

**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

	Page
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

Acronym ICC Code Name (Code change number prefix)

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

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

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

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

ICC WEBSITE - WWW.ICCSAFE.ORG

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

REFERENCED STANDARDS UPDATES

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

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

MODIFICATIONS BY PUBLIC COMMENT

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

FINAL ACTION CONSIDERATION

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

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

CALL FOR ADOPTION INFORMATION

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

CP# 28-05 CODE DEVELOPMENT

Approved: 9/24/05

Revised: 2/27/09

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

1.0 Introduction

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

2.0 Code Development Cycle

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

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

- 2.2 New Editions:** The ICC Board shall determine the schedule for publishing new editions of the Codes. Each new edition shall incorporate the results of the code development activity since the last edition.
- 2.3 Supplements:** The results of code development activity between editions may be 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	--	² / ₃ Majority	² / ₃ Majority
AM	² / ₃ Majority	² / ₃ Majority	² / ₃ Majority
D	² / ₃ Majority	² / ₃ Majority	--

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

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

6.0 Public Comments

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7.0 Final Action Consideration

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public Hearing Action (see note)	Desired Final Action		
	AS	AM	D
AS	Simple Majority	$\frac{2}{3}$ 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*[®]
 - Fire Safety (FS)
 - General (G)
 - Means of Egress (E)
 - Structural (S)
- *International Existing Building Code*[®] (EB)
- *International Fire Code*[®] (F)
- *International Fuel Gas Code*[®] (FG)
- *International Mechanical Code*[®] (M)
- *International Plumbing Code*[®] (P)
- *International Residential Code*[®]
 - Building (RB)
 - Mechanical (RM)
 - Plumbing (RP)
- *International Wildland-Urban Interface Code*[®] (IWUIC)

**2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE
General Code Development Committee**

Dan Weed, CBO - Chair

Rep: City of Central
Plans Analyst/Instructor
Colorado Code Consulting
Thornton, CO

**Mark Stimac, RA, CBO - Vice
Chair**

Director of Building and Zoning
City of Troy
Troy, MI

Don Davies

Chief Plans Examiner
Salt Lake City Corporation
Salt Lake City, UT

Christina Jamison

Rep: International Assoc. of Fire
Chiefs
Division Chief/Fire Marshal
San Ramon Valley Fire Protection
District
San Ramon, CA

Vickie Lovell

President
InterCode Incorporated
Delray Beach, FL

Homer Maiel, PE, CBO

Senior Engineer
City of San Jose, Building
Division
San Jose, CA

Anthony Merlino

Construction Official
Village of Ridgewood
Ridgewood, NJ

John Morgan, MCP

Building Commissioner
City of Frontenac
Frontenac, MO

Agustin Mujica

Rep: National Assoc. of Home
Builders
Co-Owner & Vice President of
Operations
Levitt Homes Corporation
San Juan, PR

Sharon Myers

Master Plans Examiner
State of Ohio
Reynoldsburg, OH

Gregory Nicholls, AIA

Chief Building Official
City of Mason
Mason, OH

Carroll Pruitt, FAIA

President/CEO
Pruitt Consulting, Inc.
Keller, TX

Sarah Rice, CBO

SRice Consulting
Cincinnati, OH

Carol Sue Rouw, AIA, LEED, AP

Senior Project Manager/Architect
Treanor Architects
St. Louis, MO

Scott Satula

Rep: ICC Upper Great Plains
Region III
Director of Inspection Services
Village of Greendale
Greendale, WI

Staff Secretariat:

Kermit Robinson, CBO

Senior Technical Staff
International Code Council

**INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE
GENERAL COMMITTEE
HEARING RESULTS**

G1-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee supported the concept of moving the definition to Chapter 2 because it is a definition that applies throughout the code, however it was felt that the wording of the definition needed to be refined. Referrals to code sections within definitions are inappropriate and only used in Chapter 2 when the definition itself is located in a different section. The committee felt that the language of the exception to Section 419.1 needed further refinement.

Assembly Action: **None**

G2-09/10

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

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It is not necessary or advisable to relocate the definition of patio cover into the body of the code. The proposed definition lacks clarity and it is preferable to keep the current definition of patio cover in Appendix I.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC – B/E

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that the definition is too broad and could apply to other structures such as a tent. The height issue should be a planning and zoning issue and not part of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

G3-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal corrects the oversight that roof construction should be treated the same as floor construction within the context of secondary members.

Assembly Action: **None**

G4-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This definition would result in a major shift in the scoping of the IBC and IRC. No correlating change had been proposed for the IRC. The committee concluded that this change would have a cost impact on construction.

Assembly Action: **None**

G5-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

VAPOR PERMEABLE MEMBRANE. ~~A material or covering~~ The property of having a moisture vapor permeance rating of ~~5 40 perms~~ (~~$2.9 5.7 \times 10^{-10}$ kg/Pa•s•m²~~) or greater, when tested in accordance with the desiccant method using Procedure A of ASTM E 96. A vapor permeable material permits the passage of moisture vapor.

Committee Reason: The modification changes the term into an adjective that can be a descriptor of either a material or an assembly of materials. The modification also retains the existing permeance rating of 5 perms that is in the 2009 codes and is the consensus rating of various industries affected.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IRC – B/E

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

VAPOR PERMEABLE MEMBRANE. ~~A material or covering~~ Having a moisture vapor permeance rating of ~~5 40 perms~~ (~~$2.9 5.7 \times 10^{-10}$ kg/Pa•s•m²~~) or greater, when tested in accordance with the desiccant method using Procedure A of ASTM E 96. A vapor permeable material permits the passage of moisture vapor.

Committee Reason: This proposal changes the definition from material specific to an adjective that makes it clear the break point between vapor permeable and otherwise. The modification restores the perm rating and removes the term "material". The proposed perm rating would have created inconsistencies within the code.

Assembly Action:

None

G6-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This would eliminate the evaluation of the actual variety of activities that occur in a fire station, and also the protections that would result based on a mixed occupancy application. Under the current code the sleeping areas are considered an R-occupancy and thus will be sprinkler protected. Changing fire stations to be solely a B occupancy would remove that protection from the firefighters and the protection of the community investment in the facility. These facilities are frequently used in disaster response. Any loss would significantly hamper response time.

Assembly Action:

None

G7-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The term limited combustible is not used in the International Building Code. Where such term is included in a referenced standard, the definition in the referenced standard should be used.

Assembly Action:

None

G8-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal because there was no clear analysis of the implications of changing the time period under which a structure is considered temporary. Such a change would need to be correlated through the rest of the codes as well as its application to other structures rather than just modular structures. If a change in the length of time were to be

considered, it should be stated in days as compared to months because a month is an extended period and would not be consistently applied.

Assembly Action: **None**

G9-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee did not believe that the proposed definition of non-combustible reflected all of the various uses of the term in the code. Installing this definition could unintentionally affect application of other provisions.

Assembly Action: **None**

G10-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change because of concerns that a larger assembly space in a school that was used for non-school activities would not get an appropriate classification of an A occupancies. The replacing of the phrase 'accessory to' with the phrase 'associated with' was felt to be more subjective. The committee also expressed concern about losing the direct reference to Chapter 11.

Assembly Action: **None**

G11-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that the change could allow the a private school associated with a religious institution to be classified as an A occupancy rather than the appropriate E occupancy for all schools.

Assembly Action: **None**

G12-09/10 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

G13-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee concluded that the proposed language was confusing and too broad in its application. In larger apartment complexes such spaces often have large gatherings. Changing the occupancy of such spaces from Group A to Group R would take away various code protections for assembly spaces such as panic hardware. The existing exception allowing a 750 sq. ft. assembly space to be classified the same as the primary occupancy is an appropriate threshold.

Assembly Action: **None**

G14-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

303.1 (IFC [B] 202) Assembly Group A. Assembly Group A occupancy includes, among others, the use of a building or structure, or a portion thereof, for the gathering of persons for purposes such as civic, social or religious functions; recreation, food or drink consumption or awaiting transportation.

A-2 Assembly uses intended for food for food and/or drink consumption including, but not limited to:

Banquet halls
Casinos (gaming areas)

Night clubs
Restaurants
Taverns and bars

Committee Reason: The committee approved the change with the modification because reliance on a dictionary definition of casinos would include more activities than just the gaming areas. The modification is consistent with the proponents intent and is needed so that one didn't think that the guest rooms, offices, retail shops and theaters often included in a large casino were to be classified as a Group A-2 occupancy. The change is consistent with current practice in many jurisdictions with casino facilities.

Assembly Action: **None**

G15-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The changes clarify the regulations of the ambulatory care facilities. It will also result in the IBC requirements being more consistent with CMS standards than they are currently.

Assembly Action: **None**

G16-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The change would leave a gap in the code for facilities where 1 to 5 people are receiving care but they are not located in a dwelling unit. The proposal appeared to not provide an occupancy classification for this size of facilities.

