NONE

PM5-18

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recommends disapproval because they felt that the current provisions for unsafe conditions gave needed guidance and direction to code officials to determine and cite unsafe conditions. (Vote: 7-2)

Assembly Motion: NONE

PM6-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: A laundry list of what is considered an interior surface is not needed as it is widely understood. Further, the term "staining" is too broad and could result in varied interpretations. (Vote: 9-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

PM7-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the current text adequately describes the requirement and the proposed text is not needed. (Vote: 9-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

PM8-18 Part I

THIS IS A 2 PART CODE CHANGE. PART I WAS HEARD BY THE IPMC COMMITTEE. PART II WAS HEARD BY THE IFC CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal has merit but needs more work. It should be revised to apply to all storm shelters, not just those required by the IBC. Further it should be expanded to address systems within storm shelters. Lastly, the term "any damage" in Section 310.3 is too broad and could lead to inconsistent interpretation. (Vote: 7-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

PM8-18 Part II

THIS PROPOSAL WAS HEARD BY THE IFC CODE COMMITTEE.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated objection to adding the standard to the code and that the requirements should not be retroactive. (Vote: 8-4)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

PM9-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that a 70 square foot living room for up to 2 occupants was too small when compared to the efficiency unit requirements that require a minimum of 120 square feet for a maximum of one occupant. (Vote: 6-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

PM10-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

602.2 Resident ial 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 a means to provide required heating.

~~Additionally,~~The installation of one or more portable space heaters shall not be used to achieve compliance with this section.

(no change to the exception)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal brings the IPMC 602.2 verbiage in line with the current IRC R303.9 verbiage so that these I-Codes consistently address the installation of portable space heaters. The modification removes an unnecessary word. (Vote: 9-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

PM11-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal for the following reasons: The requirements conflict with other I-codes that would allow this installation under specific conditions; flammable is the wrong term, should consider combustible; interior of the building is too broad and could bring into question what to do with an attic or crawl space; manufacturers installation instructions adequately address the protection requirements for these products. (Vote: 9-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

**2018 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE
INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL CODE – PLUMBING/
MECHANICAL**

PLUMBING/MECHANICAL CODE COMMITTEE

W. Travis Lindsey, MCP, Chair

Sr. Plans Examiner
City of Scottsdale
Scottsdale, AZ

Marguerite Carroll, Vice Chair

Codes and Regulatory Services Manager
Underwriters Laboratories
Fremont, CA

John Ainslie

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Owner
Ainslie Group
Virginia Beach, VA

Richard C. Anderson

Division Manager/Deputy Building Official
City of Austin
Austin, TX

Jud Collins, CBO, RS

Owner
JULYCO
Mannford, OK

Pennie Feehan

Rep: Copper Development Association
Owner
Pennie L. Feehan Consulting
Palm Springs, CA

R. L. Ric Johnson, CAPS, DHTI+

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
President/CEO
Right at Home Technologies
Ada, OH

Nick McAndrew, PE

Professional Engineer I (Civil/Construction)
NY Department of State Division of Buildings
Standards and Codes
Albany, NY

Thomas Polino

Plumbing Subcode Official
West Windsor Township
West Windsor, NJ

Loren K. Swanson, BSIE

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Retired from Southern Michigan Co.
Jackson, MI

Jeremy Wright

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
President
J. Wright Building Company
J. Wright Home Design
Birmingham, AL

Staff Secretariat:

Fred Grable, PE

Senior Staff Engineer - Plumbing
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hills, IL

Gregg Gress

Senior Technical Staff
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
4051 W. Flossmoor Rd
Country Club Hills, IL

International Residential Code - Building

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

RB1-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The code is a minimum standard and should allow mechanical and natural ventilation. The added cost does not equate to the benefit. Kitchen pollution is not that apparent. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RB2-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The 5 ACH threshold needs to remain. If the building meets Chapter 11 requirements, it might still be greater than 5 ACH. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RB3-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

R303.1 Habitable rooms.

Habitable rooms shall have an aggregate glazing area of not less than 8 percent of the floor area of such rooms. Natural ventilation shall be through windows, skylights, doors, louvers or other approved openings to the outdoor air. Such openings shall be provided with ready access or shall otherwise be readily controllable by the building occupants. The openable area to the outdoors shall be not less than 4 percent of the floor area being ventilated.

