

**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](http://www.iccsafe.org)

While great care has been exercised in the publication of this document, errata may occur. Errata will be posted on the ICC website at www.iccsafe.org. 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
MECHANICAL CODE COMMITTEE**

Edmund Velaski, CBO—Chair

Chief Mechanical Inspector
City of Mobile
Mobile, AL

Tony Longino, CBO—Vice Chair

Chief Mechanical Inspector
County of Greenville
Greenville, SC

Wm. Scott Copp

Senior Project Manager
FRA Engineering
Rochester, NY

Robert Daly, PE

Technical Director of Boilers
New York City Dept. of Bldgs.
New York, NY

Ernest Filippone

Chief Plumbing & Mechanical Insp.
Irving, TX Dept. 11
Irving, TX

Richard Grace, MCP

Engineer III
Fairfax County Government
Fairfax, VA

Billy Hinton, Jr., PE

Code Official-Chief Mechanical Eng.
NC Dept. of Insurance
Engineering Division
Raleigh, NC

William Ivey, PE

President-Ivey Engineering Inc.
San Diego, CA

David McMillan, CBO

City of San Marcos
San Marcos, TX

Mark Riley

Inspector Supervisor
City of Troy
Troy, MI

Matthew Rowland

Director of Building, Planning/Code
Enforcement
City of Arkansas City
Arkansas City, KS

John Sedine

President
Engineered Heating & Cooling
Walker, MI

Walter J. Sperko

President,
Sperko Engineering Services, Inc.
Greensboro, NC

John K. Taecker, PE

Senior Staff Engineer
Underwriters Laboratories Inc.
San Jose, CA

David Velderman

Rep: National Assoc. of Home
Builders
President/Owner
Dimension 4 Design
Twentynine Palms, CA

Staff Secretariat:

Gregg Gress

Senior Technical Staff
International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL MECHANICAL COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS

M1-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The operation status of something is not dependant upon the type of controls whether intermittent or continuous. The dictionary definition is adequate for these terms. Spaces such as battery rooms and machine rooms are not occupied yet the ventilation is continuous. A ventilation shaft roof fan runs 24/7 and is manually operated, but, it would fit under the definition of intermittent. A continuously operating fan could be manually activated.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II - IRC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Other ventilation proposals are not compatible with this proposal. Intermittent operation can be automatic and manual operation can be continuous. Need to bring back in a public comment to coordinate with other proposals.

Assembly Action:

None

M2-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed text will end the confusion on how to classify exhaust air from a parking garage. Such air is often erroneously classified as product conveying air. The garage is an occupied space and the air in that space is accurately described by the definition of environmental air.

Assembly Action:

None

M3-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: There is no need for two definitions for the same term. The current definitions conflict with regard to screwed joints. A mechanical joint is typically a joint that can be disassembled. Extraneous commentary text does not belong in a definition (i.e. last 3 sentences of "Mechanical joint")

Assembly Action:

None

M4-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval is based upon the action taken on M3-09/10.

Assembly Action:

None

M5-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is consistent with the action taken on M14 6-09/10 and M1 47-09/10. The proposed definition makes a distinction between press joints and push-fit joints and push-fit joint is currently defined in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

M6-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M7-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed revision provides good guidance to the code user.

Assembly Action: **None**

M8-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no standard to which to list the appliances. The requirements of UL 1370 are not stated in the proposed text, such as combustion requirements and surface temperature limits. There are no limits on room locations as these appliances would be allowed in bedrooms as proposed. There is no fuel formula stated. The definition proposed could include or exclude other products.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IFC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Same reason as given for M8-09/10 Part I.

Assembly Action: **None**

M9-09/10

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

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

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The code is a minimum standard and should not get into regulating quality. The proposed text could allow the product listing or manufacturer's installation instructions to be overridden. New work in an existing building such as a furnace replacement could trigger the requirement for existing ductwork to be sealed or could cause other additional work to be required.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: It is unclear how this would be enforced after the certificate of occupancy is issued. This would result in a cost increase and could possibly conflict with the manufacturer's installation instructions. When replacing a furnace, how far would this requirement extend relative to existing ductwork. This could discourage equipment upgrades to higher efficiency equipment. This should be limited to only new construction. There is a lack of enforcement manpower and this increases the burden.