Assembly Action: **None**

G17-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code change as written does not solve what has become a very complex and legally contentious issue. There was no correlating change for the IRC which would be the code under which most of the buildings addressed by the proposal would be regulated. A modification proposed would have changed the proposal to being simply a definition that would not have then been a term used in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

G18-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The term 'commercial kitchen' may be appropriate to add to the list of Group F-1 occupancies, but there is such a wide range of activities that could be considered a commercial kitchen, the committee felt that a definition of the term would be needed to go along with the listing.

Assembly Action: **None**

G19-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee acknowledged that repair garages have a long history as a Group S occupancy and moving them to the Group F occupancy is not justified. The change would result in a reduction in allowable area for such facilities. In addition, there was a concern that the movement of Sec. 903.2.9.1 to be new section 903.2.4.2 was incomplete because it still contained references to the Group S-1 occupancy.

Assembly Action: **None**

G20-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

308.2 Definitions. The following words and terms shall, for the purposes of this section and as used elsewhere in this code, have the meanings shown herein.

DETOXIFICATION FACILITIES. Facilities that ~~provided~~ provide treatment for substance abuse serving care recipients who are incapable of self-preservation or who are harmful to themselves or others.

HOSPITALS AND PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS. Facilities that ~~provides~~ provide care or treatment for the medical, psychiatric, obstetrical, or surgical treatment of ~~inpatients~~ care recipients that are incapable of self-preservation.

[F] 903.2. 8 (IFC 903.2.8) Group R. An automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3 shall be provided throughout all buildings with a Group R *fire area*.

An *automatic sprinkler system* installed in accordance with 903.3.1.3 shall be permitted in congregate residences with 16 or fewer residents. An automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with 903.3.1.3 shall be permitted in care facilities with 5 or fewer individuals in a single family dwelling.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The change reflects a collaborative effort to refine and clarify the various care occupancies. The committee remains concerned about the definition of foster care and its relationship to various state laws. In addition there was concern regarding undefined terms introduced by the change, specifically "Initial stage Alzheimer's" and 'long term care'. The committee acknowledged that this is not the same as the various state regulations, but provided a better framework for states to coordinate their regulations. On balance, the change improves the code and the committee hopes to see public comments to clarify the definitions.

Assembly Action:

None

G21-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee acknowledged the proponent's effort to provide clarity to these regulations, but felt that the restructuring of the Group I-1, I-2 and R-4 occupancies to be unclear. There was concern that the resulting reductions in Table 503 were not justified. They found the additional provisions proposed in Section 420 to be confusing as to how they would be applied. The proposed smoke compartments are small and did not seem coordinated with other portions of the proposal.

Assembly Action:

None

G22-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt it was inappropriate to move assisted living to the Group I-2 category. The evacuation levels would be hard to evaluate. By changing assisted living from Group I-1 to I-2 the individual sleeping rooms would no longer be provided with smoke detectors.

Assembly Action:

None

G23-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The changes in this proposal will not blend with the approved changes in G20-09/10. It doesn't sufficiently address the issues identified with respect to care occupancies.

Assembly Action:

None

G24-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The IRC has its own sprinkler requirements and the IBC should not be used to specify sprinkler requirements in buildings subject to the IRC. In addition it would set up a conflict between the sprinkler systems allowed by the IRC and those that would be required under this change.

Assembly Action:

None

G25-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change because it did not clearly address how to treat multiple mercantile spaces each with an occupant load of less than 50, but located in the same building. Would the occupant load of these spaces be aggregated? The application of other code provisions were also unclear to the committee including the determination of toilet facilities. This could result in sprinklers not being required in a mercantile space that would be required under Group M. Occupants of a Group B tend to be familiar with the spaces they are using, which can not be said for occupants in a mercantile area.

Assembly Action:

None

G26-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee preferred G27-09/10. While the extended lists may be helpful, there was a concern that the overlaps were not clear. Finally the committee felt that the redundant use of transient and non-transient was helpful and some of those were eliminated by this proposal.

Assembly Action:

None

G27-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Committee approved the change because it provided a clear format for these provisions and shows that the extensive listing shown in G26-09/10 is not needed.

Assembly Action:

None

G28-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would set up a potential conflict with the already defined term of 'sleeping unit' and therefore the application of Chapter 11 would be unclear. There would also be a need to address this use in Chapter 29 regarding plumbing fixture requirements.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IRC – B/E

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a good change but it needs more work. The term "to be constructed" implies new construction and renovations need to be addressed. Also, some of the distinctions would be better suited in the Zoning Code rather than the IRC.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

R101.2 Scope. The provisions of the *International Residential Code for One- and Two-family Dwellings* shall apply to the construction, *alteration*, movement, enlargement, replacement, repair, equipment, use and occupancy, location, removal and demolition of detached one- and two-family dwellings and townhouses not more than three stories above *grade plane* in height with a separate means of egress and their *accessory structures*.

Exceptions:

1. Live/work units complying with the requirements of Section 419 of the *International Building Code* shall be permitted to be built as one- and two-family *dwellings* or townhouses. Fire suppression required by Section 419.5 of the *International Building Code* when constructed under the *International Residential Code for One- and Two-family Dwellings* shall conform to Section ~~P2904~~ ~~903.3.1.3~~ ~~of the International Building Code~~.
2. Owner occupied lodging houses with five or fewer guest rooms shall be permitted to be constructed in accordance with the *International Residential Code for One- and Two-family Dwellings*.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Reason for modification: The modification adds the term "owner occupied" and would aid the misinterpretation about accessibility. The modification also will assure these units will be sprinklered.

G29-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would base occupancy category on ownership pattern. Such distinctions are inappropriate for the building code regulations.

Assembly Action:

None

G30-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the change found in G27-09/10. This change did not provide sufficient clarity to the issue.

Assembly Action:

None

G31-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee acknowledged the effort to clarify the application of the covered mall provisions to the open mall concept. The proposal needs additional refinements. Of specific concern is the lack of clarity regarding balconies and bridges and the extent to which they could "cover" the open mall; the relationship of the perimeter line to the anchor buildings and to the required open area around the open mall building; the relationship of the perimeter line with exit discharge as it would appear to permit exit access to dead end where a perimeter line adjoined an anchor building.

Assembly Action:

None

G32-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal was confusing and may not be properly correlated with Table 503. The provisions need to be clarified with respect to the anchor buildings and their relationship to the covered (or open) mall building.

Assembly Action:

None

G33-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal could create large warehouse spaces in covered mall buildings, and such space would be inappropriate. Where they were access by the exit passageways, there would be an increase of movement of goods and materials in the passageways running a higher risk that the path of egress travel would be blocked. Such spaces would not have the same relationship with the mercantile space as would a storage area at the back of a retail space would have. In the latter there would likely be more staff activity where potential problems could be more readily observed.

Assembly Action:

None

G34-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal presents a radical departure from years of determining the allowable size of buildings based on both height and area. Without area limits, any building would become an unlimited area building and the code would no longer require 60 foot wide open areas surrounding such buildings – thus eliminating the access for firefighting operations. Work in the past cycles by the CTC and others attempted to resolved height and area issues. For each such change the committee requested to see technical justification for changing the requirements in Table 503 and related sections. Like many of those past proposals, this proposal is without technical substantiation. The very brief reason does not provide any examples of the impact of eliminating area limits from the code.

Assembly Action:

None

G35-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change clarifies the provisions. The committee found that the current requirement that increased the requirements applicable to a detached parking garage located near a covered mall building to be unjustified.

Assembly Action:

None

G36-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed fire barrier requirement is excessive. The concept of the proposal is flawed because you won't have an unsprinklered condition because mall buildings are required to be sprinkler protected whether they are a covered or open mall building.

Assembly Action:

None

G37-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the existing code language was sufficiently clear regarding atriums in mall buildings. If there is a need for a distinction regarding various atrium facilities in a covered mall building, revised language should clarify why the distinction is necessary and the analysis needed to determine the distinction.

Assembly Action:

None

G38-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change provides consistency with Section 402.12.1.

Assembly Action:

None

G39-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee did not find that there was a good correlation between the concept of compartmentation and the proponent's stated goal that this additional level of protection would work toward preventing collapse of building involved in catastrophic events. They found the 10,000 square foot number to be arbitrary and not technically substantiated.

Assembly Action:

None

G40-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would require the enclosure walls to resist more than the structure, floors and the stair framing are capable of withstanding. In the event of a blast it is preferable that the walls blow out rather than the floor collapse. The determination of this proposed pressure remains unclear and seems to be arbitrary – whether it be the 2 psi as originally proposed or the 1.3 psi offered as a modification. The ability of current enclosure wall systems to resist the proposed loading is questionable and there was not enough information provided on what types of enclosure construction could satisfy this requirement. The provision should also provide some direction to designers and building officials. There are questions on the testing of 8 feet high wall panels and the extrapolation of the results to greater height walls. Before taking this step, the committee would prefer to see the ASCE/SEI blast document that is being developed.

