

**INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL  
2009/2010 CODE DEVELOPMENT CYCLE**

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

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

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

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



First Printing

Publication Date: December 2009

Copyright © 2009

By

International Code Council, Inc.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. This 2009/2010 Code Development Cycle Report of the Public Hearing on the 2009 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

|  | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| Introduction .....   | iv          |
| Public Comment Office Location .....                         | iv          |
| ICC Website .....  | v           |
| Referenced Standards Update .....                            | v           |
| Modifications by Public Comment .....                        | v           |
| Final Action Consideration .....                             | v           |
| Call for Adoption Information.....                           | v           |
| ICC Code Development Procedures (Council Policy CP #28)..... | vi          |
| Report of Public Hearing Table of Contents.....              | xix         |

# INTRODUCTION

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

This report includes the recommendation of the code development committee and the committee's reason on each proposed item. It also includes actions taken by the assembly in accordance with Section 5.7 of the *ICC Council Policy CP#28-05 Code Development (CP #28)*. Where the committee or assembly action was Approved as Modified, the proposed change, or a portion thereof, is included herein with the modification indicated in strikeout/underline format. Where this report indicates Withdrawn by Proponent the proposed change was withdrawn by the proponent and is not subject to any further consideration.

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

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

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

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

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

### **Send to:**

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

## **Acronym      ICC Code Name (Code change number prefix)**

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

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

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

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

### **ICC WEBSITE - [WWW.ICCSAFE.ORG](http://www.iccsafe.org)**

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

### **REFERENCED STANDARDS UPDATES**

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

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

### **MODIFICATIONS BY PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

### **FINAL ACTION CONSIDERATION**

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

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

### **CALL FOR ADOPTION INFORMATION**

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

# CP# 28-05 CODE DEVELOPMENT

Approved: 9/24/05

Revised: 2/27/09

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

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Purpose:** The purpose of this Council Policy is to prescribe the Rules of Procedure utilized in the continued development and maintenance of the International Codes (Codes).
- 1.2 Objectives:** The ICC Code Development Process has the following objectives:
- 1.2.1** The timely evaluation and recognition of technological developments pertaining to construction regulations.
  - 1.2.2** The open discussion of proposals by all parties desiring to participate.
  - 1.2.3** The final determination of Code text by officials representing code enforcement and regulatory agencies and by honorary members.
- 1.3 Code Publication:** The ICC Board of Directors (ICC Board) shall determine the title and the general purpose and scope of each Code published by the ICC.
- 1.3.1 Code Correlation:** The provisions of all Codes shall be consistent with one another so that conflicts between the Codes do not occur. Where a given subject matter or code text could appear in more than one Code, the ICC Board shall determine which Code shall be the primary document, and therefore which code development committee shall be responsible for review and maintenance of the code text. Duplication of content or text between Codes shall be limited to the minimum extent necessary for practical usability of the Codes, as determined in accordance with Section 4.4.
- 1.4 Process Maintenance:** The review and maintenance of the Code Development Process and these Rules of Procedure shall be by the ICC Board. The manner in which ICC codes are developed embodies core principles of the organization. One of those principles is that the final content of ICC codes is determined by a majority vote of the governmental and honorary members. It is the policy of the Board that there shall be no change to this principle without the affirmation of two-thirds of the governmental and honorary members responding.
- 1.5 Secretariat:** The Chief Executive Officer shall assign a Secretariat for each of the Codes. All correspondence relating to code change proposals and public comments shall be addressed to the Secretariat.
- 1.6 Video Taping:** Individuals requesting permission to video tape any meeting, or portion thereof, shall be required to provide the ICC with a release of responsibility disclaimer and shall acknowledge that they have insurance coverage for liability and misuse of video tape materials. Equipment and the process used to video tape shall, in the judgment of the ICC Secretariat, be conducted in a manner that is not disruptive to the meeting. The ICC shall not be responsible for equipment, personnel or any other provision necessary to accomplish the videotaping. An unedited copy of the video tape shall be forwarded to ICC within 30 days of the meeting.

## 2.0 Code Development Cycle

- 2.1 Intent:** The code development cycle shall consist of the complete consideration of code change proposals in accordance with the procedures herein specified, commencing with

the deadline for submission of code change proposals (see Section 3.5) and ending with publication of final action on the code change proposals (see Section 7.6).

- 2.2 New Editions:** The ICC Board shall determine the schedule for publishing new editions of the Codes. Each new edition shall incorporate the results of the code development activity since the last edition.
- 2.3 Supplements:** The results of code development activity between editions may be published.
- 2.4 Emergency Procedures:** In the event that the ICC Board determines that an emergency amendment to any Code is warranted, the same may be adopted by the ICC Board. Such action shall require an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the ICC Board.

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

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

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

### **3.0 Submittal of Code Change Proposals**

- 3.1 Intent:** Any interested person, persons or group may submit a code change proposal which will be duly considered when in conformance to these Rules of Procedure.
- 3.2 Withdrawal of Proposal:** A code change proposal may be withdrawn by the proponent (WP) at any time prior to Final Action Consideration of that proposal. A withdrawn code change proposal shall not be subject to a public hearing, motions, or Final Action Consideration.
- 3.3 Form and Content of Code Change Submittals:** Each code change proposal shall be submitted separately and shall be complete in itself. Each submittal shall contain the following information:
  - 3.3.1 Proponent:** Each code change proposal shall include the name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address of the proponent.
    - 3.3.1.1** If a group, organization or committee submits a code change proposal, an individual with prime responsibility shall be indicated.
    - 3.3.1.2** If a proponent submits a code change on behalf of a client, group, organization or committee, the name and mailing address of the client, group, organization or committee shall be indicated.
  - 3.3.2 Code Reference:** Each code change proposal shall relate to the applicable code sections(s) in the latest edition of the Code.
    - 3.3.2.1** If more than one section in the Code is affected by a code change proposal, appropriate proposals shall be included for all such affected sections.
    - 3.3.2.2** If more than one Code is affected by a code change proposal, appropriate proposals shall be included for all such affected Codes and appropriate cross referencing shall be included in the supporting information.

- 3.3.3 Multiple code change proposals to a code section.** A proponent shall not submit multiple code change proposals to the same code section. When a proponent submits multiple code change proposals to the same section, the proposals shall be considered as incomplete proposals and processed in accordance with Section 4.3. This restriction shall not apply to code change proposals that attempt to address differing subject matter within a code section.
- 3.3.4 Text Presentation:** The text proposal shall be presented in the specific wording desired with deletions shown struck out with a single line and additions shown underlined with a single line.
- 3.3.4.1** A charging statement shall indicate the referenced code section(s) and whether the proposal is intended to be an addition, a deletion or a revision to existing Code text.
- 3.3.4.2** Whenever practical, the existing wording of the text shall be preserved with only such deletions and additions as necessary to accomplish the desired change.
- 3.3.4.3** Each proposal shall be in proper code format and terminology.
- 3.3.4.4** Each proposal shall be complete and specific in the text to eliminate unnecessary confusion or misinterpretation.
- 3.3.4.5** The proposed text shall be in mandatory terms.
- 3.3.5 Supporting Information:** Each code change proposal shall include sufficient supporting information to indicate how the proposal is intended to affect the intent and application of the Code.
- 3.3.5.1 Purpose:** The proponent shall clearly state the purpose of the proposed code change (e.g. clarify the Code; revise outdated material; substitute new or revised material for current provisions of the Code; add new requirements to the Code; delete current requirements, etc.)
- 3.3.5.2 Reasons:** The proponent shall justify changing the current Code provisions, stating why the proposal is superior to the current provisions of the Code. Proposals which add or delete requirements shall be supported by a logical explanation which clearly shows why the current Code provisions are inadequate or overly restrictive, specifies the shortcomings of the current Code provisions and explains how such proposals will improve the Code.
- 3.3.5.3 Substantiation:** The proponent shall substantiate the proposed code change based on technical information and substantiation. Substantiation provided which is reviewed in accordance with Section 4.2 and determined as not germane to the technical issues addressed in the proposed code change shall be identified as such. The proponent shall be notified that the proposal is considered an incomplete proposal in accordance with Section 4.3 and the proposal shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected. The proponent shall have the right to appeal this action in accordance with the policy of the ICC Board. The burden of providing substantiating material lies with the proponent of the code change proposal.
- 3.3.5.4 Bibliography:** The proponent shall submit a bibliography of any substantiating material submitted with the code change proposal. The bibliography shall be published with the code change and the proponent shall make the substantiating materials available for review at the appropriate ICC office and during the public hearing.
- 3.3.5.5 Copyright Release:** The proponent of code change proposals, floor modifications and public comments shall sign a copyright release reading: "I hereby grant and assign to ICC all rights in copyright I may have in any authorship contributions I make to ICC in connection with any proposal and public comment, in its original form submitted or revised form, including written and verbal modifications submitted in accordance Section 5.5.2. I understand that I will have no rights in any ICC publications that use such contributions in the form submitted by me or another similar form



and certify that such contributions are not protected by the copyright of any other person or entity.”

**3.3.5.6 Cost Impact:** The proponent shall indicate one of the following regarding the cost impact of the code change proposal: 1) the code change proposal will increase the cost of construction; or 2) the code change proposal will not increase the cost of construction. This information will be included in the published code change proposal.

- 3.4 Number:** One copy of each code change proposal, two copies of each proposed new referenced standard and one copy of all substantiating information shall be submitted. Additional copies may be requested when determined necessary by the Secretariat to allow such information to be distributed to the code development committee. Where such additional copies are requested, it shall be the responsibility of the proponent to send such copies to the respective code development committee. A copy of the code change proposal in electronic form is preferred.
- 3.5 Submittal Deadline:** Each code change proposal shall be received at the office of the Secretariat by the posted deadline. Such posting shall occur no later than 120 days prior to the code change deadline. The submitter of a proposed code change is responsible for the proper and timely receipt of all pertinent materials by the Secretariat.
- 3.6 Referenced Standards:** In order for a standard to be considered for reference or to continue to be referenced by the Codes, a standard shall meet the following criteria:
- 3.6.1 Code References:**
- 3.6.1.1** The standard, including title and date, and the manner in which it is to be utilized shall be specifically referenced in the Code text.
  - 3.6.1.2** The need for the standard to be referenced shall be established.
- 3.6.2 Standard Content:**
- 3.6.2.1** A standard or portions of a standard intended to be enforced shall be written in mandatory language.
  - 3.6.2.2** The standard shall be appropriate for the subject covered.
  - 3.6.2.3** All terms shall be defined when they deviate from an ordinarily accepted meaning or a dictionary definition.
  - 3.6.2.4** The scope or application of a standard shall be clearly described.
  - 3.6.2.5** The standard shall not have the effect of requiring proprietary materials.
  - 3.6.2.6** The standard shall not prescribe a proprietary agency for quality control or testing.
  - 3.6.2.7** The test standard shall describe, in detail, preparation of the test sample, sample selection or both.
  - 3.6.2.8** The test standard shall prescribe the reporting format for the test results. The format shall identify the key performance criteria for the element(s) tested.
  - 3.6.2.9** The measure of performance for which the test is conducted shall be clearly defined in either the test standard or in Code text.
  - 3.6.2.10** The standard shall not state that its provisions shall govern whenever the referenced standard is in conflict with the requirements of the referencing Code.
  - 3.6.2.11** The preface to the standard shall announce that the standard is promulgated according to a consensus procedure.
- 3.6.3 Standard Promulgation:**
- 3.6.3.1** Code change proposals with corresponding changes to the code text which include a reference to a proposed new standard or a proposed update of an existing referenced shall comply with this section. The standard shall be completed and readily available prior to Final Action Consideration based on the cycle of code development which includes the proposed code change proposal. In order for a new standard to be considered for reference by the Code, such standard shall be submitted in at least a consensus draft form in accordance with Section 3.4. Updating of standards without corresponding

code text changes shall be accomplished administratively in accordance with Section 4.5.