Exceptions:

1. For habitable rooms other than kitchens, the glazed areas need not be openable where the opening is not required by Section R310 and a whole-house mechanical ventilation system or a mechanical ventilation system capable of producing 0.35 air changes per hour in the habitable rooms is installed in accordance with Section M1505.
2. For kitchens, the glazed areas need not be openable where the opening is not required by Section R310 and a local exhaust system is installed in accordance with Section M1505. ~~Where the openable glazing area is less than 4 percent of the kitchen floor area, ductless kitchen exhaust shall not be permitted.~~
3. The glazed areas need not be installed in rooms where Exception 1 is satisfied and artificial light is provided that is capable of producing an average illumination of 6 footcandles (65 lux) over the area of the room at a height of 30 inches (762 mm) above the floor level.
4. Use of sunroom and patio covers, as defined in Section R202, shall be permitted for natural ventilation if in excess of 40 percent of the exterior sunroom walls are open, or are enclosed only by insect screening.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification will still allow ductless hoods. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RB4-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:9-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RB5-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 6-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

International Residential Code - Mechanical

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

RM1-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM2-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The access requirements present security issues and safety issues for children. The access requirements add cost, are impractical and are visually unappealing. Commercial requirements belong in the IMC, not in the IRC. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM3-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The support of appliances is already covered in the code. (Vote 6-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM4-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Sealing is already required in the code. There is confusion about whether the wall is a simple envelope wall or a fire-resistance-rated wall. Multiple modification attempts indicate the need for revision in a public comment. (Vote 9-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM5-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The text is proposed in wrong location. Belongs in an appendix or the building part of code, not in mechanical part. This puts pressure on the contractor after the home is built. The owner may not be in the picture. There might not be a design professional involved. Items 7 and 10 conflict. There is a need to address ongoing testing requirements. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM6-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Section R109.3 already requires access. The text is missing requirements for rung spacing, etc. It is not clear how to attach the ladder to the soil floor. Who is to design the ladder? (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM7-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The requirement would add cost and complexity to installations and would prohibit homeowners from performing their own work. The standard is aimed at contractors, is not enforceable and is a best practice guide. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM8-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is in the wrong location. Should be in Section M1411. (Vote 9-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM9-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is consistent with the IMC requirements. The appliances need to be protected regardless of their location in residential or commercial. (Vote 8-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM10-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: R-3 insulation is readily available and used. This change is consistent with Chapter 11 provisions for insulation. (Vote 9-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM11-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

M1411.8 Support of Refrigerant piping.

Refrigerant piping & tubing shall be securely fastened to a permanent support within 6 feet of the compressor condensing unit, ~~and within 3 feet of each subsequent bend or angle.~~

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification deletes the support within 3 feet of bends which was extreme. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM12-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The text in item 3 is hard to interpret. This proposal discriminates against single family dwellings. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM13-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 8-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM14-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Any grille of any type is a fire hazard because they will all collect lint. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM15-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Installations need to be consistent with SMACNA requirements. (Vote 7-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM16-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the committee recommendation for RM15-18. (Vote 6-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM17-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no listing or product approval for the fitting. (Vote 8-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM18-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The requirement for demonstration by calculations is too broad and there is no guidance on how to make the calculations. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM19-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal goes beyond minimum code. This is redundant with other sections in the code.
(Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM20-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal introduces an extra step and cost in the process. It is unclear how the "licensed design professional" is regulated. These appliances are acceptable now and the code does not address much larger unvented cooking appliances. The new text implies that appliances don't have to be listed and could be "approved" by some single party. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM21-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The deleted total square foot area of house should remain in the code. Changing "provide" to "capable of providing" means that ventilation air does not need to be provided. (Vote 9-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM22-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The words "substantially the same" in the definition are subjective. The number of modifications offered indicate the need to revise this proposal in a public comment. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM23-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM24-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is good for the code. The 10% average in the definition is better than RM22-18. This text is understandable and gives guidance for balancing reports. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM25-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: ASHRAE 62.2 could supersede all of Chapter 15 and the builder could use 62.2 under the alternate approval provision in Chapter one. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RM27-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: These fittings are already allowed under the Chapter 1 alternate approval provisions. Some performance data is needed upon which to base an alternate approval. There is no test standard for such fittings. (Vote 8-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RM28-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal removes some material choices and allows black steel which should not be allowed. Table M1601.1.1 addresses only galvanized steel and aluminum. Duct thickness should be tied to the type of metal and not just to the two metals in the table. (Vote 8-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RM29-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal is consistent with the IMC and addresses only the whole house ventilation fans, not other fans. (Vote 8-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RM30-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal refers to fans instead of just equipment. Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 9-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RM31-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: ACCA Manual D already refers to Manual Zr. The standard is not yet published. The committee did not review the final version of the draft standard. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RM32-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. This makes code easier to read. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RM33-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 8-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RM34-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

M1802.4 Blocked vent switch.