In addition, there appears to be a lack of an appropriate systems engineering approach to solving the problem. Instead there is some feeling of a preconceived notion of a solution to some vaguely specified problem. There's concern that we may spend the time and money strengthening stair enclosures, yet the next blast event could result in the same problem or create new problems that are worse than the one that we're attempting to solve. The reason airplanes are not designed for blasts is that there is no agreement on the size of the blast, yet that is what this proposal tries to do inside the building. There's some concern that all this requirement would do is give a terrorist the information needed to size a bomb so that it will take out a stair enclosure.

Assembly Action:

None

G41-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee's disapproval is based on the lack of substantiating data to show that bond strength failure is not an issue for SFRM. Further, this action provides for consistency with the committee's action on G42-09/10.

Assembly Action:

None

G42-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee's disapproval is based on the lack of substantiating data to show that the proposed reduced bond strength for SFRM would be appropriate. Also, no justification was provided to show that there was a significant cost increase between providing SFRM with a bond strength of 430 psf and SFRM with a bond strength of 250 psf.

Assembly Action: None

G43-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change relocates the requirements to the appropriate location in the code and removes redundant language.

Assembly Action: None

G44-09/10

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.

Both parts of this code change proposal were heard by the IBC General Code Development Committee.

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal for a variety of reasons. The application to all high-rise buildings regardless of height was judged excessive. Providing surveillance every 5 floors did not provide very much situational awareness as intended by the proposal. Because there were so many exceptions for elevator lobbies, the effectiveness in those areas was uncertain. The occupant evacuation elevator requirements would provide communications in elevator lobbies, this system should be connected to the proposed system. There would be costs to installing such systems, especially as it relates to providing emergency power connections. The proponent should have provided more detailed cost impact information. Reference to the standard, while appropriate, was clear that the facial recognition was not required under the IBC provisions, but not for the reference contained in the IFC.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IFC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistent with the action taken to disapprove Part I.

Assembly Action: None

G45-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal provides clarification regarding standby power requirements for high-rise buildings and the elevators in the buildings.

Assembly Action: None

G46-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The purpose of the third stairway is to allow for the fire service to take one stairway out of service for fire department activities. The third stairway is in excess to the required means of egress. Therefore, allowing for the option of occupant evacuation elevators in place of the third stairway will not reduce the required means of egress. The occupant evacuation elevator is future technology that is supported by NIST and the World Trade Center report. The tradeoff is an incentive to get effective technology into high rise buildings that will significantly reduce the time needed for evacuation of high rise buildings. This is especially important when a full building evacuation is deemed necessary. It is a significant improvement for persons with disability to allow for self-evacuation with the general population as well as to allow for them to evacuate with their mobility devices.

Assembly Action: **None**

G47-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The same stairway enclosure should have the same level of protection all the way up and down. It is not clear how many levels would be permitted below the level of exit discharge, or how the proposed separation would address the exit discharge for the stairway coming up from the basement levels and possibly through the smokeproof enclosure.

Assembly Action: **None**

G48-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The option of three elevators in G49-09/10 is preferred to one or two elevators with a higher capacity car as proposed in this item. If the trade-off is capacity vs. number of elevators the fire service would prefer more elevators to allow for different elevators to be used for different purposes. Whether fire service elevators need to be also sized for stretchers can be addressed in G157-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

G49-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Reason: Redundancy in the number of elevators available for fire department use is critical for effective fire fighting operations in buildings tall enough to need Fire Service Access elevators. Elevators size can be addressed in G157-09/10. While there are some issues of additional cost, small foot-print buildings are addressed in the additional language of "or all elevators, whichever is less."

Assembly Action: **None**

G50-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee liked the proposed reformatting of the provisions because it provided clarity to the existing requirements, however the change included some technical flaws. Therefore the committee felt that G51-09/10 better addressed the issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

G51-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides a clear answer to the question of whether doors are allowed in the glass wall forming the separation between an atrium and adjoining spaces.

Assembly Action: **None**

G52-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal sets no limit on the number of stories or travel distance. In tall buildings the atrium could potentially fill up with smoke enough that some upper floors would have the use of the exit stairway jeopardized. It is not clear how this revision will coordinate with the committee's approval of E5-09/10 for open exit access stairways and open exit stairways.

Assembly Action: **None**

G53-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

SECTION 406 MOTOR-VEHICLE RELATED OCCUPANCIES

406.1 General. Motor vehicle related occupancies shall comply with Sections 406.1 through 406.8 and the *International Fire Code, International Mechanical Code and International Fuel Gas Code*.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee approved the change because it provides a clearer organization of the motor vehicle related sections found in Section 406. The committee modified the proposal to delete the references to other codes as unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

G54-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The organization issues were resolved by approval of Item G53-09/10. The committee was uncertain that the revised definitions contained in this proposal were necessary or provided clear application to the rest of the section. In addition there was concern regarding adding a vehicle weight limit to the definition of a parking garage. The committee was concerned regarding its enforceability or that it was even necessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

G55-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change clarifies that doors are to be 20 minute rated. The existing link to Section 715 does not provide that information.

Assembly Action: **None**

G56-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Replace the proposal with the following: The modification completely replaces the original proposal and contains a single revision to Item 1 of Section 406.1.4.

406.1.4 Separation. Separations shall comply with the following:

1. The private garage shall be separated from the *dwelling unit* and its *attic* area by means of a minimum 1/2-inch (12.7 mm) gypsum board applied to the garage side. Garages beneath habitable rooms shall be separated from all habitable rooms above by not less than a 5/8-inch (15.9 mm) Type X gypsum board or equivalent and 1/2 -inch (12.7 mm) gypsum board applied to structures supporting the separation from habitable rooms above the garage. Door openings between a private garage and the *dwelling unit* shall be equipped with either solid wood doors or solid or honeycomb core steel doors not less than 1 3/8 inches (34.9 mm) thick, or doors in compliance with Section 715.4.3. Openings from a private garage directly into a room used for sleeping purposes shall not be permitted. Doors shall be self-closing and self-latching.
2. and 3. *(no change to current text)*

Committee Reason: The change brings consistency with the IRC provisions and clarifies the protection needed for supporting construction.

Assembly Action:

PART II – IRC B/E

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that the current text is adequate and this change is not needed. There is no justification to require all ceilings to be 5/8 inch Type X Gypsum.

Assembly Action: **None**

G57-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change based on concerns that the reduced height would allow a significant increase in fuel load in a confined spaces. The proposal is unclear whether the height exception is intended for the equipment or the space in which the equipment is located.

Assembly Action: **None**

G58-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change because they do not agree with the proponent that a parking garage can meet the intent of being an open parking garage with openings on just one side.

Assembly Action: **None**

G59-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal because the open parking garage standards have been working for many years and the proponent did not provide sufficient justification to make the change. There was no clear basis for the proposed 6 foot dimension. Finally the committee found the proposed text unclear.

Assembly Action: **None**

G60-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee found the text confusing and it would seem to require a below grade area that would have to be wider at the bottom than at the top of the opening at grade. There was debate whether the 1 - 1/2 factor was appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

G61-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the values for height and area provided in Table 406.3.5 are sufficient for open parking garages and that additions allowed by Sections 504 and 506 would be an inappropriate expansion in the allowable size of open parking garages.

Assembly Action: **None**

G62-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee believes that the proposal provides a fair approach which will provide consistent ventilation for each level of a parking garages regardless of the floor to ceiling height of a particular design or the demands imposed on the design by different construction types. The 7 foot dimension correlates to the minimum required ceiling height in parking garages.

Assembly Action: **None**

G63-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

G64-09/10

Both parts of this code change proposal were heard by the General Code Development Committee.

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that standards for automated garages eventually need to be in the code, however this proposal needs further refinement. Among the issues identified by the committee that need to be clarified are: How would sprinklers be provided; Should there be different criteria if these are in open versus enclosed garages; Egress and accessibility need to be addressed; While there may be limited occupant load, the occupancy is still a storage facility for cars, therefore a Group S occupancy. Clear provisions on structural requirements would need to be added.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II- IFC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee questioned the selection of the 6500 pound limit for the vehicles. Many common vehicles exceed that weight. The committee also felt there was not sufficient justification provided for listing these as a Class I commodity based on the fuel load present. Proponent should reconsider the classification.

Assembly Action:

 None

G65-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1008.1.9.6 (IFC [B] 1008.1.9.6) Special Locking arrangements in Group I-2. Approved special egress locks shall be permitted in a Group I-2 occupancy where the clinical needs of persons receiving care require such locking. Special egress locks shall be permitted in such occupancies where the building is equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or an approved automatic smoke or heat detection system installed in accordance with Section 907, provided that the doors are installed and operated in accordance with Items 1 through 7 below.

1. The doors unlock upon actuation of the automatic sprinkler system or automatic fire detection system.
2. The doors unlock upon loss of power controlling the lock or lock mechanism.
3. The door locks shall have the capability of being unlocked by a signal from the fire command center, a nursing station or other approved location.
4. A building occupant shall not be required to pass through more than one door equipped with a special egress lock before entering an exit.
5. The procedures for the operation(s) of the unlocking system shall be described and approved as part of the emergency planning and preparedness required by Chapter 4 of the *International Fire Code*.
6. All clinical staff shall have the keys, codes or other means necessary to operate the locking devices.
7. Emergency lighting shall be provided at the door.