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

#### **4.0 Processing of Proposals**

- 4.1 Intent:** The processing of code change proposals is intended to ensure that each proposal complies with these Rules of Procedure and that the resulting published proposal accurately reflects that proponent's intent.
- 4.2 Review:** Upon receipt in the Secretariat's office, the code change proposals will be checked for compliance with these Rules of Procedure as to division, separation, number of copies, form, language, terminology, supporting statements and substantiating data. Where a code change proposal consists of multiple parts which fall under the maintenance responsibilities of different code committees, the Secretariat shall determine the code committee responsible for determining the committee action in accordance with Section 5.6.
- 4.3 Incomplete Proposals:** When a code change proposal is submitted with incorrect format, without the required information or judged as not in compliance with these Rules of Procedure, the Secretariat shall notify the proponent of the specific deficiencies and the proposal shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected, with a final date set for receipt of a corrected submittal. If the Secretariat receives the corrected proposal after the final date, the proposal shall be held over until the next code development cycle. Where there are otherwise no deficiencies addressed by this section, a proposal that incorporates a new referenced standard shall be processed with an analysis of referenced standard's compliance with the criteria set forth in Section 3.6.
- 4.4 Editorial:** The Chief Executive Officer shall have the authority at all times to make editorial and format changes to the Code text, or any approved changes, consistent with the intent, provisions and style of the Code. An editorial or format change is a text change that does not affect the scope or application of the code requirements.
- 4.5 Updating Standards:**
- 4.5.1 Standards referenced in the 2012 Edition of the I-Codes:** The updating of standards referenced by the Codes shall be accomplished administratively by the Administrative code development committee in accordance with these full procedures except that the deadline for availability of the updated standard and receipt by the Secretariat shall be December 1, 2011. The published version of the 2012 Code which references the standard will refer to the updated edition of the standard. If the standard is not available by the deadline, the edition of the standard as referenced by the newly published Code shall revert back to the reference contained in the previous edition and an errata to the Code issued Multiple standards to be updated may be included in a single proposal.
- 4.5.2 Standards referenced in the 2015 Edition and following Editions of the I-Codes:** The updating of standards referenced by the Codes shall be accomplished administratively by the Administrative code development committee in accordance with these full procedures except that multiple standards to be updated may be included in a single proposal. The standard shall be completed and readily available prior to Final Action Consideration of the Administrative code change proposal which includes the proposed update.
- 4.6 Preparation:** All code change proposals in compliance with these procedures shall be prepared in a standard manner by the Secretariat and be assigned separate, distinct and consecutive numbers. The Secretariat shall coordinate related proposals submitted in accordance with Section 3.3.2 to facilitate the hearing process.
- 4.7 Publication:** All code change proposals shall be posted on the ICC website at least 30 days prior to the public hearing on those proposals and shall constitute the agenda for the public hearing. Code change proposals which have not been published shall not be considered.

## 5.0 Public Hearing

- 5.1 Intent:** The intent of the public hearing is to permit interested parties to present their views including the cost and benefits on the code change proposals on the published agenda. The code development committee will consider such comments as may be presented in the development of their action on the disposition of such proposals. At the conclusion of the code development committee deliberations, the committee action on each code change proposal shall be placed before the hearing assembly for consideration in accordance with Section 5.7.
- 5.2 Committee:** The Code Development Committees shall be appointed by the applicable ICC Council.
- 5.2.1 Chairman/Moderator:** The Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall be appointed by the Steering Committee on Councils from the appointed members of the committee. The ICC President shall appoint one or more Moderators who shall act as presiding officer for the public hearing.
- 5.2.2 Conflict of Interest:** A committee member shall withdraw from and take no part in those matters with which the committee member has an undisclosed financial, business or property interest. The committee member shall not participate in any committee discussion on the matter or any committee vote. Violation thereof shall result in the immediate removal of the committee member from the committee. A committee member who is a proponent of a proposal shall not participate in any committee discussion on the matter or any committee vote. Such committee member shall be permitted to participate in the floor discussion in accordance with Section 5.5 by stepping down from the dais.
- 5.2.3 Representation of Interest:** Committee members shall not represent themselves as official or unofficial representatives of the ICC except at regularly convened meetings of the committee.
- 5.2.4 Committee Composition:** The committee may consist of representation from multiple interests. A minimum of thirty-three and one-third percent (33.3%) of the committee members shall be regulators.
- 5.3 Date and Location:** The date and location of each public hearing shall be announced not less than 60 days prior to the date of the public hearing.
- 5.4 General Procedures:** *The Robert's Rules of Order* shall be the formal procedure for the conduct of the public hearing except as a specific provision of these Rules of Procedure may otherwise dictate. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting members of the committee.
- 5.4.1 Chair Voting:** The Chairman of the committee shall vote only when the vote cast will break a tie vote of the committee.
- 5.4.2 Open Meetings:** Public hearings of the Code Development Committees are open meetings. Any interested person may attend and participate in the Floor Discussion and Assembly Consideration portions of the hearing. Only eligible voters (see Section 5.7.4) are permitted to vote on Assembly Considerations. Only Code Development Committee members may participate in the Committee Action portion of the hearings (see Section 5.6).
- 5.4.3 Presentation of Material at the Public Hearing:** Information to be provided at the hearing shall be limited to verbal presentations and modifications submitted in accordance with Section 5.5.2. Audio-visual presentations are not permitted. Substantiating material submitted in accordance with Section 3.3.4.4 and other material submitted in response to a code change proposal shall be located in a designated area in the hearing room and shall not be distributed to the code development committee at the public hearing.
- 5.4.4 Agenda Order:** The Secretariat shall publish an agenda for each public hearing, placing individual code change proposals in a logical order to facilitate the hearing. Any public hearing attendee may move to revise the agenda order as the first order of business at the public hearing, or at any time during the hearing except while another proposal is being discussed. Preference shall be given to grouping like subjects together, and for moving items back to a later position on

the agenda as opposed to moving items forward to an earlier position. A motion to revise the agenda order is subject to a 2/3 vote of those present and voting.

**5.4.5 Reconsideration:** There shall be no reconsideration of a proposed code change after it has been voted on by the committee in accordance with Section 5.6; or, in the case of assembly consideration, there shall be no reconsideration of a proposed code change after it has been voted on by the assembly in accordance with Section 5.7.

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

**5.4.6.1 Time Keeping:** Keeping of time for testimony by an individual shall be by an automatic timing device. Remaining time shall be evident to the person testifying. Interruptions during testimony shall not be tolerated. The Moderator shall maintain appropriate decorum during all testimony.

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

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

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

**5.5.1 Discussion Order:**

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

**5.5.2 Modifications:** Modifications to proposals may be suggested from the floor by any person participating in the public hearing. The person proposing the modification is deemed to be the proponent of the modification.

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

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

1. is not legible, unless not required to be written in accordance with Section 5.5.2.1; or
2. changes the scope of the original proposal; or
3. is not readily understood to allow a proper assessment of its impact on the original proposal or the code.

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

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

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

1. Approve the code change proposal as submitted (AS) or
2. Approve the code change proposal as modified with specific modifications (AM), or
3. Disapprove the code change proposal (D)

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

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

The Code Development Committee shall maintain a record of its proceedings including the action on each code change proposal.

**5.7 Assembly Consideration:** At the conclusion of the committee's action on a code change proposal and before the next code change proposal is called to the floor, the Moderator shall ask for a motion from the public hearing attendees who may object to the committee's action. If a motion in accordance with Section 5.7.1 is not brought forward on the committee's action, the results of the public hearing shall be established by the committee's action. If a motion in accordance with Section 5.7.1 is brought forward and is sustained in accordance with Section 5.7.3, both the committee's action and the assemblies' action shall be reported as the results of the public hearing. Where a motion is sustained in accordance with Section 5.7.3, such action shall be the initial motion considered at Final Action Consideration in accordance with Section 7.3.8.2.

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

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

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

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

| Committee Action | Desired Assembly Action              |                                      |                                      |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|                  | ASF                                  | AMF                                  | DF                                   |
| AS               | --                                   | <sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub> Majority | <sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub> Majority |
| AM               | <sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub> Majority | <sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub> Majority | <sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub> Majority |
| D                | <sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub> Majority | <sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub> Majority | --                                   |

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

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

## 6.0 Public Comments

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

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

**6.2 Deadline:** The deadline for receipt of a public comment to the results of the public hearing shall be announced at the public hearing but shall not be less than 30 days from the availability of the report of the results of the public hearing (see Section 5.8).

**6.3 Withdrawal of Public Comment:** A public comment may be withdrawn by the public commenter at any time prior to Final Action Consideration of that comment. A withdrawn public comment shall not be subject to Final Action Consideration. If the only public comment to a code change proposal is withdrawn by the public commenter prior to the vote on the consent agenda in accordance with Section 7.3.4, the proposal shall be considered as part of the consent agenda. If the only public comment to a code change proposal is withdrawn by the public commenter after the vote on the consent agenda in accordance with Section 7.3.4, the proposal shall continue as part of the individual consent agenda in accordance with Section 7.3.5, however the public comment shall not be subject to Final Action Consideration.

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

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

release in accordance with Section 3.3.4.5 shall be provided with the public comment.

- 6.4.2 Code Reference:** Each public comment shall include the code change proposal number and the results of the public hearing, including successful assembly actions, on the code change proposal to which the public comment is directed.
- 6.4.3 Multiple public comments to a code change proposal.** A proponent shall not submit multiple public comments to the same code change proposal. When a proponent submits multiple public comments to the same code change proposal, the public comments shall be considered as incomplete public comments and processed in accordance with Section 6.5.1. This restriction shall not apply to public comments that attempt to address differing subject matter within a code section.
- 6.4.4 Desired Final Action:** The public comment shall indicate the desired final action as one of the following:
1. Approve the code change proposal as submitted (AS), or
  2. Approve the code change proposal as modified (AM) by one or more specific modifications published in the Results of the Public Hearing or published in a public comment, or
  3. Disapprove the code change proposal (D)
- 6.4.5 Supporting Information:** The public comment shall include in a statement containing a reason and justification for the desired final action on the code change proposal. Reasons and justification which are reviewed in accordance with Section 6.4 and determined as not germane to the technical issues addressed in the code change proposal or committee action shall be identified as such. The public commenter shall be notified that the public comment is considered an incomplete public comment in accordance with Section 6.5.1 and the public comment shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected. The public commenter shall have the right to appeal this action in accordance with the policy of the ICC Board. A bibliography of any substantiating material submitted with a public comment shall be published with the public comment and the substantiating material shall be made available at the Final Action Hearing.
- 6.4.6 Number:** One copy of each public comment and one copy of all substantiating information shall be submitted. Additional copies may be requested when determined necessary by the Secretariat. A copy of the public comment in electronic form is preferred.
- 6.5 Review:** The Secretariat shall be responsible for reviewing all submitted public comments from an editorial and technical viewpoint similar to the review of code change proposals (See Section 4.2).
- 6.5.1 Incomplete Public Comment:** When a public comment is submitted with incorrect format, without the required information or judged as not in compliance with these Rules of Procedure, the public comment shall not be processed. The Secretariat shall notify the public commenter of the specific deficiencies and the public comment shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected, or the public comment shall be returned to the public commenter with instructions to correct the deficiencies with a final date set for receipt of the corrected public comment.
- 6.5.2 Duplications:** On receipt of duplicate or parallel public comments, the Secretariat may consolidate such public comments for Final Action Consideration. Each public commenter shall be notified of this action when it occurs.
- 6.5.3 Deadline:** Public comments received by the Secretariat after the deadline set for receipt shall not be published and shall not be considered as part of the Final Action Consideration.
- 6.6 Publication:** The public hearing results on code change proposals that have not been public commented and the code change proposals with public commented public hearing results and successful assembly actions shall constitute the Final Action Agenda. The Final Action Agenda shall be posted on the ICC website at least 30 days prior to Final Action consideration.