Assembly Action: **None**

M10-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed text coordinates the IMC with the IFGC and IRC and eliminates the confusion with and misapplication of this section caused by code users not understanding the scope of the IMC which addresses appliances other than gas-fired appliances.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed text offers an installation option where such appliances are available.

Assembly Action: **None**

M11-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

306.5 (IFGC 306.5) Equipment and appliances on roofs or elevated structures. Where equipment requiring access or appliances are located on an elevated structure or the roof of a building such that personnel will have to climb higher than 16 feet above grade or floor level to access such equipment or appliances, an interior or exterior permanent means of access shall be provided. Such access shall not require climbing over obstructions greater than 30 inches (762 mm) high or walking on roofs having a slope greater than 4 units vertical in 12 units horizontal (33-percent slope). Such access shall not require the use of portable ladders.\

~~Where access involves climbing over parapet walls, the height shall be measured to the top of the parapet wall.~~

Permanent ladders installed to provide the required access shall comply with the following minimum design criteria:

1. The side railing shall extend above the parapet or roof edge not less than 30 inches (762 mm).
2. Ladders shall have rung spacing not to exceed 14 inches (356 mm) on center.
3. Ladders shall have a toe spacing not less than 6 inches (152 mm) deep.
4. There shall be a minimum of 18 inches (457 mm) between rails.
5. Rungs shall have a minimum 0.75-inch (19 mm) diameter and be capable of withstanding a 300-pound (136.1 kg) load.
6. Ladders over 30 feet (9144 mm) in height shall be provided with offset sections and landings capable of with standing 100 pounds per square foot (488.2 kg/m²). Landing dimensions shall be not less than 18 inches (457 mm) and not less than the width of the ladder served. A guard rail shall be provided on all open sides of the landing.
7. Ladders shall be protected against corrosion by *approved* means.

Catwalks installed to provide the required access shall be not less than 24 inches (610 mm) wide and shall have railings as required for service platforms.

Exception: This section shall not apply to Group R-3 occupancies.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: The proposed revision deletes unnecessary text and clarifies the intent which is to ban the use of portable ladders where a climb to the equipment/appliance is over 16 feet in height. The modification deletes the parapet text which is already addressed in the revised text; adds the adjective "permanent" to enforce to the intended ban on portable ladders and adds "or floor level" to address multi-story buildings.

Assembly Action:

None

M12-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

306.5 (IFGC 306.5) Equipment and appliances on roofs or elevated structures. Where *equipment* requiring access and appliances are installed on roofs or elevated structures at a height exceeding 16 feet (4877 mm), such access shall be provided by a permanent *approved* means of access, the extent of which shall be from grade or floor level to the *equipment* and appliances' level service space. Such access shall not require climbing over obstructions greater than 30 inches (762 mm) high or walking on roofs having a slope greater than four units vertical in 12 units horizontal (33-percent slope). Where access involves climbing over parapet walls, the height shall be measured to the top of the parapet wall. Permanent ladders installed to provide the required access shall comply with the following minimum design criteria:

1. The side railing shall extend above the parapet or roof edge not less than 30 inches (762 mm).
2. Ladders shall have rung spacing not to exceed 14 inches (356 mm) on center. The upper-most rung shall be a maximum of 24 inches (610 mm) below the upper edge of the roof hatch, roof or parapet, as applicable.
3. Ladders shall have a toe spacing not less than 6 inches (152 mm) deep.
4. There shall be a minimum of 18 inches (457 mm) between rails.
5. Rungs shall have a minimum 0.75-inch (19 mm) diameter and be capable of withstanding a 300-pound (136.1 kg) load.
6. Ladders over 30 feet (9144 mm) in height shall be provided with offset sections and landings capable of withstanding 100 pounds per square foot (488.2 kg/m²). Landing dimensions shall be not less than 18 inches (457 mm) and not less than the width of the ladder served. A guard rail shall be provided on all open sides of the landing.
7. Climbing clearance. The distance from the centerline of the rungs to the nearest permanent object on the climbing side of the ladder shall be a minimum of 30 inches (762 mm) measured perpendicular to the rungs. This distance shall be maintained from the point of ladder access to the bottom of the roof hatch. A minimum clear width of 15-inches (381 mm) shall be provided on both sides of the ladder measured from the midpoint of and parallel with the rungs except where cages or wells are installed.
8. Landing required. The ladder shall be provided with a clear and unobstructed bottom landing area having a minimum dimension of 30 inches (762 mm) by 30 inches (762 mm) centered in front of the ladder.
9. Ladders shall be protected against corrosion by *approved* means.
10. ~~Ladders shall be accessible~~ Access to ladders shall be provided at all times.