Exception: Items 1 through 4 shall not apply to doors to areas where persons which because of clinical needs require restraint or containment as part of the function of psychiatric treatment areas.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee has asked the proponents to develop a comprehensive set of revisions to address this occupancy and such is what they provided by this proposal. Smoke compartments have been clarified as has the limitations on egress. Terminology has been refined and is more consistent with terminology used by health care providers. The modification was simply to have the charging paragraph reflect that the 7 items addressed both installation and operation requirements.

Assembly Action:

 None

G66-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was technically linked to G23-09/10 which was disapproved. The proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action:

 None

G67-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The revisions coordinate and clarify the stage area egress requirements currently in Sections 410 and 1015.6. Terminology has been revised to reflect the current style of theater design.

Assembly Action:

 None

G68-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The term is no longer used in the industry and except for a title is not used in the text of the IBC. Unused terms should not be defined in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

G69-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that the stage floor may not be the best place for these manual means to operate the ventilator. If there is a fire, there is a good chance that it is on the stage and access to these manual operators would be lost. The committee expressed some confusion over the phrase 'manual emergency opening'.

Assembly Action: **None**

G70-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as it was felt it would eliminate sprinklers in critical areas such as gridirons.

Assembly Action: **None**

G71-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it coordinates with NFPA 409 in intent by not needing to include ancillary uses such as offices within the fire area. This is allowed with the use of a one-hour fire barrier instead of a 2 hour fire wall.

Assembly Action: **None**

G72-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

[F] 414 .5.3 Standby or emergency power. Where mechanical ventilation, treatment systems, temperature control, alarm, detection or other electrically operated systems are required by ~~the International Mechanical Code~~, the *International Fire Code* or this code, such systems shall be provided with an emergency or standby power system in accordance with this code or the ICC Electrical Code.

Exceptions: *(Exceptions not shown remain unchanged.)*

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal as it correlates the requirements for explosion control with the IFC. Section 911.1 of the IFC would require explosion control both if the hazard exists regardless of amounts of hazardous materials or when hazardous materials listed in Table 911.1 exceed the maximum allowable quantities in Table 2703.1.1(1) of the IFC. The IBC

currently only addresses explosion control when the MAQ's have been exceeded. The modification simply deletes the reference to the IMC in Section 414.5.3 as the IFC already contains the proper link to the requirements in the IMC.

Assembly Action: **None**

G73-09/10

Both parts of this code change proposal were heard by the IFC Code Development Committee.

Part I - IBC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponents reason statement and felt that the deletion of a problematic IBC table in favor of the IFC will add needed clarity to the Group H code provisions.

Assembly Action: **None**

Part II - IFC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponents reason statement and approved the proposal for consistency with the action taken on Part I.

Assembly Action: **None**

G74-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal provides an improvement in clarity within the detached building provisions and special Group H-2 and H-3 provisions. It also provides correlation with IBC Section 508.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

G75-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

[F] 415.8.5.2.2 Liquid storage rooms. Liquid storage rooms shall be constructed in accordance with the following requirements:

3. Shelving, racks and wainscoting in such areas shall be of noncombustible construction or wood of not less than 1 inch (25 mm) nominal thickness ~~of~~ or fire-retardant-treated wood complying with Section 2303.2

Committee Reason: The code change provides another alternative for construction of racks in these storage rooms. The committee expressed initial concern that there was no thickness specified for the FRTW, but then acknowledged that the structural needs of the rack construction and the loads it would be supporting will provide adequate dimensions. The modification clarifies the intent to provide another material option and not to limit the wood to FRTW. These spaces are sprinkler protected which relieves concerns of adding more combustible materials.

Assembly Action: **None**

G76-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee found that the reorganization was not completely clear and did include some revised standards. Concern was expressed that the change would allow the non-residential use to occur on any floor of the live/work unit and not be limited to the first (or main) floor of the dwelling unit.

Assembly Action: **None**

G77-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: A limit to uses unusually classified as Group B or Group M occupancies is too restrictive for the intent of the live/work concept. This could, for example, prohibit an art studio in the live/work space. The code specifies that live/work units are Group R-2. To now say that the non-residential uses are limited to specific occupancies would conflict with the designation of the live/work unit as a Group R-2.

Assembly Action: **None**

G78-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Establishing a 49 occupant load was not technically justified by the proponent. This change would also conflict with the means of egress provisions in Section 419 which provides a reference to Chapter 10 for egress issues not provided for in Section 419. The 1500 sq. ft. limit will impose a limit on the live/work non-residential uses. They will generally not be containing a large occupant load.

Assembly Action: **None**

G79-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The general allowances for the Group R-2 are too liberal for the work areas in a live/work unit. The requirements for means of egress and accessibility should be based on the function of the space.

Assembly Action: **None**

G80-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The intent of the live/work provisions is small business oriented. The proposal is too far reaching for the limited size of live/work units. A valid concern is that the toilets required for the work area can be accessed from the work area.

Assembly Action: **None**

G81-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposed change because it appeared by be addressing concerns of property protection and not life safety of the occupants of such buildings. Fire statistics cited were concentrating on buildings under construction, not those completed with required

systems in place and occupied by residents. The committee concluded that the safeguards are adequate to continue to allow Group R occupancies to be located in buildings of combustible construction.

Assembly Action: **None**

G82-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponents did not provide technical substantiation that the proposal would address a reoccurring hazard. The lack of a definition of tenant or tenant space would result in inconsistent enforcement. It would appear to prevent small tenant spaces around the periphery of a large grocery store or 'big box' retail store without a fire rated separation.

Assembly Action: **None**

G83-09/10

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. . The standard is currently referenced in the IMC code change referenced the 2004 edition, however the 2009 was reviewed anticipating a modification request from the proponent.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Without the modification that was offered by the proponent, the change would conflict with provisions approved by the Fire Safety Committee for inclusion in Chapter 7. The provisions regarding electrical interlocks are unclear regarding where the interlocks are to be provided.

Assembly Action: **None**

G84-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee concluded that this requirement did not belong in the building code. The assessment would not result in any building code requirements. It would impose costs and significant liability vulnerabilities on architects and designers. These analyses would be beyond the expertise of most building officials. The requirement to return the assessment would violate many state laws regarding the retention of building permit documentation. Vulnerability is undefined and as a result the application of the provision could cast a wide net. Approved agency is a defined term in Chapter 17 and it is not the intent of the use of that phrase in this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

G85-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal, preferring the existing format of footnotes which quantify and limit the application of Table 503. The phrasing of Section 503.1 was awkward and unclear. Section 503.1.5 is misleading regarding the interaction of Table 503 and Section 509.1

Assembly Action: **None**

G86-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is written too broadly and would have a greater impact than the issues discussed by the proponent. At the same time the proposal doesn't really resolve the issues raised. Chapter 9 requires floors below an assembly occupancy to be sprinkler protected, such would

not be guaranteed by this proposal. Reference to the means of egress requirements is redundant. This might be more acceptable if it specifically addressed the height and area issues and didn't try to redefine an occupancy.

Assembly Action: **None**

G87-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt this proposal was the opposite extreme from G86-09/10 and was too restrictive. The committee would like to see something in the middle ground between the two code changes.

Assembly Action: **None**

G88-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Although the code technically allows an unlimited height building, the area limits for a total building will usually result in a building not having an excessive height. The committee did not feel that the fire statistics provided by the proponents included sufficient technical justification for this change. It was unclear if the intent was to still allow increases for sprinkler protection.

Assembly Action: **None**

G89-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent did not provide technical information justifying the reduction of allowable height for these occupancies. The information that was provided was about property loss, not threats to life safety of the occupants.

Assembly Action: **None**

G90-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Committee felt the added reference was not needed because designers and building officials would find the aircraft use special provisions without the assist of this footnote. Committee members expressed concern of starting another laundry list of references.

Assembly Action: **None**

G91-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Fire statistics do not support the reduction of the allowance. There is no data that the fire loss experience is different for three story versus four story building. The NFPA 13R systems are adequate. While there are fires in attics, they rarely result in loss of the building.

Assembly Action: **None**

G92-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent provided no new data or information to provide technical justification for this change. The committee felt that the issues of height and area have been more than adequately reviewed both during the original drafting of the code and through the subsequent

studies of the CTC. This proposal provided no information that distinguished it from past proposals that were disapproved in the past code development cycles.