## 7.0 Final Action Consideration

- 7.1 Intent:** The purpose of Final Action Consideration is to make a final determination of all code change proposals which have been considered in a code development cycle by a vote cast by eligible voters (see Section 7.4).
- 7.2 Agenda:** The final action consent agenda shall be comprised of proposals which have neither an assembly action nor public comment. The agenda for public testimony and individual consideration shall be comprised of proposals which have a successful assembly action or public comment (see Sections 5.7 and 6.0).
- 7.3 Procedure:** *The Robert's Rules of Order* shall be the formal procedure for the conduct of the Final Action Consideration except as these Rules of Procedure may otherwise dictate.
- 7.3.1 Open Meetings:** Public hearings for Final Action Consideration are open meetings. Any interested person may attend and participate in the Floor Discussion.
- 7.3.2 Agenda Order:** The Secretariat shall publish an agenda for Final Action Consideration, placing individual code change proposals and public comments in a logical order to facilitate the hearing. The proponents or opponents of any proposal or public comment may move to revise the agenda order as the first order of business at the public hearing, or at any time during the hearing except while another proposal is being discussed. Preference shall be given to grouping like subjects together and for moving items back to a later position on the agenda as opposed to moving items forward to an earlier position. A motion to revise the agenda order is subject to a 2/3 vote of those present and voting.
- 7.3.3 Presentation of Material at the Public Hearing:** Information to be provided at the hearing shall be limited to verbal presentations. Audio-visual presentations are not permitted. Substantiating material submitted in accordance with Section 6.4.4 and other material submitted in response to a code change proposal or public comment shall be located in a designated area in the hearing room.
- 7.3.4 Final Action Consent Agenda:** The final action consent agenda (see Section 7.2) shall be placed before the assembly with a single motion for final action in accordance with the results of the public hearing. When the motion has been seconded, the vote shall be taken with no testimony being allowed. A simple majority (50% plus one) based on the number of votes cast by eligible voters shall decide the motion.
- 7.3.5 Individual Consideration Agenda:** Upon completion of the final action consent vote, all proposed changes not on the final action consent agenda shall be placed before the assembly for individual consideration of each item (see Section 7.2).
- 7.3.6 Reconsideration:** There shall be no reconsideration of a proposed code change after it has been voted on in accordance with Section 7.3.8.
- 7.3.7 Time Limits:** Time limits shall be established as part of the agenda for testimony on all proposed changes at the beginning of each hearing session. Each person requesting to testify on a change shall be given equal time. In the interest of time and fairness to all hearing participants, the Moderator shall have limited authority to modify time limitations on debate. The Moderator shall have the authority to adjust time limits as necessary in order to complete the hearing agenda.
- 7.3.7.1 Time Keeping:** Keeping of time for testimony by an individual shall be by an automatic timing device. Remaining time shall be evident to the person testifying. Interruptions during testimony shall not be tolerated. The Moderator shall maintain appropriate decorum during all testimony.
- 7.3.8 Discussion and Voting:** Discussion and voting on proposals being individually considered shall be in accordance with the following procedures:
- 7.3.8.1 Allowable Final Action Motions:** The only allowable motions for final action are Approval as Submitted, Approval as Modified by one or more modifications published in the Final Action Agenda, and Disapproval.



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

**7.3.8.3 Motions for Modifications:** Whenever a motion under consideration is for Approval as Submitted or Approval as Modified, a subsequent motion and second for a modification published in the Final Action Agenda may be made (see Section 6.4.3). Each subsequent motion for modification, if any, shall be individually discussed and voted before returning to the main motion. A two-thirds majority based on the number of votes cast by eligible voters shall be required for a successful motion on all modifications.

**7.3.8.4 Voting:** After dispensing with all motions for modifications, if any, and upon completion of discussion on the main motion, the Moderator shall then ask for the vote on the main motion. If the motion fails to receive the majority required in Section 7.5, the Moderator shall ask for a new motion.

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

**7.3.9 Proponent testimony:** The Proponent of a public comment is permitted to waive an initial statement. The Proponent of the public comment shall be permitted to have the amount of time that would have been allocated during the initial testimony period plus the amount of time that would be allocated for rebuttal. Where a public comment is submitted by multiple proponents, this provision shall permit only one proponent of the joint submittal to waive an initial statement.

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

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

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

| Public Hearing Action<br>(see note) | Desired Final Action   |   |                 |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---|-----------------|
|                                     | AS                     | AM  | D               |
| AS                                  | Simple Majority        | $\frac{2}{3}$ Majority  | Simple Majority |
| AM                                  | $\frac{2}{3}$ Majority | Simple Majority to sustain the Public Hearing Action or; $\frac{2}{3}$ Majority on additional modifications and $\frac{2}{3}$ on overall AM | Simple Majority |
| D                                   | $\frac{2}{3}$ Majority | $\frac{2}{3}$ Majority  | Simple Majority |

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

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

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

## **8.0 Appeals**

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

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

| CODE  | PAGE |
|---|------|
| International Building Code                       |      |
| Fire Safety .....                                 | 2    |
| General .....                                     | 43   |
| Means of Egress .....                             | 90   |
| Structural .....                                  | 135  |
| International Existing Building Code .....        | 212  |
| International Fire Code.....                      | 232  |
| International Fuel Gas Code .....                 | 290  |
| International Mechanical Code.....                | 301  |
| International Plumbing Code.....                  | 340  |
| International Residential Code                    |      |
| Building .....                                    | 381  |
| Plumbing .....                                    | 422  |
| Mechanical .....                                  | 424  |
| International Wildland-Urban Interface Code ..... | 433  |

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

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| ICC Administrative Code Provisions .....     | 437 |
| International Energy Conservation Code ..... | 449 |
| International Property Maintenance Code..... | 505 |
| International Residential Code               |     |
| Energy .....                                 | 512 |
| International Zoning Code.....               | 515 |

# CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS FOR FINAL ACTION:

**MAY 14 – 23, 2010  
DALLAS, TEXAS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE  
Fire Safety Code Development Committee**

**Daniel Nichols, PE - Chair**  
Fire Protection Engineer  
State of New York Division of Code  
Enforcement  
Albany, NY

**Gene Boecker, AIA – Vice Chair**  
Project Manager  
Code Consultants Inc.  
St. Louis, MO

**Anthony Apfelbeck, CBO**  
Rep: International Association of Fire  
Chiefs  
Fire Marshal/Building Official  
City of Altamonte Springs Florida  
Altamonte Springs, FL

**Kenneth Bush**  
Rep: National Association of State Fire  
Marshals  
Senior Fire Protection Engineer  
Maryland Office of State Fire Marshal  
Easton, MD

**Douglas Evans, PE**  
Fire Protection Engineer  
Clark County Dept. of Dev. Services  
- Bldg Div.  
Las Vegas, NV

**W. Jay Hall, CBO**  
Codes Specialist  
Virginia Masonry Association  
Mechanicsville, VA

**Marcelo Hirschler**  
GBH International  
Mill Valley, CA

**Howard Hopper, PE**  
Manager, Regulatory Services  
Underwriters Laboratories  
San Jose, CA

**Steve Mills, CBO**  
Director of Building and Codes  
City of Hendersonville  
Hendersonville, TN

**Lorin Neyer**  
Regional Compliance Officer  
California Office of Statewide  
Health  
Planning & Dev. - CA  
Manteca, CA

**Tim Pate, CBO**  
Senior Plans Analyst  
City and County of Broomfield  
Building Department  
Broomfield, CO

**Michael Pokorny, PE**  
Fire Protection Engineer  
Montgomery County Department  
of Permitting Service  
Rockville, MD

**Michael Shannon, PE, CBO**  
Development Services Engineer  
City of San Antonio, Development  
Services Department  
San Antonio, TX

**Jerry Tepe, FAIA**  
Architect  
JRT-AIA-Architect  
Hopkinton, NH

**Michael Whalen**  
Code Specialist  
New Jersey Department of  
Community Affairs  
Trenton, NJ

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

**INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE  
FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE  
HEARING RESULTS**

## **FS1-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Although non-fire-resistance rated construction is addressed in Chapter 7, the bulk of the Chapter deals with fire-resistance rated construction and smoke migration protection. Therefore, the change in title is not warranted. Further, using the term horizontal assemblies in the scope, by definition, refers to fire-resistance rated assemblies, which currently does not include non-fire-resistance rated assemblies. This could lead to confusion.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **FS2-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** This proposal clarifies the current intent of the code by requiring compliance with all applicable code requirements for fire assemblies that serve multiple purposes.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **FS3-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Using the term "building elements" limits the scope of the definition, based on the definition of building elements. Further, the term "linear opening" is specific and descriptive and should remain in the definition. Also, the term "linear" is consistent with terminology used in the referenced standards dealing with joints. Lastly, the term "void" is too broad.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **FS4-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that passive and active fire protection should not be used together, specific to ASTM E119 and UL263 testing. Further, code officials should not be attempting to determine if a proposed test completely meets the requirements of test methods ASTM E119 or UL263. Lastly, ad hoc tests that combine active and passive systems are not prohibited and can be reviewed and approved by the code official as alternative methods under Section 104.11 of the code.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **FS5-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that Chapter 26 sufficiently deals with the requirements for foam plastic materials. Further, neither the proposed text nor the proposed test standard (NFPA 259) contains pass fail criteria. Therefore there is no guidance on what to do with the test results. Lastly, these requirements are in the wrong location as foam plastic materials are combustible materials.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS6-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that this was not needed as it was redundant with the action they took on FS4-09/10.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS7-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Modified**

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

**703.6 Marking and identification.** Fire walls, fire barriers, fire partitions, smoke barriers, and smoke partitions or any other wall required to have protected openings or penetrations shall be effectively and permanently identified with signs or stenciling. Such identification shall:

1. Be located in accessible concealed floor floor-ceiling or attic spaces;
2. Be located within 15 feet (4572 mm ) of the end of each wall and at intervals not exceeding 30 feet (9144mm) measured horizontally along the wall or partition; and
3. Included lettering not less than 3 inches (76 mm ) in height with a minimum 3/8 inch (9.5 mm) stroke in a contrasting color incorporating the suggested wording. "FIRE AND/OR SMOKE BARRIER—PROTECT ALL OPENINGS" or other wording.