~~The venting system for oil~~ Oil-fired appliances shall be equipped with a device that will stop burner operation in the event that the venting system is obstructed. Such device shall have a manual reset, and shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification clarifies that this requirement relates to the appliance, not the vent system. (Vote 9-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RM35-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

M2101.14 Preparation of pipe ends.

Pipe shall be cut square, reamed, and shall be free of burrs and obstructions. ~~CPVC, PE, and PVC pipe shall be chamfered.~~ Pipe ends shall have full-bore openings and shall ~~not be undercut.~~ be prepared in accordance with the pipe manufacturer's instructions.

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. The modification makes the text apply to all materials without naming specific materials. Reaming and undercutting is for metal pipe. (Vote 9-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RM36-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RM37-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Including C448 would exclude some materials. PVC and CPVC are left out. Need to retain the reference to manufacturer's instructions. Proposal should be revised in a public comment. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RM38-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This adds another acceptable standard for these materials. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM39-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed standard is not yet published. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM40-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM41-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM42-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM43-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM44-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The text needs to refer to a standard that is applicable to fuel oil applications. (Vote 10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RM45-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's published reason statement. (Vote 10-0)

International Residential Code - Plumbing

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

RP1-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was no real data presented that would indicate that a 5 foot test is just as good as 10 foot test. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RP2-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: It has been too confusing to have this one type of test only requiring 5 feet of head. There needs to be consistency between the IRC and the IPC. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RP3-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Although this is a legitimate concern, to require these in every home is overkill. Stanchions might interfere with shower doors, clearances at water closets and other fixtures. Although this proposal is focused for areas in and around bathing fixtures, this topic is more aligned to be placed in building part of the code (Chapter 3). Perhaps the first step towards a future possible requirement for these bars is to require blocking to be installed for proper attachment of the indicated bar arrangements. Requirements for bar mounting blocking in manufactured plumbing fixtures (such as fiberglass shower and bathtub enclosures) needs to be addressed in the product standards for those products such as CSA B45.5/IAPMO Z124. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RP4-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RP5-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. Also, this supports design applications where sun/heat causes inappropriate sprinkler activation. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

RP6-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

P2904.2.3 Freezing areas. Piping shall be protected from freezing as required by Section P2603.5 or by using one of the following:

1. ~~A~~ dry pipe automatic sprinkler system that is listed for residential occupancy applications.

2. ~~Where sprinklers are required in areas that are subject to freezing, d~~ Dry-side-wall or dry-pendent sprinklers extending from a nonfreezing area into a freezing area ~~shall be installed.~~

Committee Reason: For the Modification: Breaking this into a list is helpful to show that there are two alternate methods.

For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RP7-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RP8-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

P2904.4.1.3 Other Ceiling Configurations. For ceiling configurations not addressed by Sections P2904.4.1.1 or P2904.4.1.2, the flow rate shall be subject to approval by the ~~fire~~ code official.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: Smaller jurisdictions might not have a fire code official.

For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RP9-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RP10-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

P2905.3 Hot water supply to fixtures. The developed length of hot water piping, from the source of hot water to the fixtures that require hot water, shall not exceed 50 100 feet (~~15-240 mm~~). Water heaters and recirculating system piping shall be considered to be sources of hot ~~or tempered~~ water.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: 100 feet is a more feasible threshold than 50 feet.