Assembly Action: **None**

G93-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

505.2.1 Area limitation. The aggregate area of a mezzanine or mezzanines within a room shall not exceed one-third of the floor area of that room or space in which they are located. The enclosed portion of a room shall not be included in a determination of the floor area of the room in which the mezzanine is located. In determining the allowable mezzanine area, the area of the mezzanine shall not be included in the floor area of the room. Where a room contains both a mezzanine and an equipment platform the aggregate area of the two raised floor levels shall not exceed two thirds of the floor area of that room or space in which they are located ~~with neither occupying more than one-third of the floor area of the room.~~

505.3.1 Area limitations. The aggregate area of all equipment platforms within a room shall not exceed two thirds of the area of the room in which they are located. Where an equipment platform is located in the same room as a mezzanine, the area of the mezzanine shall be determined by Section 505.2.1 and the combined aggregate area of the equipment platforms and mezzanines shall not exceed two-thirds of the room in which they are located.

~~**Exception.** Where a room contains both a mezzanine and an equipment platform the aggregate area of the two raised floor levels shall not exceed two thirds of the floor area of that room or space in which they are located.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The reorganization provided in the proposal clarifies the application of the section as well as clearly distinguishes the mezzanine and equipment platform standards and the limits imposed when both occur in the same space. The modifications removed language which was found to be redundant of other language in the section, and therefore unneeded.

Assembly Action: **None**

G94-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

G95-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The deletion removes redundant language and allows all mezzanines to use the general means of egress requirements found in Chapter 10.

Assembly Action: **None**

G96-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved the change because it provides clarity to the measurement of open areas and public ways in two key areas of the code. It reflects the application of these provisions that the measurement includes all adjoining yards/open areas as well as public

ways. Measurement differs from fire separation distance, It clarifies the measurement of open space next to building facades for calculation of allowable area increases in Section 506.2.1 and for measurement of open area surrounding unlimited area buildings in Section 507. This amendment is compatible with those contained in G97-09/10 and G98-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

G97-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change, with those of G96 and G98 -09/10 bring clarification to the measure of W for determining allowable area increases. This revision clarifies the application to multiple building sites.

Assembly Action: **None**

G98-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Providing a formula makes the code clear and easier to apply. This change was approved by the committee because the formula provides a 'definition' for the term weighted average and clearly shows the code user how to calculate it. This change with G96 and G97-09/10 work together to clarify Section 506.2.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

G99-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that while the code often has provisions different than, and superseding of, referenced standards, the departure from the NFPA standard contained in this proposal would be better reviewed by NFPA in the context of revising the sprinkler standard. While the proposal concentrated on the make-up of the roof sheathing, the committee noted the presence of other combustible materials in attics, especially structural framing supporting the roof, that would be unprotected.

Assembly Action: **None**

G100-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Although the committee thought the concept included in the proposal may be an appropriate option to add to the code, it found the language of the proposal unclear and misleading. The committee expressed concern that the resulting building would potentially have first stories approaching unlimited area scale without any provision to improve firefighter access surrounding the building. Significantly smaller upper stories could also be set back a significant distance from the walls of lower story, again providing a challenging firefighter access issue. There appeared to be a potential that under a mixed occupancy scenario that an even larger building than intended could be achieved.

Assembly Action: **None**

G101-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee understood the concept of the proposal, but felt it needed to be more specific as to the accessory occupancies of concern or how they be applicable in the various unlimited area building scenarios. The use of the term 'listed' is not as the term is defined. The committee speculated that because 10% of an unlimited area building could be quite a large area whether a limit to the tabular value of Table 503 might not be appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

G102-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change was approved because it provides clarity regarding the relationship between the occupancies allowed in a Section 507.3 building and the construction type or types associated with the group of occupancies.

Assembly Action:

None

G103-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee concluded that retaining this exception was not in conflict with the general limitations of Chapter 9 of the IBC and IFC because it was a specific provision that would take precedence over the general. The concerns expressed by supporters of the code change that these facilities get used for activities other than those listed were felt to be enforcement issues and should not be the basis of a code change. The listed activities are clearly those which have very limited fuel load on the sporting surface. The committee acknowledged that an amendment that would clarify that the exception applies to just the sporting area and not surrounding support functions such as spectator seating, locker or dressing facilities or concession areas would be appropriate.

Assembly Action:

None

G104-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found the format of the proposal very appealing in the clarity it would bring to these provisions, however it appeared that the reformat includes a technical change in the relationship of the hazardous material area located at the building perimeter and the measurement of that perimeter.

Assembly Action:

None

G105-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent did not provide sufficient technical support to justify reducing the allowed Type IIIA allowed unlimited area building to the unrated Type IIIB. This could result in a significant increase in combustible materials in the building construction that would not be protected by one hour assemblies.

Assembly Action:

None

G106-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this change because there was not justification that allowing motion picture theaters of unlimited size in a combustible building construction type where they are now only allows in non-combustible construction types.

Assembly Action:

None

G107-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee found the code change appropriate because it clarifies that the activities and facilities listed in Table 508.2.5 present a special hazard regardless whether the building is a single occupancy or a mixed occupancy. The change would make sure that these standards are met regardless of the approach taken to address mixed occupancies. These things are uses or building support facilities and not occupancies unto themselves. The committee expressed

concern that divorcing these provisions from the accessory use provisions would allow these features to exceed the 10% area limitation of accessory occupancy. While this part of the provision could be refined by public comment, the committee was comfortable that the term incidental was sufficiently clear that were such features/uses to become the primary or only use of a building, that it would be judged to be not 'incidental'.

Assembly Action: **None**

G108-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this change based on the preferred action contained in G107-09/10. There was also specific discomfort with the phrasing 'under all circumstances' and that the change would not clarify the interaction with other mixed use options but actually be more confusing.

Assembly Action: **None**

G109-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the intent of the proponent was to clarify the section, the committee felt that it did the opposite. Specifically the committee found the first sentence of new Section 508.2 could be read to imply that an accessory occupancy could be a total building, not a small area of a larger building. They found that the wording of Section 508.2.2 confused the determination of aggregate areas of accessory occupancies.

Assembly Action: **None**

G110-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee understood the issue addressed by the proposal but felt the language did not provide a clear solution. Further the committee felt the issue was one of plan review and fairness in leasing practices and not one of building or occupant safety, therefore it is inappropriate to resolve in the building code.

Assembly Action: **None**

G111-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change because they did not find it solved the issue raised by the proponent, that of limiting accessory occupancy location in a building based on its tabular value in Table 503 rather than the tabular value of the primary occupancy of the building.

Assembly Action: **None**

G112-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt the proposal made inappropriate use of the table. In addition to a number of inconsistencies in the proposed occupancy categories, the committee felt that making a simple declaration of one occupancy would eliminate an appropriate evaluation of the specific activities occurring or the quantities of hazardous materials present.

Assembly Action: **None**

G113-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee approved this change to provide consistency in application of these provisions between Group I-2 and in Ambulatory care facilities. Both occupancies are treating patients who may not be able to respond to emergency situations. The protection of the waste and linen rooms will reduce potential hazards to the patients of ambulatory care facilities.

Assembly Action: **None**

G114-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The intent of the proposal that all parking garages present a hazard in combination with other occupancies is an implication that is not substantiated by fire statistics. Parking garages have a proven track record, especially open garages. The provision, if appropriate may be more appropriate located or referenced in Section 406 as well as having connection to Section 508.4.

Assembly Action: **None**

G115-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The term calculated is confusing. Many provisions of the code require calculation. The term separated occupancies is well understood in context of its opposing option - non-separated mixed occupancies.

Assembly Action: **None**

G116-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The added reference is not needed. The code is well understood that Section 402 takes precedence over the occupancy separation provisions of Section 508. The committee could not support commencing another 'list' of exceptions or references when they are not needed.

Assembly Action: **None**

G117-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change because it did not feel that it clarified the application of the section. The language could be construed to require separation between different uses contained on the same list under a single type of occupancy such as between a restaurant and a tavern.

Assembly Action: **None**

G118-09/10

Errata: Change the values in two cells as shown. The intent of the proponent is to replicate Table 302.3.2 from the 2003 IBC without change. The two cells were improperly transcribed by staff.

**TABLE 508.4
REQUIRED SEPARATION OF OCCUPANCIES (HOURS)**

Use	A-1	A-2 ^e	A-3	A-4	A-5	B ^d	F-1	F-2	H-1	H-2	H-3	H-4	H-5	I-1	I-2	I-3	I-4	M ^b	R-1	R-2	R-3, R-4	S-1	S-2 ^c	U	
A-1	--	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	NP	4	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
A-2 ^e		--	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	NP	4	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
A-3			--	2	2	2	2	3	2	NP	4	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
A-4				--	2	2	2	3	2	NP	4	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
A-5					--	2	2	3	2	NP	4	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
B ^d						--	2	3	2	NP	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
E							--	3	2	NP	4	3	2	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
F-1								--	3	NP	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
F-2									--	NP	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
H-1										--	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
H-2											--	1	2	2	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	2	2	1
H-3												--	1	1	4	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	1	1	1
H-4													--	1	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	1	1	1
H-5														--	4	4	4	3	1	4	4	4	1	1	3
I-1															--	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	3	2
I-2																--	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
I-3																	--	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
I-4																		--	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
M ^b																			--	2	2	2	3	2	1
R-1																				--	2	2	3	2	1
R-2																					--	2	3	2	1
R-3, R-4																						--	3	2 ^d	1 ^d
S-1																							--	3	3
S-2 ^c																									1
U																									--

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the table as providing a better format for the information for occupancy separation requirements. It allows a simple reading of the table for the intersection each possible combination of occupancies. The values quickly force someone to consider the non-separated mix occupancy option. There was discomfort that the existing Table 508.4 combines in the same column and row occupancies that are distinctly different. It was acknowledged that the values contained in the table are still the subject of considerable debate but the format provides a clear route to consider different values. The committee intends that existing Table 508.4 be replaced by Table 302.3.2 from the 2003 Edition of the IBC, with no changes to the tabular values in the 2003 Table.