**Exception:** Walls in Group R-2 occupancies that do not have a removable decorative ceiling allowing access to the concealed space.

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the closer spacing and larger letter height would aid in enforcement of these provisions. The modification provides for consistent letter sizing, which again will aid in enforcement of these provisions.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS8-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposal was unclear in that penetrations through rated assemblies required by Table 601 may require protection depending on the details of the assembly. For example, penetrations through a cavity-type wall (studs and sheathing) may need to be protected in order to keep products of combustion out of the wall cavity.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS9-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that these provisions were confusing and should be located in charging text rather than in an exception. Further, it would be more appropriate for the provisions to be located where the code addresses heavy timber construction.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS10-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that change will accommodate the 6'-4" width of a pair of 36" doors in a hollow metal frame, which is consistent with common construction practice.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS11-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that this proposal did not clarify the requirements for allowable projections. Further, the committee was concerned about the use of the term fire separation distance in that it seemed to conflict with the code-defined term.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS12-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** This proposal seems to allow for projections where the fire separation distance is 24 inches with no substantiation. Further, the committee was concerned about the use of the term fire separation distance in that it seemed to conflict with the code-defined term.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS13-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Modified**

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

**705.2.3 Combustible projections.** Combustible projections located where openings are not permitted, or where protection of openings is required, or where a combination of protected and unprotected openings are permitted, shall be of at least 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction, Type IV construction, fire-retardant-treated wood or as required by Section 1406.3.

**Exception:** Type VB construction shall be allowed for combustible projections in R-3 occupancies with a fire separation distance greater than or equal to 5 ft (1524 mm).

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the proposal provides for coordination with Section 705.3 and Section 705.2.3 by including projections located where a combination of protected and unprotected openings are permitted. Further, the revisions to the exception clarify that the intent of the exception is not to allow a combustible projection within 24 inches of a lot line. Lastly, the modification provides for consistent code terminology.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS14-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The IBC should not be revised to match the IRC because the provisions in the IBC recognize a sprinklered building. Further, this provides consistency with the committee's action on FS13-09/10.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS15-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that projection requirements should also be considered for buildings on the same lot that are not considered as one building.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---



## FS16-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** There was no justification provided to show the fire resistance characteristics of fire blocking as compared to gypsum board. Further, the terms “fire resistive” and “fire rating” are not consistent with terms currently used in the code.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS17-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that referencing only Table 601 could lead to confusion, in that Table 602 should also be considered and may result in a higher fire resistance rating.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS18-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt more substantiation was required to justify this sprinkler trade-off and to clarify why in some cases an NFPA 13R or NFPA 13D system are considered appropriate protection to allow the trade-off.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS19-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The proposed requirement for proportional spacing of openings is too subjective and unenforceable.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS20-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The proposal is impractical to enforce based on verification of the conditions of an existing building. Further, the language is confusing in that it could be interpreted to be more restrictive for buildings on the same lot than for buildings on separate adjacent lots.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS21-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The proposal is impractical to enforce based on verification of the conditions of an existing building. Further, the language is confusing in that it could be interpreted to be more restrictive for buildings on the same lot than for buildings on separate adjacent lots. Also, Section 705.8.6.1 appears to reduce the distance between buildings from 30 feet to 15 feet without technical justification.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS22-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Errors in the proposal cause too much confusion and could lead to misinterpretation. These include multiple incorrect section references and typographical errors related to proposed text.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS23-09/10

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

**Analysis:** The standard was not received by ICC staff.

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Disapproval was based on the proponents request for disapproval. Further, the proposed standard NFPA 221-09 has not been submitted.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS24-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that current language is clear and describes appropriate performance requirements for fire walls. Further, there are apparent differences between the proposed requirements and NFPA 221, which may be of concern. Lastly, reference to Section 705 in Section 706.2.3 would trigger weather resistance and exterior finishes requirements, which do not appear to be applicable.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS25-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** "Sources of ignition" is too subjective and should be defined to determine appropriate limitations. Further, there was no data submitted to show that sources of ignition within a wall have been a problem. Lastly, the term "potential sources" is too broad and therefore unenforceable.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS26-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the reorganization did not clarify the requirements and preferred the current text in which the requirements for horizontal continuity and exterior wall intersection requirements remain separate.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS27-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The relationship of a fire wall to adjacent roofs that are sloping towards the fire wall is currently not addressed in the code and this proposal clearly describes this condition and provides reasonable fire wall continuity requirements.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS28-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** There was no technical justification to support the 20 wall length allowance. Further, the proposed language could be interpreted to allow 100 percent openings in a fire wall that is 20 feet or less in length.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS29-09/10

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The disapproval is based on the request for disapproval from the proponent based on previous code change activity.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

### PART II- IFC

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Modified**

**Replace the proposal as follows:**

901.4.3 Fire areas. Where buildings, or portions thereof, are divided into fire areas so as not to exceed the limits established for requiring a fire protection system in accordance with this chapter, such fire areas shall be separated by fire barriers or horizontal assemblies, or both, constructed in accordance with the International Building Code having a fire-resistance rating of not less than that determined in accordance with the International Building Code Section 707.3.9.

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that adding these fire area provisions in the *International Fire Code* would appropriately coordinate the IBC and the IFC.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS30-09/10

**Withdrawn by Proponent**

---

## FS31-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that high merchandise display in Group M occupancies is a fire safety concern, which warrants the 3 hour separation regardless of the display area or the presence of automatic sprinklers.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS32-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the term "to construct" was not clearer than the current language and therefore the additional language was not needed.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS33-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the same requirement to protect the joint of a fire barrier and the underside of the floor should also apply to the joint of a fire barrier and an exterior wall.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS34-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Renumbering Chapter Section 708 to 714 would not be appropriate based on other committee actions where coordinating changes were disapproved.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS35-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that these requirements did not belong in the requirements for shafts and that this particular concern was already covered in the portion of the code dealing with joint requirements.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS36-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee was concerned about the phrase "...and their supporting construction..." in that they were not clear on how this related to penetration protection.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS37-09/10

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

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

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that referencing NFPA 82-09 for refuse and laundry chutes in Group I2 occupancies was appropriate.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS38-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the fire resistance and opening protectives required for the shaft that encloses the refuse or laundry chute also be provided as the minimum protection for the termination room.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS39-09/10

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

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

**708.3 Materials.** The shaft enclosure shall be of materials permitted by the building type of construction.

**708.3.1 Shaft enclosure at rubbish and laundry chutes.** The shaft enclosure containing a rubbish or laundry chute shall include the following provisions:

**708.3.1.1 Single-sided construction.** The chute shaft enclosure shall be of a listed construction that can be fully assembled in accordance with its approved design, including all required drywall taping when required by the design, from one side after the chute has been installed, regardless of the presence of bearing walls supporting floor framing.

~~708.3.1.2 Identical floor and wall ratings.~~ A chute shaft enclosure shall provide the required fire protection rating over its entire length. Fire ratings shall not be lower at floor, ceiling or roof framing intersections.

~~708.3.1.3 Extend shaft enclosure to roof.~~ The shaft enclosure shall extend to the underside of the roof. Structural framing members supporting the roof shall be outside of the chute shaft enclosure and shall not be permitted inside the shaft enclosure.

**708.13.1 Rubbish and laundry chute enclosures.** A shaft enclosure containing a rubbish or laundry chute shall not be used for any other purpose and shall be enclosed in accordance with Section ~~708.3.4~~ and 708.4. ~~Openings into the shaft, Fire-rated chute intake door assemblies as well as openings including those from access rooms and termination rooms, shall be protected in accordance with this section and Section 715.~~ Openings into chutes shall not be located in *corridors*. ~~Doors~~ ~~Fire-rated chute intake door assemblies~~ shall be self- or automatic-closing upon the actuation of a smoke detector in accordance with Section 715.4.8.3, except that heat-activated closing devices shall be permitted between the shaft and the termination room. ~~Fire-rated chute intake door assemblies shall additionally comply with Sections 715.4.8 and 715.4.8.1.1.~~

**708.13.3 Rubbish and laundry chute access rooms.** ~~Access openings~~ ~~Openings into access rooms for rubbish and laundry chutes shall be located in rooms or compartments enclosed by not less than 1-hour fire barriers constructed in accordance with Section 707 or horizontal assemblies constructed in accordance with Section 712, or both.~~ Openings into the access rooms shall be protected by opening protectives having a *fire protection rating of* not less than  $\frac{1}{4}$  hour. Doors shall be self- or automatic-closing upon the detection of smoke in accordance with Section 715.4.8.3.

**715.4.1 Side-hinged or pivoted swinging doors.** *Fire door* assemblies with side-hinged and pivoted swinging doors shall be tested in accordance with NFPA 252 or UL 10C. After 5 minutes into the NFPA 252 test, the neutral pressure level in the furnace shall be established at 40 inches (1016mm) or less above the sill.

~~**Exception:** Side-hinged rubbish and laundry chute intake doors shall be tested to UL-10B and shall otherwise comply with the provisions of Section 715.4.8 and 715.4.8.1.1.~~

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

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that rubbish and laundry chute access doors should remain latched and closed in the event of failure of the self-closing mechanism (tension spring). The modification removed any changes to the identified sections based on the committees previous actions to include referenced to NFPA 82 (FS37-09/10)

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS40-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that reducing the elevator lobby threshold from 3 stories to 2 stories was not technically justified. Also the code currently allows a two story unprotected opening to be directly adjacent to what is proposed to be an enclosed elevator lobby, so it is unclear what is being achieved with this proposal.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS41-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that by definition a basement is a story and therefore the language is redundant. Further, the definition of story does not include mezzanines and therefore this language is not needed.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS42-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that current code language clearly establishes the requirements for elevator shaft doors and that the proposed language was unnecessary.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS43-09/10

**Withdrawn by Proponent**

---

## FS44-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee did not agree that the proposed language was a coordination issue with Section 3007.4 and that the requirements for testing fire doors in fire partitions currently in the code were sufficient.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS45-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Modified**

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

**708.14.1 Elevator lobby.** An enclosed elevator lobby shall be provided at each floor where an elevator shaft enclosure connects more than three *stories*. The lobby enclosure shall separate the elevator shaft enclosure doors from each floor by *fire partitions*. In addition to the requirements in Section 709 for *fire partitions*, doors protecting openings in the elevator lobby enclosure walls shall also comply with Section 715.4.3 as required for *corridor* walls and penetrations of the elevator lobby enclosure by ducts and air transfer openings shall be protected as required for *corridors* in accordance with Section 716.5.4.1. Elevator lobbies shall have at least one *means of egress* complying with Chapter 10 and other provisions within this code. Access to an exit through an enclosed elevator lobby shall be permitted provided that access to at least one other required exit does not require passing through the elevator lobby.