For the Proposal: Sustainability goals are important. The code needs to provide clear direction that the fixtures cannot be too far away from the hot water source. (Vote:6-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RP11-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RP12-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RP13-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This doesn't belong in the plumbing chapters because it is not plumbing. These requirements would increase the cost of construction. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RP14-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This appears to be a proprietary product. It is unknown what impact this could have on the venting system. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RP15-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

RP16-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Even though this would be an "above code" appendix, there is concern that if a jurisdiction adopts, there could be drainage (sewer) problems with lesser flows being discharged. Discussions about lowering flow rates in the body of the code raised similar concerns. (Vote:6-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

2018 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL SWIMMING POOL AND SPA CODE

SWIMMING POOL AND SPA CODE COMMITTEE

Edward Kulik, Chair

Chief Building Official
Building Division
Mohave County Development Services
Kingman, AZ

Donald Leas, Vice Chair

Rep: Association of Pool & Spa Professionals
Consultant
United States Of America Diving
Mayport, PA

Steve Barnes, CPO

Rep: Association of Pool & Spa Professionals
Director of Science and Compliance
AquaStar Pool Products, Inc.
Ventura, CA

Larry W. Brock

Building Inspector III
Chesterfield County
Chesterfield, VA

Joseph R. Crum, CBO

Rep: Orange County, FL
Commercial Plans Examiner
Orange County Building Safety
Orlando, FL

Dale Engebretson, MCP

Chief Code Official
City of Warrenville
Warrenville, IL

Kenneth Gregory

Compliance and Safety Manager
Pentair Water Quality Systems
Washington, UT

Lee Hovis

Director of Operations and Recreation
Tolomato Community Development District
Ponte Vedra, FL

Eugene “Gene” Novak, Jr., CBO

Rep: Metro West Building Officials of MA
District State Building Inspector
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Dept. of Public Safety
Framingham, MA

Michael Olson

City of McGregor
Kempner, TX

Michael Ribnikar

Rep: Association Pool and Spa Professionals
VP Operations, Premier Pools & Spas
Premier Pools & Spas/Dallas Office
Plano, TX

Shajee Siddiqui

Rep: Association of Pool & Spa Professionals
Director, Global Product Safety & Compliance
Zodiac Pool Systems, Inc.
Vista, CA

Shawn Still

Rep: Association of Pool and Spa Professionals
(APSP)
President & CEO
Olympic Pool Plastering
Norcross, GA

Staff Secretariat:

Fred Grable, PE

Senior Staff Engineer - Plumbing
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hills, IL

International Swimming Pool and Spa Code

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

SP1-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The definition needs to clarify that a swimout has to be outside the diving envelope. The Committee agrees with the need for the proposal as it is not possible for a swimout to be outside the perimeter of a pool. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP2-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would add more confusion to what the Committees approved for SP1-18. "Deep water" is not defined. There would be a cost impact to add stairs to a swimout. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP3-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The term "bench" is more commonly used in the industry. (Vote:11-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP4-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would create an additional safety hazard because the remote operator can't see what is happening when the cover is being closed. (Vote: 11-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP5-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Safety fencing is needed for every excavation. Most contractors should be doing this anyhow. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP6-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement.(Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP7-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP8-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP10-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP12-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP13-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is a good standard for this type of equipment. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP14-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP15-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP16-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP17-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP18-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

317.1 General. This section applies to devices and systems that induce or allow air to enter Class A and residential pools, and spas either by means of a powered pump or passive design.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: Applying the requirements of Section 317.1 to all types of pools is too broad. There are features used in the water park pools that utilize air. The modification narrows the scope appropriately.

For the Proposal: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP19-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP20-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP21-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with testimony that stated that children are more likely to get their head stuck in a 4 to 6 inch space between the ladder and the wall. (Vote: 12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP22-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. This is aligned with the Model Aquatic Health Code. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP23-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP24-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Ladder accidents can be better prevented by proper instruction rather than adding cost to construction . (Vote: 12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP25-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This will add unnecessary cost without enough substantiation. Better adult supervision is a more reasonable solution. (Vote: 11-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP26-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP27-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This a necessary change to ensure pool circulation for improving the sanitation of the water. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP28-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: These requirements could end up eliminating some pool designs. It is difficult to determine what activity a pool might be used for at any given time. Does this mean that ropes have to be changed around when the activity changes? The number of ropes and their locations needs to be by pool classification, not by activity. (Vote 12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP29-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote: 9-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP30-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Studies for stair dimensions don't take into account the buoyancy of a swimmer. Smaller pools could have different dimensions that will work. Maybe there could be a compromise between what the code has and what the IBC has. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP31-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This doesn't take into account the depth of the pool. There are too many pool areas where this would be far to restrictive to design. (Vote: 12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP32-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote: 12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP33-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is overly restrictive for all types of pools that have only one or two steps. Defining which types of pools this is required might be a better approach. (Vote: 11-1)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP34-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote: 12-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