Catwalks installed to provide the required access shall be not less than 24 inches (610 mm) wide and shall have railings as required for service platforms.

Exception: This section shall not apply to Group R-3 occupancies.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponents printed reason. The modification replaces "accessible" with "access to" because the term accessible has a unique meaning in the ICC codes.

Assembly Action:

None

M13-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was no technical justification offered. Maintenance of equipment is dangerous where the roof slope is greater than 3/12. A platform is needed for placement of tools.

Assembly Action:

None

M14-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides a product standard which is lacking in current code.

Assembly Action: **None**

M15-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The current table applies to and is useable for any heat source whereas the proposed table has limited application. There is no coverage for beneath horizontal surfaces. Some methods would be lost if the table was changed.

Assembly Action: **None**

M16-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

M17-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

401.4 Intake opening location. Air intake openings shall comply with all of the following:

1. Intake openings shall be located a minimum of 10 feet (3048 mm) from lot lines or buildings on the same lot.
Where openings front on a street or public way, the distance shall be measured to the centerline of the street or public way.
2. Mechanical and gravity outdoor air intake openings shall be located not less than 10 feet (3048 mm) horizontally or ~~25 feet (7620 mm) vertically~~ from any hazardous or noxious contaminant source, such as vents, streets, alleys, parking lots and loading docks, except as specified in Item 3 or Section 501.2.1. Outdoor air intake openings shall be permitted to be located less than 10 feet horizontally from streets, alleys, parking lots and loading docks provided that the openings are located not less than 25 feet vertically above such locations.
3. Intake openings shall be located not less than 3 feet (914 mm) below contaminant sources where such sources are located within 10 feet (3048 mm) of the opening.
4. Intake openings on structures in flood hazard areas shall be at or above the design flood level.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. The modification more clearly describes how the vertical distance is measured.

Assembly Action: **None**

M18-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Parking lots should not be deleted because of the contaminants present in such locations. The current text is more clear.

Assembly Action: **None**

M19-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M20-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M21-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M22-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

M23-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed amount of ventilation is too small to be useful. It is not apparent how one is to design the system to provide air to the breathing zone as required by current code. Ventilation is not needed in stair enclosures because such spaces are not occupied.

Assembly Action: **None**

M24-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Note b should remain. The exhaust rate of 50 cfm per station is in addition to the exhaust rate of 0.6 cfm per sq. ft required for beauty and nail salons.

Assembly Action: **None**

M25-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

**TABLE 403.3
MINIMUM VENTILATION RATES**

(Portions of table not shown remain unchanged)

- a. through d. *(No change)*
- e. Rates are per water closet or urinal. The higher rate shall be provided where the exhaust system is designed to operate intermittently. The lower rate shall be permitted only where the exhaust system is designed to operate continuously ~~during occupancy~~ while occupied.
- f. Rates are per room unless otherwise indicated. The higher rate shall be provided where the exhaust system is designed to operate intermittently. The lower rate shall be permitted only where the exhaust system is designed to operate continuously ~~during occupancy~~ while occupied.
- g through h *(No change)*

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Reason: The proposed revisions will allow uniform interpretation by eliminating ambiguous text regarding when “heavy use” is expected. The modification clarifies that the ventilation system needs to operate only while occupants are present.

Assembly Action: **None**

M26-09/10

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, Sections 3.6.2.1 and 3.6.3.2

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no need for a specific standard for balancing. Current text allows other methods and the proposed revision would restrict to a single method. The standard does not comply with ICC standards policy.