**Exceptions:**

*(Exceptions to remain unchanged)*

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the proposed language clarified the intent of the code by allowing egress through an elevator lobby as long as one other required exit was available without having to egress through the lobby.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS46-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that “level of exit discharge” was more appropriate terminology as it is a defined term in the code.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS47-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that it was appropriate to reference the maximum air leakage requirements in Section 715.4.3.1 as being applicable to the additional hoistway doors discussed in exception 3 as an alternative to the elevator lobby enclosure.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS48-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed replacing bottom seal with “horizontal or vertical seal” is more appropriate in that it reflects current testing practices.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## **FS49-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that it is common practice for many elevators within highrise buildings serve only the lower floors and as such should not require enclosed elevator lobbies.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **FS50-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Based on the committees action taken on FS45-09/10. Also, the proposed wording seems confusing when compared to the proponents intent.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **FS51-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the deletion hoistway pressurization option was not warranted based on the feasibility of designing a pressurization system as currently provided for in the code.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **FS52-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Based on the proponents request for disapproval. Also, the committee felt the substantiation was lacking and in some cases contradictory to what the proposal was trying to do. Further, not permitting stair pressurization in this case conflicts with other requirements in the code where stair pressurization is required for highrise buildings.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **FS53-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that this proposal was not technically justified as being a problem in current practice. Further, requiring these exterior doors to open during the operation of the pressurization system could be a health and safety risk to the occupants of the building.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **FS54-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The wording is confusing in that it is not clear if the sprinkler system is required for the building or only the B occupancy. Further, sprinkler systems can fail and redundant safety features in a highrise building are needed.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS55-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the reorganization of the elevator lobby requirements was too difficult to follow and the committee could not verify all previous requirements were accounted for. Placing the exceptions in 708.14 is confusing in that one could interpret that once you comply with one of the exceptions all of 708.14 is no longer applicable.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS56-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the proposal was a good reorganization of the requirements for vertical openings. The committee did recognize that there were also some minor technical changes and felt that these were appropriate and reasonable.

**Note:** The following modification was considered editorial:

**712.1.4 Penetrations.** Penetrations by pipe, tube, conduit, wire, cable and vents shall be protected in accordance with Section 714 ~~742.4~~.

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

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS57-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies the requirement for fireblocking or draftstopping the combustible concealed space between the ceiling and the underside of the deck above in those cases where the fire partitions are not required to be continuous to the underside of the sheathing, deck, or slab above.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS58-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposed revisions did not accomplish the proponent's objective. The concern with the proposed language is the migration of smoke over the smoke barrier. The current language is preferred.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS59-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that smoke barriers enclosing areas of refuge need not be continuous to the exterior walls.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS60-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that smoke barriers enclosing fire service access elevator lobbies and occupant evacuation elevator lobbies need not be continuous to the exterior walls.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---



## FS61-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Modified**

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

**710.4 Continuity.** *Smoke barriers* shall form an effective membrane continuous from outside wall to outside wall and from the top of the foundation or floor/ceiling assembly below to the underside of the floor or roof sheathing, deck or slab above, including continuity through concealed spaces, such as those found above suspended ceilings, and interstitial structural and mechanical spaces. The supporting construction shall be protected to afford the required *fire-resistance rating* of the wall or floor supported in buildings of other than Type IIB, IIIB or VB construction.

**Exceptions:**

1. Smoke-barrier walls are not required in interstitial spaces where such spaces are designed and constructed with ceilings that provide resistance to the passage of fire and smoke equivalent to that provided by the smoke-barrier walls.
2. Smoke barriers used for elevator lobbies in accordance with Section 405.4.3, 3007.4.2 or 3008.11.2 are not required to need not extend from outside wall to outside wall.
3. Smoke barriers used for areas of refuge in accordance with Section 1007.6.2 are not required to need not extend from outside wall to outside wall.

**Committee Reason:** Consistent with their actions on FS59-09/10 and FS60-09/10 the committee agreed that smoke barriers enclosing specific elevator lobbies and areas of refuge need not be continuous to the exterior walls. The committee also indicated that they preferred this proposal over FS59-09/10 and FS60-09/10. The modification added language consistent with the format of the code.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS62-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee thought the language was incorrect in that it did not recognize that an area of refuge could be located anywhere on a floor. Further, other stairway or elevator shaft walls may not meet smoke barrier requirements.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS63-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that this was a good reorganization of the opening requirements for smoke partitions. The committee did recognize the technical change in Section 711.7 and indicated that it was appropriate.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS64-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The proposed wording is confusing in that most of the proposal tells the code user what is not required. The code is typically written to indicate what is required.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS65-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposed change would conflict with Section 712.1 where you would need to go to Table 601 to determine the requirements for fire resistance. Further, Section 102.1 of the code differentiates between general and specific requirements sufficiently so coordination with 420 is not required and in fact might cause confusion instead of clarity.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS66-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Disapproval was to avoid conflict with previously approved proposal FS66-09/10. Additionally, the term horizontal assembly is used throughout the code and each individual instance should be scrutinized against the intent of this proposal.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS67-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Disapproval was based on the proponent's request.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS68-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The different methods of protecting the power cables should be described in the proposal for clarity. The proposal assumes that the power cables are metal clad and insulated, which may not always be the case. Lastly, the allowable voltage of the power cables should be indicated.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS69-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that protection of floor drains, tub drains or shower drains provided by a membrane of a horizontal assembly was appropriate.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS70-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that there was no technical justification for the T-rating requirement to be added for all through penetration firestop systems. The committee also felt that the exception to 713.4.1.1.2 has been well established and should not be removed.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS71-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the T-rating for the items described in item 4 of 713.3.2 was appropriate and was cost effective to achieve during the testing of the boxes and therefore should remain as a requirement.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS72-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that there was a concern over the availability of approved contractors to provide these installations nation-wide. Further, the term “approved agency” puts the responsibility on the code official to approve these agencies, which in many cases they are not qualified to do.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS73-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** As with FS72-09/10, the committee felt that there should be a limitation for smaller buildings. Also, there was a concern over the availability of approved contractors to provide these installations nation-wide. Further, the term “approved agency” puts the responsibility on the code official to approve these agencies, which in many cases they are not qualified to do.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS74-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt some of the terms, such as “impractical” and “impossible” were too subjective and difficult to determine. Further, the phrase “calculations performed in an approve manner” is difficult to determine and perhaps unenforceable. Lastly, Section 104.11 already allows for alternative methods.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS75-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the ceiling membrane should be continuous and uninterrupted; however if this proposal were to be considered it should be limited to nonfireresistance rated partitions or fire partitions.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS76-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Disapproval was requested by the proponent based on the committee’s action on FS56-09/10.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS77-09/10

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

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

**L RATING.** The air leakage rate rating of a through-penetration firestop system when tested in accordance with ~~UL 1479~~, or a fire-resistant joint system when tested in accordance with UL1479 or UL 2079, respectively.

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

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that using the listed L rating for determining air leakage rate was appropriate. The modification aligns the definition of L rating with the industry recognized definition.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS78-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that duplicating common requirements for vertical and horizontal assemblies was unnecessary. Further, vertical openings are more appropriately addressed in FS56-09/10 previously recommended for approval by this committee.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS79-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** To be consistent with the committees action on FS78-09/10 and as requested by the proponent.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS80-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that since Section 705.9 already requires this for exterior walls that the current language should remain, and revising it to say interior walls may even cause confusion.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS81-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the exception was in the wrong place and would be better located in the continuity provisions. Also, the committee felt there should be some referenced to an acceptable material to used to fill the void in question.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS82-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that this proposal clarified the requirements for curtain walls.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS83-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt the phrase "calculations performed in an approve manner" is difficult to determine and perhaps unenforceable. Further, Section 104.11 already allows for alternative methods.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS84-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that installation of joint systems should be in accordance with the listing, similar to that currently required for through penetration systems.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS85-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that there should be a limitation for smaller buildings. Also, there was a concern over the availability of approved contractors to provide these installations nation-wide. Further, the term "approved agency" puts the responsibility on the code official to approve these agencies, which in many cases they are not qualified to do.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS86-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** As with FS85-09/10, the committee felt there was a concern over the availability of approved contractors to provide these installations nation-wide. Further, the term "approved agency" puts the responsibility on the code official to approve these agencies, which in many cases they are not qualified to do.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS87-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that since the criteria for F rating includes passage of heat and hot gasses that this change was editorial and ultimately easier to enforce.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS88-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Modified**

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

**714.4 Exterior curtain wall/floor intersection.** Where fire resistance-rated floor or floor/ceiling assemblies are required, voids created at the intersection of the exterior curtain wall assemblies and such floor assemblies shall be sealed with an *approved* system to prevent the interior spread of fire. Such systems shall be securely installed and tested in accordance with ASTM E 2307 to prevent the passage of flame for the time period at least equal to the *fire-resistance rating* of the floor assembly and prevent the passage of heat and hot gases sufficient to ignite cotton waste. Height and fire-resistance requirements for curtain wall spandrels shall comply with Section 705.8.5.

**Exception:** Voids created at the intersection of the exterior curtain wall assemblies and such floor assemblies where the vision glass extends ~~down~~ to the finished floor level shall be permitted to be sealed with an approved material to prevent the interior spread of fire. Such material shall be securely installed and ~~capable~~ *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 at least equal to the fire-resistance rating of the floor assembly.

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that this proposal appropriately allows for assemblies that are commonly used in current building practice to be approved based on ASTM E119 time-temperature exposure conditions. The modification recognizes that the glass could extend up or down. Changing cable to capable was considered editorial.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS89-09/10

**Withdrawn by Proponent**

---

## FS90-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that these changes should be done in the development of the referenced standard rather than in the code. Further, the limit of 30 minutes in Section 714.4.2 may not be appropriate for situations where the floor fire-resistance rating is greater than this.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS91-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the term "perimeter fire barrier" was not needed and could cause confusion rather than clarity.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS92-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee concluded that since there have been no safety issues brought forth regarding joints between dissimilar materials and assemblies, this proposed language was not necessary.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS93-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Based on previous committee actions the proponent requested disapproval. Further, the committee suggested that this subject matter be brought in front of the ICC-ES Technical Committee under their process.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS94-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposed provisions would conflict with the atrium provisions in Chapter 4 of the code related to the atrium enclosure wall requirements.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS95-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that listing and testing requirements for the electronic controls in horizontal sliding doors was not technically justified. Further, these requirements appear to be in the wrong location. Lastly, the committee had several unanswered questions as the proponent was not present for testimony.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS96-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that these provisions were not necessary to enforce the code. Elevator manufacturers have indicated that they can not achieve smoke and draft control requirements, therefore the option is to provide an enclosed elevator lobby, which are clearly provided for in the code.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS97-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposed wording was confusing with respect to door requirements and door vision panel requirements. Further, NFPA 257 is the appropriate standard and should not be eliminated.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS98-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that NFPA 257 is the appropriate standard and should remain. Further, the 24 inch measurement in Section 715.4.3.2.1 is unclear and arbitrary.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS99-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee preferred the language in FS107-09/10. Further, the language is unclear with respect to door requirements and door vision panel requirements.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS100-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the presence of sprinklers in the building should not eliminate the life safety and fire spread hazard posed by unrestricted transmission of radiant heat flux through large sizes of fire protection rated glazing panels especially when those doors are protecting exit enclosures or passageways.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS101-09/10

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the proposed glazing marking is appropriate and consistent with Section 2403.1.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

### PART II- IBC STRUCTURAL

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** To be consistent with the committee's action on FS101-09/10 Part I.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS102-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The term "assemblies" appropriately includes the frame, which makes the requirements more conservative. Further, this is consistent with the committee's actions on FS107-09/10.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS103-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that these deletions were appropriate and that wired glass needs to meet all the requirements of other glazing materials used in this application. Also, the committee suggested editorially changing the title to Section 715.5.4 to "Glass & Glazing"

**Note:** The following modification was considered editorial:

**715.5.4 Glass and Glazing ~~Nonwired glass.~~** Glazing in *fire window assemblies* shall be fire-protection-rated glazing installed in accordance with and complying with the size limitations set forth in NFPA 80.