SP35-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This doesn't seem to be a simple proposal. Assuming that coloration of the leading edge of steps is accomplished by tile, there is not a requirement for the leading edge tile of the steps to be slip resistant. It is questionable as to whether handrails for all swimouts will increase safety. (Vote: 11-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP36-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee did not approve SP31-16 that would have deleted these same entries in the list at Section 411.3. Deleting these same items in this section would create an inconsistency with Section 411.3. The language is vague and too open ended to be enforceable. Where renovating existing pools, modifying the steps to comply with these new requirements will cause unintended consequences. (Vote: 11-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP37-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Tanning shelves are intended for adults only and not to serve as a children's wading pool. (Vote:11-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP38-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The reason statement didn't indicate that there was a hazard that needed to be addressed by the proposal. The change in dimension is an unnecessary restriction to design. (Vote: 12-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP39-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

504.2 Timer. The operation of the hydrotherapy jets shall be limited by a cycle timer having a maximum setting of 10 ~~15~~ minutes. The cycle timer shall be located not less than 5 feet away, adjacent to, and within sight of the spa.

Committee Reason: For the Modification: Lessening the time better accommodates use by children who would be more susceptible to long term exposure to heat.

For the Proposal: Making this a code requirement increases the level of safety that is needed for spas. (Vote: 10-1)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP40-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

~~4. Use of the spa when alone is prohibited (if no lifeguards on site).~~

Committee Reason: For the Modification:

Not allowing only one person to use a spa is too restrictive given that the spa timer is limited to 10 minutes operation per cycle. See previous action on SP39-18 for AM which modified timer operation from 15 minutes to 10 minutes.

For the Proposal:

The added warnings are standard practice in the industry and are necessary to advise persons who might be of a greater health risk when using spas. (Vote:9-3)

Assembly Motion: **Disapproved**

Online Vote Results: Successful - Support: 59.8% (64) Oppose: 40.2% (43)

Assembly Action: **Disapproved**

SP41-18

Committee Action: **Withdrawn**

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP42-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The designer is the person who should make the determination for these types of pools. (Vote: 12-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP43-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would be a large cost impact for facilities of 4000 to 7500 square feet. No justification was provided for this level of cost increase. (Vote: 12-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP44-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP45-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistency with previous action on SP30-18. Smaller steps could create more of a safety issue for these types of pools. (Vote: 12-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP46-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is too restrictive for pools with only one or two steps. A 7 foot wide set of steps would require two handrails. (Vote: 12-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

SP47-18**Committee Action:****Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Handrails in these types of moving water pools would create more safety issues. There is concern for the entrapment that could occur at the handrail. (Vote: 12-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

SP48-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. (Vote:10-2)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

SP49-18**Committee Action:****Approved as Submitted****Committee Modification:**

The Committee agreed with the published reason statement. There are problems coming up in jurisdictions having to deal with bad designs of these systems. (Vote:12-0)

Assembly Motion:**NONE**

2018 GROUP A – PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE INTERNATIONAL FIRE CODE

FIRE CODE COMMITTEE

Dan Weed, CBO, Chair

Rep: City of Victor, CO
Building Official
Colorado Code Consulting, LLC
Denver, CO

Michael E. Whalen, Vice Chair

Construction Official
New Jersey Department of Community Affairs
Codes and Standards
Trenton, NJ

Michael W. Evans

Rep: International Association of Fire Chiefs
Deputy Fire Chief
Brighton Area Fire Authority
Brighton, MI

Sam Francis

National Programs Director
American Wood Council
West Grove, PA

Barry Grieve, CBO

Bldg. Regulatory & Strategy Lead
Target Corporation
Minneapolis, MN

Howard Hopper, FPE

Regulatory Services Program Manager
UL LLC
Fremont, CA

Randall Metz

Rep: Southern California Fire Prevention
Officers Association-ICC Chapter
Fire Marshal
Carlsbad Fire Department
Carlsbad, CA

Derek Murgatroyd, PE

Rep: National Association of State Fire
Marshals
Fire Protection Engineer
Office of the Maryland State Fire Marshal/
Southern Regional Office
Prince Frederick, MD

David R. Owens, CBO, C. I.