Assembly Action: **None**

M27-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no stated time frame for exposure to CO level of 35 ppm. No detector location specifications are provided. Some areas in the garage may not have detector coverage. Detector response is unknown with regard to diesel exhaust. There are other contaminants of concern beside CO. CO detectors have short life spans. No option is allowed for detecting occupants as opposed to CO.

Assembly Action: **None**

M28-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides broader coverage by offering an alternative method of ventilation control.

Assembly Action: **None**

M29-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M30-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is consistent with the action taken on M19-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

M31-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal limits designer flexibility. The text could be misconstrued to prohibit common exhaust shaft arrangements with subducts. The term manifold is not defined.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with action taken on Part I. Text should be revised by a public comment so as not to prohibit systems that use a common fan with multiple exhaust inlets.

Assembly Action: **None**

M32-09/10

This proposal was heard by the IFC committee

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M33-09/10

This proposal was heard by the IFC committee

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal would not create correlation between the IFC and IMC but, rather, would create conflict by not requiring ventilation if below the maximum allowable quantity per control area.

Assembly Action: **None**

M34-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Rivets are already covered under the term "fasteners" used in current text.

Assembly Action: **None**

M35-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Screws that protrude ¼ inch into ducts can create blockages and allowing 1/8 inch protrusions is not much safer.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

M1502.4.1 Material and size Exhaust ducts shall have a smooth interior finish and be constructed of metal having a minimum thickness of 0.0157 inches (.3950 mm) (No. 28 gage). The duct shall be 4 inches nominal in diameter.

M1502.4.2 Duct installation. Exhaust ducts shall be supported at ~~12 foot~~ intervals not to exceed 12 feet and shall be secured in place. The insert end of the duct shall extend into the adjoining duct or fitting in the direction of airflow. Exhaust duct joints shall be sealed in accordance with Section M1601.4.1 and shall be mechanically fastened. Ducts shall not be joined with screws or similar fasteners that protrude more than 1/8 inch (3.2 mm) into the inside of the duct.

M1502.4.4.1 Specified length. The maximum length of the exhaust duct shall be 35 feet (1068 mm) from the connection to the transition duct from the dryer to the outlet terminal. Where fittings are used, the maximum length of the exhaust duct shall be reduced in accordance with Table M1502.4.4.1.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. The modification clarifies that the 12 foot interval is a maximum interval.

Assembly Action:

None

M36-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Exhaust temperatures are too high for PVC. PVC pipe deforms at typical dryer exhaust duct temperatures. There is no practical way to connect backdraft dampers and transition ducts to PVC pipe.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II - IRC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text does not coordinate with the exhaust duct fitting table. Requirements for fittings are lacking. There is no stated duct size requirement.

Assembly Action:

None

M37-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on M34-09/10 and M35-09/10. There is no stated limit on how far the rivets can protrude into the duct.

Assembly Action:

None

M38-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed revision deletes a viable option. There is no problem with applying Section 504.6.4.2 to dwelling installations because the duct length label requirement addresses the issue of dryer replacements.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II - IRC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed revision deletes a viable installation option.

Assembly Action:

None

M39-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The UL standard for such units is not yet available. The proposed text lacks a requirement for a label stating that a power ventilator is part of the installed system. The proposed text would allow such units to be tested to any criteria or standard, thus allowing all units to be sold as dryer exhaust duct power ventilators without consistency in product safety.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II - IRC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed standard is not yet available.

Assembly Action:

None

M40-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on M39-09/10. The proposed placard wording is not proper standard text. No letter size or location specifications are given for the placard and no requirements are stated for the "electrical system connection."

Assembly Action:

None

PART II - IRC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with action taken on M39-09/10. The signage requirement lacks application text.

Assembly Action:

None

M41-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: In the previous code change cycles that created the current text, there was ample justification for increasing the distance to 35 feet.

Assembly Action: **None**

M42-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M43-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

M44-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is consistent with the action taken on M29-09/10. Current text fails to state that Section 504.8 is dedicated to serve only clothes dryers.