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

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS104-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that there was no substantiation provided to show that the 1-½ hour protection was not appropriate for openings within exterior walls with a rating greater than 1 hour.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS105-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that there was no substantiation provided to show that there is a life safety problem with radiant heat transfer to justify the minimum 36-inch height above the floor surface.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS106-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Disapproval was to be consistent with the committee's actions on FS97-09/10 and FS99-09/10; the language is unclear with respect to door requirements and door vision panel requirements.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS107-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed with the reorganization of the glazing provisions and the clarity of the fire rated glazing marking provisions. The revised provisions will give the code official all they need to determine if glazing is being used in the right locations.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS108-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Disapproval was based on the proponent's request.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---



## FS109-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that this proposal was appropriate because the definition of labeled required the approved agency to maintain periodic inspections of the product.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS110-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that this proposal provides consistency in the working for the smoke damper ratings, and clarity of the two acceptable leakage-rating classes.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS111-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Introduces additional hazards in exception #2 by changing the limit from Groups B and R to multi-story buildings without justification.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS112-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The proposal does not belong in this exception nor does it address the proponent's intent.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS113-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the sprinkler threshold was confusing as written with respect to the area to be sprinklered throughout; the Group B area or the entire building. Further, perhaps this proposal would be better located under current exception #2. Lastly, the language "air.....moves" and "prevent recalculation" is confusing as it seems to contradict.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS114-09/10

The following is errata that were not posted to the ICC website.

**716.5.4 (IMC 607.5.3) Fire partitions.** Ducts and air transfer openings that penetrate *fire partitions* shall be protected with *listed fire dampers* installed in accordance with their listing.

**Exceptions:** In occupancies other than Group H, *fire dampers* are not required where any of the following apply:

1. Corridor walls in buildings equipped throughout with an *automatic sprinkler system* in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2 and the duct is protected as a *through penetration* in accordance with Section 713.
2. Tenant partitions in *covered mall buildings* where the walls are not required by provisions elsewhere in the code to extend to the underside of the floor or roof sheathing, slab or deck above.
3. The duct system is constructed of *approved materials* in accordance with the *International Mechanical Code* and the duct penetrating the wall complies with all of the following

requirements:

- 3.1. The duct shall not exceed 100 square inches (0.06 m<sup>2</sup>).
  - 3.2. The duct shall be constructed of steel a minimum of 0.0217 inch (0.55 mm) in thickness.
  - 3.3. The duct shall not have openings that communicate the *corridor* with adjacent spaces or rooms.
  - 3.4. The duct shall be installed above a ceiling.
  - 3.5. The duct shall not terminate at a wall register in the fire-resistance-rated wall.
  - 3.6. A minimum 12-inch-long (305 mm) by 0.060-inch-thick (1.52 mm) steel sleeve shall be centered in each duct opening. The sleeve shall be secured to both sides of the wall and all four sides of the sleeve with minimum 1 1/2-inch by 1 1/2-inch by 0.060-inch (38mm by 38mm by 1.52 mm) steel retaining angles. The retaining angles shall be secured to the sleeve and the wall with No. 10 (M5) screws. The *annular space* between the steel sleeve and the wall opening shall be filled with mineral wool batting on all sides.
4. Such walls are penetrated by ducted HVAC systems, have a required fire-resistance rating of 1 hour or less, and are in buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2. For the purposes of this exception, a ducted HVAC system shall be a duct system for conveying supply, return or exhaust air as part of the structure's HVAC system. Such a duct system shall be constructed of sheet steel not less than 26 gage thickness and shall be continuous from the air-handling appliance or equipment to the air outlet and inlet terminals.

**Reason:** Currently the code is less restrictive for penetrations of a fire barrier than a fire partition. This proposal adds an additional exception for fire partitions. This proposal appropriately duplicates provisions of Section 716.5.2 Exception 3 as an exception 4 for fire partitions because it is logical to allow the exception for a wall type where the code places lesser restrictions on its use. This exception does not limit the size of a duct penetration as Exception 3 does currently. If this exception is acceptable for fire barriers, it should be acceptable for fire partitions.

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** This proposal appropriately duplicates provisions of Section 716.5.2 exception 3 as an exception 4 for fire partitions to allow for a wall type with lesser restrictions on its use.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS115-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that this would allow the duct to pass through an occupied area, which would provide no protection from combustible materials.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS116-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that until the consensus standard is complete and available, Section 104.11 should continue to be used as the basis to approve these types of systems.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS117-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Errors such as improper Section references in Section 716.2 and improper section renumbering were the committees reasons for disapproval.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS118-09/10

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

#### Modify the proposal as follows:

**717.2.1 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. ~~Spray-applied~~ cellulose insulation installed as tested for the specific application

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that cellulose insulation used as fireblocking has been substantiated as another valid option and which allows for current construction practices. The modification allows for more types of cellulose insulation to be used as fireblocking material.

#### Assembly Action:

None

## PART II - IRC

### Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

#### Modify proposal as follows:

**R302.11.1 Fireblocking materials.** Except as provided in Section R302.11, Item 4, 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 23/32-inch (18.3 mm) wood structural panels with joints backed by 23/32-inch (18.3 mm) wood structural panels.
4. One thickness of 3/4-inch (19.1 mm) particleboard with joints backed by 3/4-inch (19 mm) particleboard.
5. One-half-inch (12.7 mm) gypsum board.
6. One-quarter-inch (6.4 mm) cement-based millboard.
7. Batts or blankets of mineral wool or glass fiber or other approved materials installed in such a manner as to be securely retained in place.
8. ~~Spray-applied~~ Cellulose insulation installed as tested for the specific application.

**Committee Reason:** This change will increase the list of products that can be used for fire blocking and will permit more options. The modification removes the limitation to spray-applied cellulose.

#### Assembly Action:

None

## FS119-09/10

### Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** NFPA is an appropriate severe fire exposure test to qualify exterior wall coverings for use without fire blocking.

#### Assembly Action:

None

## FS120-09/10

### Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that this proposal clarifies a current interpretation problem by requiring automatic sprinklers specifically where the draft stopping is being omitted.

#### Assembly Action:

None

## FS121-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that this proposal clarifies a current interpretation problem by requiring automatic sprinklers specifically where the draft stopping is being omitted.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS122-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that Chapter 26, Section 2603 already requires this and therefore this proposal is redundant.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS123-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee's disapproval was based on the following reasons: This level of protection is not required by the code; this material and application poses no threat to life-safety and regulating it achieves nothing; this proposal would require a Class A finish on a material that is used in a space where other interior finishes are required to only be Class C; the code already requires this material to meet Section 719.7, so this is redundant text or should be handled as an exception if it were not required; and lastly, the ability to enforce this after the building occupancy is a concern.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS124-09/10

### PART I- IBC GENERAL

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The dictionary term for insulation is sufficient and a code definition is not warranted. Further, the term "usually" is subjective and could lead to enforcement problems. Lastly, the definition of thermal insulation is incomplete as it can be used to reduce unwanted heat gain also.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

### PART II- IPC

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Based on the committee's action on FS124-09/10 Part I.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

### PART III - IRC

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The second sentence is commentary. The definition is too broad; pipe insulation could be used on a round duct. The proponent should get with the industry and work out an appropriate definition.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS125-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that these were editorial corrections to the table.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS126-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the revised language was consistent with terminology use in the 2005 edition of the NDS.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS127-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Disapproval was based on lack of supporting data (test report) to verify this assembly. Approved design can contain many details and specifications and the committee could not verify these without a test report that included a description.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS128-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the requirements were being decreased without justification and therefore the proposal was more than editorial.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS129-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Lack of substantiation to address the fire retardant relationship between the asbestos and the building paper.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS130-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Disapproval was based on the proponent's request and the committee's previous actions on FS5-09/10.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS131-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the critical spacing is not greater than 16 inches and therefore a spacing of less than 16 inches will be appropriate.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS132-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that this proposal is a correlative change between Section 721.6.2.3 and 705.5 based on previous code change activity, specifically FS16-07/08.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS133-09/10

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** the committee felt that this proposal could prohibit the use of a product for new construction that may meet the code for such a use. Further, requirements for change of occupancy belongs in Chapter 34 or the International Existing Building Code for existing buildings.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

### PART II- IBC STRUCTURAL

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Based on the committee's action on FS133-09/10 Part I.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS134-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt the wording was confusing in that the packaging could be tested and labeled rather than the material.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS135-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that this proposal clarified the intent of the section with respect to the issue of thin finish materials and the construction used to fur them from the face of the wall.

**Note:** The following modification was considered editorial:

**803.11.2.1 Hangers and assembly members.** The hangers and assembly members of such dropped ceilings that are below the horizontal fire-resistance-rated fire-resistive floor or roof assemblies shall be of noncombustible materials. ~~The construction of each set-out wall and horizontal fire-resistance-rated fire-resistive floor or roof assembly shall be of fire-resistance-rated construction as required elsewhere in this code.~~

**Exception:** In Types III and V construction, *fire-retardant-treated wood* shall be permitted for use as hangers and assembly members of dropped ceilings.

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

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS136-09/10

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that NFPA 286 was also an appropriate test method for polypropylene based on its similarity to polyethylene with respect to fire exposure.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

### PART II- IFC

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** Based on the committee's action on FS136-09/10 Part I.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS137-09/10

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

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

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that ASTM D2859 is an equivalent test to 16 CFR and should be included as an alternate test method for interior floor finish materials.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS138-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposal eliminated potential problems with the current code language and created code requirement that are more easily understood and enforced.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS139-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that Chapter 4 requirements should perhaps be removed if these requirements were to move to Chapter 8, however the committee was not convinced that Chapter 8 was appropriate as it deals only with interior finishes. Chapter 4 might be more appropriate as it deals with amusement structures. Lastly, the terms structure and compartment need to be defined in this context.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS140-09/10

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposed revisions to add "durable and continuous" was too ambiguous and that it would be too much for the code official to determine and verify.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

### PART II - IRC

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee feels that the term "durable and continuous" are too subjective and will create enforcement issues. The proponent should rework this and bring it back.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS141-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that deleting defined terms from the code is not appropriate or justified in this case.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS142-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee was concerned that there was no area limitations imposed on architectural trim or exterior wall veneers.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS143-09/10

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

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

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee was concerned that NFPA 289 was not appropriate for polypropylene materials. Further, no fire data to substantiate the fire hazard was provided.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS144-09/10

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

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

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as modified**

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

**Polypropylene Siding.** A shaped material, made principally from polypropylene homopolymer, or copolymer, which in some cases may contain fillers and/or reinforcements, that is used to clad exterior walls of buildings covering.

**1405.13 Polypropylene Siding.** Polypropylene siding conforming to the requirements of this section and complying with ASTM D7254 shall be limited to permitted on exterior walls of Type VB construction buildings located in areas where the wind speed specified in Chapter 16 does not exceed 100 miles per hours (45m/s) and the building height is less than or equal to 40 feet (12 192 mm) in Exposure C. Where construction is located in areas where the basic wind speed exceed 100 mile per hour (45 m/s), or building heights are in excess of 40 feet (12 192 mm), tests or calculations indicating compliance with Chapter 16 shall be submitted. Polypropylene siding shall be secured to the building so as to provide weather protection for the exterior walls of the building.