Assembly Action:

None

G119-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

**TABLE 508.4
REQUIRED SEPARATION OF OCCUPANCIES (HOURS)**

OCCUPANCY	A ^d , E		I-1, I-3, I-4		I-2		R		F-2, S-2 ^b , U		B, F-1, M, S-1		H-1		H-2		H-3, H-4, H-5	
	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS
A ^d , E	N	N	1	2	2	NP	1	2	N	1	1	2	NP	NP	3	4	2	3 ^a
I-1, I-3, I-4			N ^g	N ^g	2	NP	1	NP	1	2	1	2	NP	NP	3	NP	2	NP
I-2					N	N	2	NP	2	NP	2	NP	NP	NP	3	NP	2	NP
R							N ^g	N ^g	1 ^c	2 ^c	1	2	NP	NP	3	NP	2	NP
F-2, S-2 ^b , U									N	N	1	2	NP	NP	3	4	2	3 ^a
B, F-1, M, S-1											N	N	NP	NP	2	3	1	2 ^a
H-1													N	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
H-2															N	NP	1	NP
H-3, H-4, H-5																	1 ^{e,f}	NP

- a. For Group H-5 occupancies, see Section 903.2.4.2.
- b. The required separation from areas used only for private or pleasure vehicles shall be reduced by 1 hour but to not less than one hour.
- c. See Section 406.1.4, ~~709.1, and 712.3.~~
- d. Commercial kitchens need not be separated from the restaurant seating areas that they serve.
- e. Separation is not required between occupancies of the same classification.
- f. For H-5 occupancies, see Section 415.8.2.2.
- g. See Section 420.

Committee Reason: The intent of the proposal was to provide reference to the provisions regarding separations applying to dwelling units and sleeping units. The modification changed the reference to the code section that actually requires the separations not to the sections which tell the code user how to build the separations. Section 420 applies to dwelling units and sleeping units in Group R occupancies and Group I-1 occupancies, Therefore the new footnote 'g' is placed in the table at the intersection of the R occupancies columns and rows and the intersection of the columns and rows that include the Group I-1 occupancy.

Assembly Action:

None

G120-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

**TABLE 508.4
REQUIRED SEPARATION OF OCCUPANCIES (HOURS)**

(Portions of table not shown are unchanged)

- a. For Group H-5 occupancies, see Section 903.2.4.2.
- b. The required separation from areas used only for private or pleasure vehicles shall be reduced by 1 hour.
- c. See Section 406.1.4.
- d. Commercial kitchens need not be separated from dining or seating areas that they serve.
- e. Separation is not required between occupancies of the same classification.
- f. For H-5 occupancies, see Section 415.8.2.2.

Committee Reason: The revision provides clarification that a separation is not needed between a 'commercial kitchen' and the associated dining and seating areas regardless if the activity is a restaurant or other use. Some of the committee felt the footnote wasn't needed at all because such kitchens are part of the occupancy and separation is not required. As there is not universal agreement on that interpretation, the change provides consistency regardless of the occupancy classifications assigned. The change also allows the exception clearly apply to such applications as school lunchrooms, places of religious worship and fire stations.

Assembly Action:

None

G121-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproved based on the preferred action taken on G120-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

G122-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Deleting the footnote and adding provisions to only Group A-2 would leave in questions the application to kitchens serving schools, places of religious worship and fire houses. A definition of commercial kitchen would need to be provided; and would be helpful in clarifying this activity in this and other situations such as catering kitchens.

Assembly Action: **None**

G123-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee concluded that the issues were not one of building or occupant safety but of proper plan review. The listing of possible separation construction options was confusing. There was no technical substantiation provided for always requiring an actual separation.

Assembly Action: **None**

G124-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes approved under G118-09/10 and this change would be unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

G125-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes approved under G118-09/10 and this change would be unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

G126-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes approved under G118-09/10 and this change would be unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

G127-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes approved under G118-09/10 and this change would be unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

G128-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes approved under G118-09/10 and this change would be unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

G129-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes approved under G118-09/10 and this change would be unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

G130-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes approved under G118-09/10 and this change would be unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

G131-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee was uncomfortable that the apparent effect of the change would be to allow a 5 story shaft which would only be rated as a one hour enclosure for four stories.

Assembly Action: **None**

G132-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is another version of G131-09/10 and was disapproved to be consistent with the previous action.

Assembly Action: **None**

G133-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change was approved as it was a simple and appropriate editorial clarification to the provision.

Assembly Action: **None**

G134-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

G135-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: While the committee understood the issue raised by the proponent, they were not convinced that the change actually clarified the application of the code. There was specific concern regarding the term 'outer perimeter' and how that might be interpreted differently in each jurisdiction.

Assembly Action:

None

G136-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: At the proponent's request, the committee disapproved the code change acknowledging that it needed further study and refinement. Of particular concern that it would allow a lessening of structural stability of roof assemblies.

Assembly Action:

None

G137-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: At the proponent's request, the committee disapproved the code change recognizing a need to further refine the text. Of particular concern was what unintended consequences could result from the broad language proposed. The committee reminded the proponent that exemption from permit does not justify exemption from code standards. Footnote 'i' represented an uncomfortable mix of technical and administrative code provisions.

Assembly Action:

None

G138-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: No technical substantiation was provided to justify reducing the protection of Type IIIB construction.

Assembly Action:

None

G139-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal is not justified based on any technical information. The change would eliminate design options and would exclude building materials without ample justification. The term 'solid' could be read to prohibit any openings in a wall so regulated.

Assembly Action:

None

G140-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal defeats the allowance for fire-retardant-treated wood in these assemblies especially the application of FRTW sheathing. Language addressing inner and outer faces was unclear to the committee as how it should be interpreted.

Assembly Action:

None

G141-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The text of the proposal was dependent on the approval of a related change to Chapter 7. That proposal heard by the Fire Safety Code Development Committee was disapproved.

Assembly Action: **None**

G142-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would allow too much combustible materials into non-combustible construction types. This change is more than just sheathing, but gets to the structural elements of a building. It is not appropriate to allow wood floors to be constructed in high-rise buildings where the concept is to defend people in place during a fire incident.

Assembly Action: **None**

G143-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent did not provide technical justification to restrict use of standard wood for simply blocking purposes. It was questioned whether there were fire retardant products available for all typical blocking situations. There was no information presented of a loss history because blocking materials were wood other than FRTW.

Assembly Action: **None**

G144-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee found the concept embodied in the proposal intriguing but found the proposed text unclear and confusing. The technique may work for typical residential construction methods and designs but probably not for typical commercial buildings. Section 1203.2 requires that cross ventilation be provided in attic spaces. This proposed section hangs there with no connection from Section 1203.2.

Assembly Action: **None**

G145-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The change resolves issues imposed by the current text. It puts the incentive in correct format to direct the code user to provide better ventilation. It also allows flat roof situations to be addressed where a 3 foot vertical distance between upper and lower vents can not be achieved. It also eliminates the ability to interpret the section to allow all ventilation openings on the ridge of a roof.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC- B/E

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that the language of proposal RB158-09/10 more adequately addresses this issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

G146-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The change would introduce highly discretionary language into the code without providing the building official ample guidance for its use. A more detailed exception addressing the variety of climatic conditions that might warrant the waiver of attic ventilation would be appropriate. The discussion regarding installation of photovoltaic equipment on roof tops seemed irrelevant to the proposal to allow a waiver of attic ventilation

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IRC-B/E

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal would add language that would require the Building Official to decide the code requirements. This is a local issue and should be handled through local amendment to the code.

Assembly Action:

None

G147-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt this type of requirement was more appropriate for a jurisdiction's zoning regulations rather than the building code. The committee identified gaps in the ranges of standards in the proposal which would result in no requirement for specific situations.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IRC-B/E

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal does not provide adequate prescriptive methods of measurement and will create enforcement problems. A standard should be referenced to achieve the results. This is a Zoning Code issue and is outside the scope of the IRC.

Assembly Action:

None

G148-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1208.3 Room area. Every dwelling unit shall have at least one room that shall have not less than 120 square feet (13.9 m2) of net floor area. Other habitable rooms shall have a net floor area of not less than 70 square feet (6.5 m2).