Assembly Action: **None**

M45-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is consistent with the action taken on M29-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M46-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Ground water could back up into the duct. Clean earth is not defined. Item 2.4 is a specification that could preclude other designs.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is concern for entry of insects, water and radon gas.

Assembly Action: **None**

M47-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M48-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: UL 1978 applies to factory-built ducts only. Field fabricated ducts can not be submitted to the performance tests required in UL 1978.

Assembly Action: **None**

M49-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval is based upon the committee's preference for the more prescriptive approach in M50-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

M50-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. Item #1 speaks to the "duct it serves" thereby assuring consistent construction.

Assembly Action: **None**

M51-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M52-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The metal would be subject to corrosion when installed in soil and back fill and exposed to moisture. Ducts need to be tested prior to covering. The backfill is not specified. Concrete encasement is necessary for such ducts.

Assembly Action: **None**

M53-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The code lacks coverage for such systems the proposed text fills that void. The allowance for black steel as an option to stainless steel provides cost savings.

Assembly Action:

None

M54-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The revised list version is easier to read than the original paragraph.

Assembly Action:

None

M55-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

None

M56-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed revision provides no statement as to what causes an enclosure to be required (i.e. where the duct penetrates a ceiling wall or floor)

Assembly Action:

None

M57-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

506.3.10.2 Field applied enclosure. Commercial kitchen grease ducts constructed in accordance with Section 506.3.1 shall be enclosed by field-applied grease duct enclosure that is a listed and labeled material, system, product, or method of construction specifically evaluated for such purpose in accordance with ASTM E2336. The surface of the duct shall be continuously covered on all sides from the point at which the duct originates to the outlet terminal. Duct penetrations shall be protected with a through-penetration fire-stop system classified in accordance with ASTM E814 or UL 1497 and having a "F" and "T" rating equal to the fire-resistance rating of the assembly being penetrated. Such systems shall be installed in accordance with the listing and the manufacturer's installation instructions. Partial application of a field-applied grease duct enclosure system shall not be installed for the sole purpose of reducing clearance to combustibles at isolated sections of grease duct. ~~except where specifically listed and labeled for such partial application.~~ Exposed duct-wrap systems shall be protected where subject to physical damage.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: This product is being misapplied in some cases and some product installation instructions are silent on partial application. The revision is consistent with the intent of the code to require a continuous duct enclosure (i.e. no partial enclosures) and consistent with Section 506.3.6, Exception # 3. The modification deletes text that suggests that there are methods of testing for partial applications because there are none.

Assembly Action:

None

M58-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no reason to refer to only one applicable provision because there are many.

Assembly Action: None

M59-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

M60-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval is based upon the action taken on M59-09/10 which does a better job of clarifying the intent of this section.

Assembly Action: None

M61-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

M62-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The IMC is concerned with the heat and moisture effluent from such appliances. The code needs a formula to replace what is being proposed for deletion. Deleting the text without providing substitute guidance is not acceptable.

Assembly Action: None

M63-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

M64-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. Having a measurable performance criteria is desired in applying the code. The proposed text is consistent with NFPA 96.

Assembly Action: None

M65-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M66-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M67-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Requiring that the hood label state the required exhaust rate in cfm per line ar foot will help code officials verify that the hood system is appropriate for the appliances served.

Assembly Action: **None**

M68-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The laundry list of exceptions was deleted and replaced with simplified text in the previous code change cycle and the proposed new text would be starting the laundry list again. Current text already allows the HVAC system to be designed to handle the effluent load from the dishwashing machine.

Assembly Action: **None**

M69-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The requirements of NFPA 58 are irrelevant to this code provision. The proposed revision would exempt all appliances that produce combustion products, not just those appliances of concern to the proponent.

Assembly Action: **None**

M70-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The ventilation rate required under current text is minimal. Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on M62-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

M71-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M72-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The current text allows the designer to account for venting and pressure issues. Positive pressure maintenance could cause odor migration from the kitchen. The exception needs to identify the reference space to which the positive pressure is to be measured.

Assembly Action: **None**

M73-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed text will prevent the misuse of such materials. ASTM E 2336 does address the application prohibited by the proposed text.

Assembly Action: **None**

M74-09/10

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 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The code lacked a standard to which grease filters could be listed.