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

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that ASTM D7254 was the appropriate material standard and appropriate installation requirements were provided. The modification created further consistency with the referenced standard and the current ICC ES Acceptance Criteria.

**Assembly Action:**

### PART II - IRC

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Based on the committee's previous action on RB148-09/10. Also, this material is not permitted in the IBC.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---



## FS145-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee was concerned about the disposition of the referenced standard, ANSI 137. Further, the committee felt the proposal should be limited to porcelain tiles only and suggests the proponet bring the change back for final action with the approved standard and the suggested revisions.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS146-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the proposal clarified that cast artificial stone with minimum thickness of 1-1/2 inches is an anchored veneer rather than an adhered veneer.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS147-09/10

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that there is no difference in performance between plywood, OSB, or composite panels where the use of a Class III vapor retarder is concerned and therefore the term "wood structural panel" is appropriate.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

### PART II - IRC

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** This change appropriately groups wood structural panels into a single category.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS148-09/10

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

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** Testing of anchored masonry veneer has shown that the horizontal reinforcement has no beneficial effect. This code change removes this unnecessary requirement from the code.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS149-09/10

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

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Modified**

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

**1405.7 Stone veneer.** Stone veneer units not exceeding 10 inches (254 mm) in thickness shall be anchored directly to masonry, concrete or to stud construction by one of the following methods:

1. *(No change to current text)*
2. With wood stud backing, a 2-inch by 2-inch (51 by 51 mm) 0.0625-inch (1.59 mm) corrosion-resistant wire mesh with two layers of water-resistive barrier in accordance with Section 1404.2 shall be applied directly to wood studs spaced a maximum of 16 inches (406 mm) o.c. On studs, the mesh shall be attached with 2-inch-long (51 mm) corrosion-resistant steel wire furring nails at 4 inches (102

mm) o.c. providing a minimum 1.125-inch (29 mm) penetration into each stud and with 8d common nails at 8 inches (203 mm) o.c. into top and bottom plates or with equivalent wire ties. There shall be not less than a 0.1055-inch (2.68 mm) corrosion-resistant wire, or approved equal, looped through the mesh for every 2 square feet (0.2 m<sup>2</sup>) of stone veneer. This tie shall be a loop having legs not less than 15 inches (381 mm) in length, so bent that it will lie in the stone veneer mortar joint. The last 2 inches (51 mm) of each wire leg shall have a right-angle bend. One-inch (25 mm) minimum thickness of cement grout shall be placed between the backing and the stone veneer.

3. With cold-formed steel stud backing, a 2-inch by 2-inch (51 by 51 mm) 0.0625-inch (1.59 mm) ~~corrosion-resistant zinc-coated or non-metallic coated~~ wire mesh with two layers of water-resistive barrier in accordance with Section 1404.2 shall be applied directly to steel studs spaced a maximum of 16 inches (406 mm) o.c. The mesh shall be attached with ~~2-inch long (51 mm)~~ corrosion-resistant #8 self-drilling, tapping screws at 4 inches (102 mm) o.c. ~~providing a minimum 0.5-inch (12.7 mm) penetration into each stud~~, and at 8 inches (203 mm) o.c. into top and bottom tracks or with equivalent wire ties. All screws shall extend through the steel connection a minimum of three exposed threads. There shall be not less than a 0.1055-inch (2.68 mm) ~~corrosion-resistant zinc-coated or non-metallic coated~~ wire, or approved equal, looped through the mesh for every 2 square feet (0.2 m<sup>2</sup>) of stone veneer. This tie shall be a loop having legs not less than 15 inches (381 mm) in length, so bent that it will lie in the stone veneer mortar joint. The last 2 inches (51 mm) of each wire leg shall have a right-angle bend. One-inch (25 mm) minimum thickness of cement grout shall be placed between the backing and the stone veneer. The cold-formed steel framing members shall have a minimum ~~uncoated bare steel~~ thickness of 0.0428~~3~~ inches (1.087~~9~~ mm).

**Committee Reason:** This proposal provides a reasonable extension of stone veneer to steel studs in Section 1405.7, item 3. It also clarifies that current item 2 is specifically applicable for anchoring to wood studs. The modification substitutes wording in item 3 that is more in line with common steel industry terminology. The addition of appropriate steel stud requirements exposes problems with the current wood stud requirement (item 2) that should be addressed by a public comment.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS150-09/10

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposal was confusing because of the circular code references. Reference back to 1405.10 does not get the code user forward to the subsection of 1405.10.2.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

### PART II - IRC

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** This change provides a prescriptive method for flashing or weep screeds for adhered masonry veneer. The committee suggests the proponent improve the language to clarify where the flashing should start, above or below the plate.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS151-09/10

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposal was confusing because of the circular code references. Reference back to 1405.10 does not get the code user forward to the subsection of 1405.10.2.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

### PART II- IRC B/E

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee feels this is a good start but the list needs to be reworked so that the application is clear. The list should appear as numbered items as is done in other sections of the code. The proponent should rework this and bring it back.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS152-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the proposal was consistent with the scope of the referenced standard (ASTM F2006)

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS153-09/10

**Withdrawn by Proponent**

---

## FS154-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the proposed relocation would result in more consistent enforcement of these requirements.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS155-09/10

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt the proposal was not coordinated with the definition of fire separation distance, was too broad in its application and was already cover in the projection requirements of the code.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

### PART II- IRC B/E

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** This is intended for a specific type of housing but the language addresses more than intended. This change would create permit issues with respect to replacement. This will make compliance difficult. Also, the content of the deck could ignite even though the exception is used.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS156-09/10

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

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The proponent requested disapproval at this time so that the proposal requirements for foam plastic sheathing can be better coordinated with the energy code. This includes the treatment of positive and negative wind pressures, performance of the lateral force system as well as fastener requirements.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

### PART II- IRC B/E

The following is errata that were not posted to the ICC website.

Add to Table R703.3.1 fourth row title "EPS" and values in first column "95 125 130", add to Table R703.4 reference to footnote "aa" to 'Foam plastic sheathing into stud' column heading, delete added words to Table R703.4 footnote 'j', add strike out Section R703.5.1, add strike out and correct cross-reference Section R703.11.2.1.

**TABLE R703.3.1  
REQUIREMENTS FOR FOAM PLASTIC SHEATHING  
IN EXTERIOR WALL COVERING ASSEMBLIES<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Foam Plastic Sheathing Material <sup>3</sup>                    | Foam Sheathing Thickness (in) <sup>3</sup>     | Maximum Wind Speed (mph) – Exposure B <sup>4</sup> |                 |                               |                 |
|---|--|--|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
|   |  | Walls with Interior Finish <sup>5</sup>            |                 | Walls without Interior Finish |                 |
|   |  | 16"oc framing                                      | 24"oc framing   | 16"oc framing                 | 24"oc framing   |
| <b>Siding Offset from Foam Sheathing per Section R703.3.2.2</b> |  |  |                 |                               |                 |
| EPS   | $\frac{3}{4}$ "<br>1"<br>$\geq 1\text{-}1/2$ " | 95<br>125<br>130                                   | NP<br>85<br>130 | NP<br>105<br>130              | NP<br>NP<br>105 |

**TABLE R703.4  
WEATHER-RESISTANT SIDING ATTACHMENT AND MINIMUM THICKNESS**

| SIDING MATERIAL | NOMINAL THICKNESS <sup>a</sup> (inches) | JOINT TREATMENT | WATER RESISTIVE BARRIER REQUIRED | TYPE OF SUPPORTS FOR THE SIDING MATERIAL AND FASTENERS <sup>b,c,d</sup> |                                |                            |  |                 |  |
|-----------------|---|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
|                 |   |                 |                                  | Wood or wood structural panel sheathing                                 | Fiberboard sheathing into stud | Gypsum sheathing into stud | Foam plastic sheathing into stud <sup>aa</sup> | Direct to studs | Number or spacing of fasteners <sup>bb</sup> |
|                 |   |                 |                                  |   |                                |                            |  |                 |  |

j. Wood board sidings applied vertically shall be nailed to horizontal nailing strips or blocking set 24 inches on center. Nails shall penetrate 1 1/2 inches into studs, studs and wood sheathing combined or blocking. For application over foam sheathing, refer to Section R703.3.2.2, ~~combined or blocking~~.

**R703.5.1 Application.** Wood shakes or shingles shall be applied either single-course or double-course over nominal 1/2-inch (13 mm) wood-based sheathing or to furring strips over nominal 1/2-inch (13 mm) nonwood sheathing.

**Exception:** Wood shakes or shingles over foam plastic sheathing, shall be applied to wood furring strips in accordance with Section R703.3.2.2.

A permeable water-resistive barrier shall be provided in accordance with Section R703.2 over all sheathing, with horizontal overlaps in the membrane of not less than 2 inches (51mm) and vertical overlaps of not less than 6 inches (152 mm). Where furring strips are used, they shall be 1 inch by 3 inches or 1 inch by 4 inches (25mm by 76 mm or 25mm by 102 mm), and shall be fastened horizontally to the studs with 7d or 8d box nails. For application over foam plastic sheathing, furring strips shall be fastened in accordance with Section R703.3.2.2, and Furring strips shall be spaced a distance on center equal to the actual weather exposure of the shakes or shingles, not to exceed the maximum exposure specified in Table R703.5.2. The spacing between adjacent shingles to allow for expansion shall not exceed 1/4 inch (6 mm), and between adjacent shakes, it shall not exceed 1/2 inch (13 mm). The offset spacing between joints in adjacent courses shall be a minimum of 1 1/2 inches (38 mm).

**R703.11.2.1 Basic wind speed not exceeding 90 miles per hour and Exposure Category B.** Where the basic wind speed does not exceed 90 miles per hour (40 m/s), the Exposure Category is B and gypsum wall board or equivalent is installed on the side of the wall opposite the foam plastic sheathing, the minimum siding fastener penetration into wood framing shall be 1 1/4 inches (32 mm) using minimum 0.120-inch diameter nail (shank) with a minimum 0.313-inch diameter head, 16 inches on center. The foam plastic sheathing minimum thickness shall comply with Section R703.3.1 and shall not exceed a maximum thickness of 1.5 inches (38mm) for a 0.120-inch diameter nail or 2.0 inches (51 mm) for a 0.135-inch diameter nail. ~~shall be 1/2-inch thick (12.7 mm) (nominal) extruded polystyrene per ASTM C578, 1/2-inch thick (12.7 mm) (nominal) polyisocyanurate per ASTM C1289, or 1-inch thick (25 mm) (nominal) expanded polystyrene per ASTM C578. Vinyl siding shall be permitted to be installed on furring strips in accordance with Section R703.2.2 using the siding manufacturer's installation instructions when foam plastic sheathing thickness complies with Section R703.3.1.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown, remain the unchanged)

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** This is a needed addition to the code and will provide an efficient method to provide energy savings. The committee is concerned that this needs improvement but this is a good start. The proponent should work with industry and bring the needed improvement back to the Final Action.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

## FS157-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the proposed revisions to Section 1406 will clarify the application and interpretation of this section resulting in ease of use and enforcement. Further, the proposal brings in code-defined terms where appropriate.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS158-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the current provisions are based on appropriate data and should remain. Further, data to substantiate the removal of these provisions has not been provided. Lastly, the committee felt there was no relation between Section 1406.2.1.2 and Section 705.5.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS159-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the readability of Section 1406.2.4 is improved and that systems tested to NFPA 285 as required by Section 717 should not be limited to the 1-5/8 inch limitation.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS160-09/10

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

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

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that NFPA 275 was appropriate to qualify materials for use as thermal barriers.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

### PART II- IRC B/E

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** This change is a good improvement to the code. The new standard eliminates the need for the test procedure in the code. Also, the three UL Standards are referenced in the new standard thereby eliminates the need for the code text to refer to them.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS161-09/10

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

**Analysis:** The standard was not received by ICC staff.

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Disapproval was based on previous committee action on FS160-09/10 Part I and the proponent's request for disapproval.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

# FS162-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that testing MCM systems in accordance with NFPA 286 as appropriate and would yield conservative results.