Exception: Kitchens in a one and two family dwelling dwellings.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent that there was no technical justification for a minimum area of and that for Accessible, Type A and Type B dwelling units, the A117.1 standard would provide ample space for access to kitchen spaces. The proponent originally intended a simple correlation with the IRC, but the committee expanded the proposal to include all dwelling unit kitchens regardless of occupancy category. There seemed no justification to waive the area for Group R-3 dwelling units and not Group R-2 dwelling units or Group R-4 congregate residences .

Assembly Action:

None

G149-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change provides important protection and surfacing around slop sinks. As most state and local health laws contain similar provisions, this change would provide coordination and result in installation before, rather than after, the health inspector's first inspection.

Assembly Action:

None

G150-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The concept of the proposal was welcomed by some of the committee but they were concerned that the threshold numbers would not result in equal access to such stations for both fathers and mothers. The application to just assembly occupancies was too limited. Application to mercantile facilities, especially covered/open malls seemed essential. Other committee members were not convinced that as important as it is to provide these diaper changing stations, that it is an appropriate item for either building or plumbing codes.

Assembly Action:

None

G151-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The requirement is not needed because it is adequately addressed in the referenced NFPA 70. The proposed discretion for the building official and fire code official would result in inconsistent application of the system. The installation of a system to complete shut down a building would be expensive and difficult.

Assembly Action:

None

G152-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.2.1. Mandatory language.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: At the request of the proponent, the committee disapproved the proposal because the proposed referenced standard does not comply with ICC standards for referenced documents. The committee also questioned whether this equipment needed to be regulated by the building code as it does not convey people from floor to floor but is used for material conveyance.

Assembly Action:

None

G153-09/10

All three parts of this code change proposal were heard by the General Code Development Committee.

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal because they felt that the requirement is adequately covered by the standard and the requirement doesn't need to be repeated in the code. In addition, the proposed language is poorly crafted, and would seem to prohibit inspection by qualified inspectors employed by the jurisdiction. The proponent did not clarify why this language was necessary in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II- IFC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproved for consistency with the action taken on Part I.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III- IPMC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproved for consistency with the action taken on Parts I and II.

Assembly Action: **None**

G154-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This language needs to be provided in the code and not force building officials or designers to consult the standard for 10 simple words.

Assembly Action: **None**

G155-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The lighting is only needed for the use of firefighters. It has no relationship to the use of any elevator for accessible means of egress or for occupant self evacuation.

Assembly Action: **None**

G156-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: While the committee was supportive of the concept intended by the proposal, they disapproved the proposal as written. The proposal was unclear regarding what would be required, where the identification would be placed, how the designation would be made. Numbered elevators if posted on the frame of the hoistway door could be confused with floor numbers.

Assembly Action: **None**

G157-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: G49-09/10 added redundancy to the number of cars required to be Fire Service Access elevators. While one of the Fire Service Access elevators should be the stretcher elevator required in Section 3002.4, there is no justification to require all Fire Service Access elevators to have such a jump in elevator size (i.e., 2500 pounds to 3500/4000 pounds). Buildings large enough or of a type that justifies additional elevators sized for stretchers can be determined on a case by case basis during development of the fire and safety evacuation plans between the building owners and fire departments.

Assembly Action: **None**

G158-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This clarifies that the same exemptions for sprinklers installed in the elevator machine room and shaft and the installation for shunt trips permitted for Occupant Evacuation Elevators in Section 3008.6 should also be permitted in Fire Service Access Elevators.

Assembly Action: **None**

G159-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

3007.2 Phase I Emergency recall operation. An independent, three-position, key-operated "Fire Recall" switch shall be provided at the designated level for each fire service access elevator or for each group of fire service access elevators in accordance with the requirements in ASME A17.1/CSA B44. In addition, actuation of any building fire alarm initiating device shall initiate Phase I emergency recall operation on all fire service access elevators in accordance with the requirements in ASME A17.1/CSA B44. All other elevators shall remain in normal service unless Phase I emergency recall operation is manually initiated by a separate, required three-position key-operated "Fire Recall" switch or automatically initiated by the associated elevator lobby, hoistway or ~~and~~ elevator machine room smoke detectors.

Committee Reason: The modification to the proposal is to coordinate with what is required in ASME A17.1 and will require activation of the fire recall from all three locations listed. The proposal provides the fire service a standardized way to initiate the fire recall process.

Assembly Action: **None**

G160-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: With the reference to Section 403.2.3, it is not clear if the requirement for hardened shaft would be applicable for all Fire Service Access elevators (starting at 120 feet), or just those in Seismic Category III and IV or only at buildings taller than 420 feet. The intent of the proponent is for all Fire Service Access elevators to be hardened at 120 feet regardless of seismic category. The correct placement for this requirement is in Section 402.3.2. Justification for the additional costs must be provided.

Assembly Action: **None**

G161-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Sufficient justification was not provided for additional costs and problems in dealing with pressurization requirements in 120 foot tall buildings. G164-09/10 will address the issue of possible smoke infiltration when the fire department is running the fire hose from the stand pipe and out of the stairway door.

Assembly Action: **None**

G162-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The performance language for this requirement will allow a wide variety of design options and provides protection for the hoistway from possible water infiltration. Water does cause problems for elevators during a fire event, so this protection is needed. The requirements do clarify that protection is not needed from sprinklers activated within the lobby since the elevators will go into fire department recall if there is smoke/fire in the elevator lobbies. This coordinates with G174-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

G163-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed revision clarifies that the intent of the exception is for the level of exit discharge used by the fire department rather than a 'street' level that might not be where the fire department wants to access the building.

Assembly Action: **None**

G164-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The requirement would keep the integrity of the lobby for the Fire Service Access elevator even when the fire department is running the hose from the stand pipe out of the stairway door.

Assembly Action: **None**

G165-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because no technical justification was provided for the increase for the fire-resistance rating for cable protection. Most of the wiring for elevators can be run inside the protected shaft.

Assembly Action: **None**

G166-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this was an improvement over G165-09/10. This requires critical wiring for fire service operation to be protected, not all wiring. This will not decrease the safety of the elevator for the fire department service.

Assembly Action: **None**

G167-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because the 'fire hat' symbol is already used inside the elevator cab and therefore instantly recognizable by the fire service. This will aid in the quick identification of the Fire Service Access Elevators and will assist the fire service.

Assembly Action: **None**

G168-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Alternative methods are already permitted for unique situations so proposed Section 3008.1.1 is not needed. The requirements engineering analysis is redundant and is not needed.

Assembly Action: **None**

G169-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The AMSE standard does not currently include specifics for Occupant Evacuation Elevators. Requiring the standard to have specific requirements before this option could be used would effectively prohibit Occupant Evacuation Elevators at this time. ASME should move forward to include specific information. The IBC needs to move forward to provide direction for this new technology. Involvement of the fire department and code official during construction and development of the fire and safety evacuation plans will address specific control issues on a case by case basis until the ASME standard is complete.

Assembly Action: **None**

G170-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This reference to Section 1003.7 could be perceived as the Fire Service Access Elevators and Occupant Evacuation Elevator being a trade off for means of egress requirements. These elevators are aids for means of egress, and not a replacement.

Assembly Action:

None

G171-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposed text allows flexibility for individual recall in addition to bank recall. This will help fire department efficiency when using the Occupant Evacuation Elevators during evacuation events.

Assembly Action:

None

G172-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

3008.7 Activation. Occupant evacuation elevator systems shall be activated by any of the following:

1. The operation of an automatic sprinkler system complying with Section 3008.6;
2. Smoke detectors required by another provision of the code; ~~or required as an alternative standard complying with Section 3008.1.4.~~
3. Approved manual controls.

Committee Reason: The modification was to remove a reference to a section proposed by G169-09/10 which was disapproved. The proposal provides a means of system activation. This should be in the code since sprinklers and smoke detectors are building code issues.

Assembly Action:

None

G173-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is the wrong place in the code for this requirement. This requirement for structural integrity needs to be incorporated into the high-rise provisions in Section 403.2.3. With this referenced, if the designer chose to provide Occupant Evacuation Elevators in building less than 420 feet it is not clear if the shaft would still have to meet the structural integrity requirements in Category I and II Seismic areas.

Assembly Action:

None

G174-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This coordinates with the committee's decision in G162-09/10. The performance language for this requirement will allow a wide variety of design options and provides

protection for the hoistway from possible water infiltration. Water does cause problems for elevators during a fire event, so this protection is needed. The requirements do clarify that protection is not needed from sprinklers activated within the lobby since the elevators will go into fire department recall if there is smoke/fire in the elevator lobbies.

