This Power Point includes the following:

- Feedback received that was presented at the Members Forum at the 2016 Annual Conference.
- Member Forum comments.
- Additional feedback received.
- Next Steps

Comments can be sent to:

ICCCodeProcessFeedback@iccSAFE.org
The following are comments received that were presented at the Members Forum at the 2016 Annual Conference
2018/2019 Cycle
• Feedback No. 1: Revise Code Groups
  – A: IBC, IEBC, IFC
  – B: All others
• Feedback No. 2: Revise Code Groups
  – A: IBC (not IBC-S), IFC, IPC, IMC, IFGC, ISPC
  – B: All others
• Eliminate assembly motions
• Implement strict cost impact justifications including staff rejection if adequate information not provided.
2018/2019 Cycle

• Reference Standards updates should be considered by the applicable Code Committee and not the Administrative Code Committee.

• cdpACCESS
  – Make all code changes “public” for viewing during development – code text only (not reason statement or cost impact)
  – Code changes/public comments should be posted 60 days prior to hearings
2021/2022 Cycle – REVISED PROCESS NO. 1

3 year process

- **Year 1: Two Committee Action Hearings (CAH)**
  - Submit Group A code changes
  - First CAH to consider code changes
  - Submit public comments in response to first CAH results
  - Second CAH to consider public comments

- **Year 2: Repeat for Group B codes**

- **Year 3: Group A & B Public Comment Hearing and OGCV**
  - Submit public comments for Groups A & B
  - Public Comment Hearing for Groups A & B
  - OGCV for Groups A & B
2021/2022 Cycle – REVISED PROCESS NO. 2

2 year process: Committee meeting format; not a hearing format

• Year 1: Group A codes
  – Submit Group A code changes
  – Hold multiple 3 day Committee Action Meetings (CAM)
  – Submit public comments in response to CAM results
  – Hold multiple 2.5 day Committee Public Comment Meetings
    • Committee acts on public comments
    • Committee action sets theagenda for the OGCV
  – OGCV for Group A

• Year 2: Repeat for Group B codes
The following are comments made at the Members Forum at the 2016 Annual Conference
• The hearing videos from both the CAH and PCH should be free, not an ICC subscription service.
• ICC should conduct regional cdpACCESS “how to” forums to educate the Members on the use of cdpACCESS.
The following is additional feedback received to date relative to the 2018/2019 Cycle
Additional Feedback  – 2018/2019 Cycle

• cdpACCESS
  – Continue to enhance/de-bug the cdpACCESS system. Particularly numbered lists and tables.
  – Add an export function to create a spreadsheet to track proposals.
  – Provide print feature for voting members to record their votes.
  – Provide the ability to cut and paste from Word docs into cdpACCESS.
• cdpACCESS (cont’d)
  – Revise on-line voting process:
    • Assembly motion: Ability to block vote to support all committee recommendations
    • OGCV: Ability to block vote to support all the Public Comment Hearing actions
    • Ability to vote on select code changes and block vote the remaining as noted above
Additional Feedback – 2018/2019 Cycle

• Need more restrictions on Code Development Committee balance. Limit single stakeholder participation. Ensure broad interests represented.
• Create process to expedite hearings with groupings of proposals.
• Hearings are too long, need to streamline the process.
• Process needs to be more responsive to building performance issues, with experts making the final decisions.
Discontinue the OGCV: The OGCV is well intentioned to increase participation, however:

- The PCH participants lose the ability to collaborate and make good decisions on the final outcome as the PCH is not the last step in the process.
- Two voting opportunities may result in unintended consequences of conflicting code text.
- The OGCV may increase additional lobbying opportunities.
- The OGCV process may result in uninformed members voting if they do not view the PCH videos.
- May result in reduction in PCH attendance.
The following is additional feedback received to date relative to the 2021/2022 Cycle
Additional Feedback – 2021/2022 Cycle

• Re-institute Group C and place the IECC and IRC – Energy in Group C
• Expand cycle from 3 years to 5 – 7 years
Code Development Committees (Developed in conjunction with 2021/2022 Revised Process No. 2 (see slide 6)

- 6 year appointments; staggered
- Minimum 50% Regulators
- An action of “further study” is permitted at the Committee Action Meeting. These code changes would be sent to the applicable Code Action Committee.
Additional Feedback – 2021/2022 Cycle

Code Action Committees (Developed in conjunction with 2021/2022 Revised Process No. 2 (see slide 6))

- 6 year appointments; staggered
- Minimum 50% Regulators
- Establish Goals & Objectives
- Review further study items from the Code Development Committees.
2021/2022 Cycle – REVISED PROCESS NO. 3

• Year 1: Two Group A Committee Action Hearings (CAH)
  – First: Consider code changes, tabling allowed
  – Second: Consider tabled items

• Year 2:
  – Group A Public Comment Hearings (PCH)
  – Group A OGCV
  – First Group B CAH

• Year 3:
  – Second Group B CAH
  – Group B PCH
  – Group B OGCV
- November 30th: Feedback received will be included in Preliminary Report.
- Feedback received will be posted for comments. Timeframe TBD.
- Develop Final Report.
- May/2017: Board meets to review Final Report.
QUESTIONS?

Contact Mike Pfeiffer at:
mpfeiffer@iccsafe.org