**Note:** The following modification was considered editorial:

**1407.10.3 Thermal barrier not required.** The thermal barrier specified for MCM in Section 1407.10.2 is not required where:

1. The MCM system is specifically approved based on tests conducted in accordance with NFPA 286 ~~and (with the acceptance criteria of Section 803.1.2.1), UL 1040 or UL 1715.~~ Such testing shall be performed with the MCM in the maximum thickness intended for use. The MCM system shall include seams, joints and other typical details used in the installation and shall be tested in the manner intended for use.
2. The MCM is used as elements of balconies and similar projections, architectural trim or embellishments.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

# FS163-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Modified**

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

**1407.11.3.3 Specifications.** MCM shall be required to comply with all of the following:

1. MCM shall have a self-ignition temperature of 650°F (343°C) or greater when tested in accordance with ASTM D 1929.
2. ~~MCM shall have a smoke developed index of not more than 450 when tested in the maximum thickness intended for use in accordance with ASMT E 84 or UL 723 or a maximum average smoke density rating not greater than 75 when tested in the maximum thickness intended for use in accordance with ASTM D 2843.~~
23. MCM shall conform to one of the following combustibility classifications when tested in accordance with ASTM D 635:

**Class CC1:** Materials that have a burning extent of 1 inch (25 mm) or less when tested at a nominal thickness of 0.060 inch (1.5 mm) or in the thickness intended for use.

**Class CC2:** Materials that have a burning rate of 2 ½ inches per minute (1.06 mm/s) or less when tested at a nominal thickness of 0.060 inch (1.5 mm) or in the thickness intended for use.

**1407.11.4.2 Specifications.** MCM shall be required to comply with all of the following:

1. MCM shall have a self-ignition temperature of 650°F (343°C) or greater when tested in accordance with ASTM D 1929.
2. ~~MCM shall have a smoke developed index of not more than 450 when tested in the maximum thicknesses intended for use in accordance with ASMT E 84 or UL 723 or a maximum average smoke density rating not greater than 75 when tested in the maximum thicknesses intended for use in accordance with ASTM D 2843.~~
23. MCM shall conform to one of the following combustibility classifications when tested in accordance with ASTM D 635:

**Class CC1:** Materials that have a burning extent of 1 inch (25 mm) or less when tested at a nominal thickness of 0.060 inch (1.5 mm), or in the thickness intended for use.

**Class CC2:** Materials that have a burning rate of 2 ½ inches per minute (1.06 mm/s) or less when tested at a nominal thickness of 0.060 inch (1.5 mm), or in the thickness intended for use.

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

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that metal composite materials (MCM) should be used consistently with light transmitting plastics based on similar fire hazards. The modification eliminates confusion with the fact that MCM panels are currently required to meet ASTM E84.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

## FS164-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that these were appropriate technical requirements for the new finish material and that suggested improvements related to referencing equivalent testing standards can be proposed in the public comment period for Final Action consideration.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS165-09/10

**Withdrawn by Proponent**

---

## FS166-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that Section 2603.3 already has this requirement and therefore this proposal is redundant.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS167-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the current language was clearer than the proposal.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS168-09/10

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that in current construction practices there are more conditions where there is direct communication between crawl spaces and attics and the interior of the building. As such, providing this as a limitation for allowing foam plastics to be protected only by an ignition barrier is appropriate.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

### PART II- IRC B/E

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** This change clarifies this section more and adds an additional layer of safety as stated in the proponent's published reason.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS169-09/10

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that using inorganic coated glass mat as an ignition barrier was not justified. Further, the appropriateness of the testing threshold is unknown.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

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

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** There was not sufficient test data submitted. A specific standard needs to be referenced for this product. The committee feels that there needs to be a standard for ignition barrier, rather than continue to add to the list of products. ICC-ES is working toward this and this should be brought back later.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**FS170-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Based on a lack of technical justification and the proponent's request for disapproval.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**FS171-09/10**

**PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY**

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

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

**2603.4.1.14 Floors.** The thermal barrier specified in Section 2603.4 is not required to be installed on the walking surface of a structural floor system that contains foam plastic insulation when the foam plastic is covered by a minimum nominal ½-inch (12.7 mm) thick wood structural panel or approved equivalent. The thermal barrier specified in Section 2603.4 is required on the underside of the structural floor system that contains foam plastic insulation when the underside of the structural floor system is exposed to the interior of the building.

**Exception:** Foam plastic used as part of an interior floor finish.

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that this proposal reflects current construction practices and did not pose a significant hazard. The modification adds code-consistent language to verify that the equivalent is approved by the code official.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

**PART II- IRC B/E**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** This change provides a viable means to require adequate barriers for foam plastic in floors that is consistent with the protection for attics and crawl spaces. This recognizes the use of SIPS panels for floors which is already in the IRC.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**FS172-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that using small scale testing to predict large scale results is not appropriate to qualify alternate foam plastic materials.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**FS173-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that this proposal was reasonable and reflects standard labeling practices.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---



## FS174-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that these requirements are appropriate to qualify a foam plastic for use in plenums.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS175-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Based on the committee's previous action on FS174-09/10 and the proponent's request for disapproval.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS176-09/10

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Based on apparent conflicts with the *International Energy Conservation Code* and the proponent's request for disapproval.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

### PART II- IRC B/E

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Based on the proponent's request for disapproval. The proponent will work with industry and incorporate the out of order modification and bring this back to the Final Action.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS177-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt there was insufficient data to support this allowance and that if this was to be placed in the code it should be in a separate exception.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS178-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that it was appropriate to include smoke developed requirements for interior finishes qualified under the special approval requirements to provide a comparable level of safety to the provisions of Chapter 8.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS179-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that this change clarifies and coordinates the relationship between testing performed in accordance with NFPA 285 and testing performed for special approval.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS180-09/10

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

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** As worded, the proposal would require guards or screens at all skylights and that is considered unnecessary. The requirement should also apply to skylights that are not glass, yet the proposed text specifically refers to the glass below the guard. In addition the area of the screen over which the 200 pound force should be applied is not specified. A consensus test standard is being worked on currently that should resolve this.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS181-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt there was a lack of data to indicate that a plastic skylight with metal edge protection is a fire exposure problem.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS182-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Modified**

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

**2610.2 Mounting.** The light-transmitting plastic shall be mounted above the plane of the roof on a curb constructed in accordance with the requirements for the type of construction classification, but at least 4 inches (102 mm) above the plane of the roof. Edges of the light-transmitting plastic skylights or domes shall be protected by metal or other approved noncombustible material, or the light transmitting plastic dome or skylight shall be shown to be able to resist ignition where exposed at the edge to a flame from a Class B brand as described in ASTM E 108 or UL 790. The Class B brand test shall be conducted on a skylight that is elevated to a height as specified in ~~by~~ the manufacturer's installation instructions, but not less than 4 inches (102 mm).

**Exceptions:**

*(Exception remain unchanged)*

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposal appropriately ties the testing with the actual installation requirements specific to a given skylight. The modifications clarify the intent by specifically mentioning the installation instructions.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS183-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** To allow for approval was to allow for skylights with larger aspect ratios, the committee agreed that basing the rise required on the maximum span is excessive and referring to the maximum width, while retaining the minimum of 3 inches, is appropriate.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS184-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that foam plastic cores are used with FRP composite panels and as such the code requirements of Chapter 26 are applicable and should be referenced.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS185-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Modified**

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

**2612.6 Exterior use.** Fiber reinforced polymer shall be permitted to be installed on the *exterior walls* of buildings of ~~any type of Types IV and V~~ construction when such polymers meet the requirements of Section 2603.5. Fireblocking shall be installed in accordance with Section 717.

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

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that this change was simply a clarification of the current technical requirements. The modification put the language back to reference any type of construction as there was insufficient technical justification to limit the installation of fiber reinforced polymer to Types IV and V construction.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS186-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposal provided a good compromise to address the basic fuel loading concerns of FRP used on the exterior walls of building s any type of construction.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS187-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Disapproval was based on a lack of technical justification to remove the established FRP requirements. Further, the committee prefers the language in code change proposal FS186-09/10.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS188-09/10

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

**Analysis:** Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard not comply with ICC standards criteria.

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that ASTM E2599 was an appropriate standard for preparation and mounting of reflective plastic core insulation for testing in accordance with ASTM E84 or UL 723.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS189-09/10

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

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

**Analysis:** Review of proposed new standards ASTM D 7032 and D 7031 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6. Review of proposed new standard ASTM D 2017 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.2(1). Review of proposed new document AC 174 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria. Acceptance criteria are developed for use solely by ICC-ES for purposes of issuing ICC-ES evaluation reports. Acceptance criteria are not for use outside of the ICC-ES system. ICC-ES Acceptance Criteria are not intended to be code-referenced documents.

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Wood plastic composite materials are currently qualified by evaluation reports and including them in the code is not appropriate at this time. It is important to be able to verify design capacities.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **FS190-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee was not clear on how the proposal was an improvement over the existing text and the proponent was not present to answer the committees questions.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **FS191-09/10**

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx>.

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that recycling chutes are becoming common practice in building construction and result in similar hazards as those associated with refuse and laundry chutes.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **FS192-09/10**

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx>.

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies that the fireblocking and draftstopping addressed in the exception #5 is in the attic, not the floor fireblocking and draftstopping.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **FS193-09/10**

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx>.

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that this proposal appropriately clarifies the intent and application of the requirements for smoke and draft control doors.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## **FS194-09/10**

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx>.

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** Disapproval was based on the lack of technical justification for the lesser thickness of sub-duct in exception 2.1.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## FS195-09/10

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx>.

### PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt these sections should remain as the definition of smoke compartment indicates that smoke compartments are enclosed by smoke barriers on all sides, including the top and bottom. Also, this action is consistent with the committee's action on FS196-09/10.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

### PART II- IBC GENERAL

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt these sections should remain as the definition of smoke compartment indicates that smoke compartments are enclosed by smoke barriers on all sides, including the top and bottom. Also, this action is consistent with the committee's action on FS196-09/10.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS196-09/10

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx>.

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The reference to 407.4 is not appropriate as this section eventually requires enclosed elevator lobbies; further correlation is required. Further, the proposal seems redundant with exception #4. Lastly, removing the lobby enclosure for these buildings would inhibit the ability to defend a fire in place.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## FS197-09/10

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to <http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx>.

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the average total heat release (3 MJ/m<sup>2</sup>) and the heat flux of 50 kW/m<sup>2</sup> were too low and required further justification. Also test method ASTM E1354, which tests for low combustibility, is inappropriate to determine equivalence to the ASTM E136 test method for noncombustibility.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---