Assembly Action: **None**

G175-09/10 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

G176-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies that the lobby in front of the Fire Service Elevator and Occupant Evacuation Elevator will protect the area from fire and smoke so that hoistway doors do not have to meet fire-door assemblies. This proposal also addresses the practical difficulties for elevator doors to meet fire door assembly requirements and still operate effectively. The addition of the language in Section 3008.11.3 aligns lobby requirements for both types of elevator systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

G177-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Signage at Occupant Evacuation Elevators should only be identification signage or symbols, not instructions, since what happens depends on the emergency and the building's evacuation plan. The Occupant Evacuation Elevator is not intended to be used in all emergencies (i.e., earthquakes) therefore the proposed text is misleading. The requirement for the symbol for accessibility could be construed that this was an elevator only for persons with disabilities and therefore could hamper occupant evacuation. This should be addressed by ASME A17.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

G178-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee expressed concern regarding waiving the supporting construction for the rated construction surrounding the opening to the pedestrian walkway. There was no justification provided for the additional requirement for the wall extensions specified in the revised exception to Section 3104.5.

Assembly Action: **None**

G179-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal added terms that should be defined. There was no justification for discounting the openings between the building and the pedestrian walkway. There was concern that if the walkway was removed there would be too many openings in the exterior wall. The committee expressed concern that there should be some protection between stacked walkways to prevent fire from leaping from one walkway to another one above it.

Assembly Action: **None**

G180-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal because it was found not to be clear in its wording or how it would be applied. The committee was not made aware of any entrance 'requirement' that needed to be addressed by this proposed text.

Assembly Action: **None**

G181-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This code change closes a loophole in the design of communication towers under the referenced standard, TIA-222, by excluding exceptions related to seismic design. It is more appropriate that the design of these structures consider seismic loading.

Assembly Action: **None**

G182-09/10

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 standards do not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section Sections 3.6.2.1 and 3.6.2.4, Mandatory language.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed standards did not comply with the ICC policy regarding referenced standards. In addition, the proposal was disapproved at the request of the proponent in order to allow the work on the new ICC swimming pool code to proceed.

Assembly Action: **None**

G183-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent did not provide substantiation that the current provisions are causing significant problems nor that the revisions would eliminate the hazard. The committee speculated whether any allowance for steps or handrails should be made to permit projection into a public way.

Assembly Action: **None**

G184-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change because they found the proposed language very unclear and confusing. In addition there was no technical justification for constructing a 1 hour rated barrier between building areas being remodeled and portions of building where occupancy continues.

Assembly Action: **None**

G185-09/10

Both parts of this code change proposal were heard by the General Code Development Committee.

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: These references are needed because there currently are none in the IBC that would get the user to these key requirements. This allows code users to find their way to the IFC where it is clear that this is the responsibility of the fire marshal.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II- IFC

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: During construction there are hazards that need to be addressed. The committee approved this change for consistency with Part I and provide needed options to manage hazardous situations.

Assembly Action:

None

G186-09/10

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

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

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change for a variety of reasons. Primarily the proposal does not address any identified life safety hazard to the building occupants, but seems to be just provided to minimize clean up costs at the ending phases of construction. Finally the referenced document is not a standard but clearly is a guideline and it does not meet ICC policies for referenced standards.

Assembly Action:

None

G187-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that the terminology was inconsistent with the section that actually provides the regulations, that terminology being 'moved structures' rather than 'relocated'. The committee judged that a moved structure is simply a form of alteration and is within the existing scoping language.

Assembly Action:

None

G188-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

3401.3 (IEBC [B] 301.1.1) Compliance. Alterations, repairs, additions and changes of occupancy to, or relocation of, existing structures shall comply with the provisions for alterations, repairs, additions and changes of occupancy, or relocation in the *International Fire Code*, *International Fuel Gas Code*, *International Mechanical Code*, *International Plumbing Code*, *International Property Maintenance Code*, *International Private Sewage Disposal Code*, *International Residential Code* and NFPA 70.

Committee Reason: The revisions to the text provides proper reference to the full range of requirements found in Chapter 34 of the IBC and in the International Existing Building Code.

Assembly Action: **None**

G189-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The revisions would seem to conflict with the general references to other codes as contained in Chapter 1 and the reason for the differences are unclear.

Assembly Action: **None**

G190-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This code change clarifies the selection of design coefficients and factors for the analysis of existing seismic force-resisting systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

G191-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This proposal clarifies the provision for existing materials by adding the cross-reference to Section 116, which accomplishes the original intent of code change G205-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

G192-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The code change appropriately relocates the section on dangerous conditions to the beginning of Chapter 34 to reflect its broad applicability.

Assembly Action: **None**

G193-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal is not an appropriate way to establish the point at which rehabilitation and upgrades are required. We need to keep the current capacity trigger and stay away from an economic trigger. The current loss-of-capacity trigger is something that can be determined prior to going into the building department for an application for a permit whereas with the economic loss or financial loss trigger you need to do a complete design and have a set of plans in order to do that calculation. This affects how an owner can rehabilitate his structure. The proposal has adverse

consequences on an owner trying to make a decision about his building. The current system is the better way to go about it.

Assembly Action: **None**

G194-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

3405.2.1 (IEBC [B] 304.2.1) Evaluation. The building shall be evaluated by a registered design professional, and the evaluation findings shall be submitted to the building official. The evaluation shall establish whether the damaged building, if repaired to its pre-damage state, would comply with the provisions of this code for wind and earthquake loads. Evaluation for earthquake loads shall be required if the substantial structural damage was caused by or related to earthquake effects or if the building is in Seismic Design Category C, D, E, or F.

Wind loads for this evaluation shall be those prescribed in Section 1609. Earthquake loads for this evaluation, if required, shall be permitted to be seventy-five percent of those prescribed in Section 1613. ~~Where the existing seismic force-resisting system is a type that can be designated ordinary,~~ values of R , Ω_o , and C_d for the existing seismic force-resisting system shall be those specified by this code for an ordinary system unless it is demonstrated that the existing system will provide performance equivalent to that of ~~a detailed, an~~ intermediate or special system.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged.)

Committee Reason: This proposal makes necessary clarifications to the required evaluation of damaged structures. The modification restores the current language in Section 3405.2.1 so that there will be no conflicts with the revisions to this section that are made in G190-09/10 which are preferred.

Assembly Action: **None**

G195-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This would introduce uneven requirements for repairs of earthquake damaged buildings. The Instrument Intensity VII measure may be an appropriate trigger for higher seismic areas. How the Instrument Intensity trigger would work with old buildings is not clear. It could create problems for an owner of a damaged building in making a determination on the Instrument Intensity of VII after an earthquake.

Assembly Action: **None**

G196-09/10 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

G197-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The code change provides clearer wording that clarifies the seismic requirements that apply in connection with a change of occupancy.

Assembly Action: **None**

G198-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Withdrawn by Proponent

PART II- IEBC

Withdrawn by Proponent

G199-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: At the proponent's request, the committee disapproved the proposal. The proposal is in need of refinement to provide references other than the IRC; to consider if needed provisions were not included and reconsider it all of the repetitive code language and referencing to other sections are truly needed.

Assembly Action:

None

G200-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: It is not clear what level of alteration is required within a dwelling unit before the unit would be expected to comply with Type A dwelling unit requirements.

Assembly Action:

None

G201-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the revision because it provides better coordination with other parts of the IBC and IEBC.

Assembly Action:

None

G202-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal is needed to coordinate the provisions of Section 3412 with those in Chapter 30 of the IBC.

Assembly Action:

None

G203-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this change because it was inconsistent with the action taken to approve G107 09/10.

Assembly Action:

None

G204-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Adoption of a fee schedule is a jurisdictional responsibility during the adoption process of this, or any, code. The code could not provide a fee schedule that could address the distinct operations requirements of thousands of different jurisdictions.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IRC –B/E

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agrees the table needs updating, but the values may be low. There is no substantiation provided for the values and more data is needed.

Assembly Action:

None

G205-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

G206-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was supportive of the concept of moving the IBC closer to being recognized as providing compliance with Federal standards for the construction of medical facilities, however the proposed inclusion of the CMS forms is inappropriate. Even if the forms are not included but only referenced, the proposed appendix text reads more like commentary than it does code. Appendices need to be written so that they can be adopted and enforced as part of the code. This proposal also has an uncomfortable mixture of ICC phrasing and that of the NFPA. The IBC can not provide a vehicle for enforcing both codes.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IFC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the forms included in the proposed appendix are based on NFPA 101 and NFPA 70 which could put the fire code official in the position of being responsible for enforcing those codes. The committee also noted that the forms, if needed, are readily available on the internet and therefore need not be included in the code.

Assembly Action:

None

G207-09/10

Note: 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: This proposal would remove Table 503 from the process of determining allowed area of a building. Such action was not technically substantiate by the proponent.

Assembly Action:

None

G208-09/10

Note: 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 proposed footnote is so complex with so many references out of the

section that this revisions would not make this provision simpler, but definitely more confusing. What happens to the framing needs to be addressed.

Assembly Action: **None**

G209-09/10

Note: 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>.

Both parts of this code change proposal were heard by the IEBC Code Development Committee.

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Part I was disapproved to be consistent with the first action taken on Part II.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II- IEBC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because it contains allowances to use a green building code which may result in lesser standards that contained in the IECC or IBC. The proposal confuses alterations and changes of occupancy, which are not the same and are subject to different requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**