Rep: National Association of Home Builders
Managing Member
Owens Inspection Services, LLC
Palmer, AK

Sarah A. Rice, CBO

Project Manager/Partner
The Preview Group Inc.
Cincinnati, OH

Greg Rogers, FMD

Rep: International Association of Fire Chiefs
Fire Marshal
Division Chief/Fire Marshal
Spokane Valley Fire Department
Spokane Valley, WA

Stephen Rondinelli, AIA

Rondinelli Life Safety
Lakewood, CO

Heather Roth, PE

Rep: National Association of State Fire
Marshals
Fire Protection Engineer 2
NYS Office of Fire Prevention and Control
Rochester, NY

Marc Sampson

Assistant Fire Marshal
Longmont Fire Department
Longmont, CO

Scott Stookey

Engineer A-Hazardous Materials
Austin Fire Department
Austin, TX

Staff Secretariats:

Beth Tubbs, PE, FSFPE

Senior Staff Engineer
Codes and Standards Development
ICC - Boston Field Office
Boston, MA

Keith Enstrom, PE
Staff Engineer
International Code Council
Central Regional Office
Country Club Hills, IL

International Wildland-Urban Interface Code

2018 Group A - REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ACTION HEARING RESULTS

WUIC1-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

~~ROOF ASSEMBLY. A system designed to provide weather protection and resistance to design loads. The system consists of a roof covering and roof deck or a single component serving as both the roof covering and the roof deck. A roof assembly includes the roof deck, underlayment and roof covering, and can also include a thermal barrier, ignition barrier, insulation or a vapor retarder.~~

A system designed to provide weather protection and resistance to design loads. The system consists of a roof covering and roof deck or a single component serving as both the roof covering and the roof deck. A roof assembly can include an underlayment, thermal barrier, ignition barrier, insulation or a vapor retarder.

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on preference for the IBC version of the definition for ROOF ASSEMBLY. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

WUIC2-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 14-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

WUIC3-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the proposed revisions to the testing requirements do not match the original intent of the section. The change from testing on all sides to just the front and back faces is an unacceptable reduction in requirements and does not represent actual use and exposure of different types of materials and the cutting of these products during installation. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

WUIC4-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the deletion of the exception did not address the difference between materials and an assembly and did not agree with the resulting requirement that all products have to be tested ripped or gaped. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

WUIC5-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee did not agree with the change from testing on all sides to just the front and back faces. It was stated that the section description needs to address the requirements for the material ends and sides. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

WUIC6-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the deletion of the existing five methods in the section would create regional problems based on the different types of materials currently being used and it removes effective materials that have a proven record. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

WUIC7-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 12-2)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

WUIC9-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the new proposed standard only addresses fires under decks and does not address embers blowing down from above. (Vote: 7-6)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

WUIC10-18

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the new sections would unacceptably weaken the requirements for deck surfaces adjacent and abutting wall surfaces and did not agree with the Class B flame spread rating. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion: **NONE**

WUIC11-18

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Modification:

505.2 Roof covering. Roofs shall have a roof assembly that complies with not less than a Class A rating when tested in accordance with ASTM E108 or UL 790, or an approved noncombustible roof covering. For roof coverings where the profile allows a space between the roof covering and roof decking, the space at the eave ends shall be firestopped to preclude entry of flames or embers, or have one layer of ~~72-pound (32.4 kg) mineral surfaced, nonperforated~~ cap sheet complying with ASTM D3909 installed over the combustible decking.

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the improvement of the language to match the current reference standard. Approval of the proposal is based upon recent fires, notably in remote areas and the demonstrated need for a higher rating. (Vote: 9-5)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

WUIC12-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the deletion of the existing five methods in the section would unacceptably weaken the current requirements and it removes effective materials that have a proven record. (Vote: 13-0)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

WUIC13-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's published reason and the action on WUIC7-18. (Vote: 10-4)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

WUIC14-18

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee stated that the new proposed standard is not the correct test method for this section. (Vote: 11-2)

Assembly Motion:

NONE

WUIC16-18

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Modification:

506.2 Roof covering. Roofs shall have a roof assembly that complies with not less than a Class B rating when tested in accordance with ASTM E108 or UL 790 or an approved noncombustible roof covering. For roof coverings where the profile allows a space between the roof covering and roof decking, the space at the eave ends shall be firestopped to preclude entry of flames or embers, or have one layer of ~~72-pound (32.4 kg) mineral surfaced, nonperforated~~ cap sheet complying with ASTM D3909 installed over the combustible decking.

Committee Reason: Approval of the modification is based on the improvement of the language to match the current reference standard. Approval of the proposal is based upon the proponent's published reason. (Vote: 11-3)

Assembly Motion:

NONE