Assembly Action: **None**

M75-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The expanded version of ASTM E 2336 that will address the proposed application is still under development. As proposed, the grease duct standard would be applied out of context. There is no shaft system that is currently evaluated for this hazardous duct application.

Assembly Action: **None**

M76-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No standard exists for the proposed alternate enclosure system. Chapter 1 already allows for approval of alternative designs. Hazardous exhaust systems are potentially dangerous systems. ASTM E2336 is limited to grease duct enclosures and not applicable in the proposed application.

Assembly Action: **None**

M77-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

510.7 Suppression required. Ducts shall be protected with an approved automatic fire suppression system installed in accordance with the *International Building Code*.

Exceptions:

1. An approved automatic fire suppression system shall not be required in ducts conveying materials, fumes, mists and vapors that are nonflammable and noncombustible ~~and where flammable contaminants are diluted to below 25% of their lower flammability limit under all conditions and at any concentrations.~~
2. Automatic fire suppression systems shall not be required in metallic and noncombustible nonmetallic exhaust ducts in semiconductor fabrication facilities.
- ~~2.3.~~ An *approved* automatic fire suppression system shall not be required in ducts where the largest cross-sectional diameter of the duct is less than 10 inches (254 mm).
- ~~3.4.~~ For laboratories, as defined in Section 510.1, automatic fire protection systems shall not be required in laboratory hoods or exhaust systems.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: The modification restores the original text of exception # 1 and adds a new exception to specifically address semiconductor fabrication facilities so that other occupancies are not affected. The proposed revision eliminates a conflict with the IFC which currently exempts specific types of ducts in H 5 occupancies from the requirement for fire suppression where the exhaust stream is diluted to below the flammability range, whereas, the IMC would require suppression except where the exhaust gases are fundamentally non-flammable regardless of dilution. There is no fire history for metallic and noncombustible non-metallic ducts.

Assembly Action:

None

M78-09/10

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 standards did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.1, 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed text will provide for new technology and options to current practice and will help reduce duct leakage.

Assembly Action:

None

M79-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Current Section 603.8 already addresses underground ducts. The PVC coating is thin and easily damaged during installation thus allowing corrosion failure of the ducts.

Assembly Action:

None

M80-09/10

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, Sections 3.6.2.1, 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The standard is not compliant with ICC policy for referenced standards. The proposed text offers no alternative method. The standard is inconsistent with what is referenced in the IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

M81-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M82-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M83-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Volume dampers need to be allowed. A cleanout opening in the shaft is unnecessary for this application. The proposed text creates a conflict with Section 607.5.5 regarding fire damper options. Item # 3 is confusing.

Assembly Action: **None**

M84-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M85-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed term "duct plenum" creates confusion with current plenum definitions. Item # 1 of proposed section 602.1 would classify all such spaces as plenums and then restrictions would apply to piping and other materials installed in such spaces.

Assembly Action: **None**

M86-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed text conflicts with current Section 602.2 and is proposed for the wrong section.

Assembly Action: **None**

M87-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The revised text is confusing. Other means such as smoke detection should be pursued to lessen the hazard in plenums. There is no standard for testing and listing the assemblies and systems referred to in item 5.3.

Assembly Action: **None**

M88-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed revision conflicts with current Section 602.2 and Section 602.2 is the appropriate place for such revision.

Assembly Action: **None**

M89-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M90-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The UL 1887 standard is not appropriate for DWV piping as it is not filled with water. The proposed revision will lessen safety with regard to smoke production.

Assembly Action: **None**

M91-09/10

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

Analysis: The standard was not submitted for review.

Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Delete and substitute as follows:

602.2.1.1 Wiring. Combustible electrical wires and cables and optical fiber cables exposed within a plenum shall be listed as having a maximum peak optical density of 0.50 or less, an average optical density of 0.15 or less, and a maximum flame spread distance of 5 feet (1524 mm) or less when tested in accordance with NFPA 262 or shall be installed in metal raceways or metal sheathed cable. Combustible optical fiber and communication raceways exposed within a plenum shall be listed as having a maximum peak optical density of 0.5 or less, an average optical density of 0.15 or less, and a maximum flame spread distance of 5 feet (1524 mm) or less when tested in accordance with ANSI/UL 2024. Only plenum-rated wires and cables shall be installed in plenum-rated raceways. Electrical wires and cables, optical fiber cables and raceways addressed in this section shall be listed and labeled and shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 70.

2. Add new standards as follows:

ANSI/UL 2024 Standard for Safety Optical-Fiber and Communications Cable Raceway
UL 2424 ~~Outline of Investigation for Cable Marked Limited Combustible~~

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Reason: The proposed revision correlates with NFPA 70 and current practice. The modification strikes the addition of UL 2424 which is not referenced within the code text.

Assembly Action: **None**

M92-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The action taken on M 91-09/10 addresses metal sheathed cables, therefore, the proposed text is redundant and unnecessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

M93-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on M90-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

M94-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval is based upon the action taken on M95-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

M95-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M96-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The term "discrete" is subjective. UL 2043 is not equivalent to ASTM E 84 or UL 723. The proposed text is too broad in scope.

Assembly Action: **None**

M97-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Such cavities can not be properly sealed and will always allow air leakage. The proposal is in harmony with the IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M98-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed text conflicts with recognized SMACNA standards.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The intent of the proposed deletion of 0.0175 inch for aluminum duct is unclear. The SMACNA standards may not recognize 30 gage duct metal.

Assembly Action: **None**

M99-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M100-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No pass/fail criteria is stated. The words "that are considered discrete" are subjective. There are no definitive limits stated in UL 2043. The words "forced air" used to describe fittings are odd because fittings are fittings regardless of the air type.

Assembly Action: **None**

M101-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

603.7 Rigid duct penetrations. Duct system penetrations of walls, floors, ceilings and roofs and air transfer openings in such building components shall be protected as required by Section 607. Ducts in a private garage that penetrate a wall or ceiling that separates a dwelling from a private garage shall be continuous, shall be constructed of sheet steel having a minimum thickness of 0.0187 inch (0.4712 mm) (No.26 Gage) and shall have no openings into the garage. Fire and smoke dampers are not required in such ducts passing through the wall or ceiling separating a dwelling from a private garage except where required by Chapter 7 of the *International Building Code*.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. The modification clarifies that the revised text is applicable to private garages.

Assembly Action: **None**

M102-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed text limits plastic technologies. Fittings cannot be tested to UL 181 therefore the proposed text creates an impossibility.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Fittings cannot be tested to UL 181 and UL 181 is not the appropriate standard for plastic ducts. Plastic solvent-welded ducts should be encouraged for energy efficiency. Exposed DWV PVC plastic is acceptable, so why not PVC ducts ?

Assembly Action: **None**

M103-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: PVC coated ducts fail underground because of damage to the coating caused by handling and backfilling.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on Part I. The proposed requirements could be proprietary.

Assembly Action: **None**

M104-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on M103-09/10. The SMACNA standards for the listed materials should have been included in the proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

M105-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. Listed tapes demonstrate smoke and flame properties.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

M1601.4.1 Joints and seams. Joints of *duct systems* shall be made substantially airtight by means of tapes, mastics, liquid sealants, gasketing or other *approved* closure systems. Closure systems used with rigid fibrous glass ducts shall comply with UL181A and shall be marked 181A-P for pressure-sensitive tape, 181A-M for mastic or 181 A-H for heat-sensitive tape. Closure systems used with flexible air ducts and flexible air connectors shall comply with UL181B and shall be marked 181B-FX for pressure-sensitive tape or 181B-M for mastic. Duct connections to flanges of air distribution system *equipment* or sheet metal fittings shall be mechanically fastened. Mechanical fasteners for use with flexible nonmetallic air ducts shall comply with UL 181B and shall be marked 181B-C. Crimp joints for round metal ducts shall have a contact lap of at least 1 1/2 inches (38 mm) and shall be mechanically fastened by means of at least three sheet-metal screws or rivets equally spaced around the joint. Closure systems used to seal metal ductwork shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions. Unlisted duct tape is not permitted as a sealant on any duct.

Exceptions:

1. Spray polyurethane foam shall be permitted to be applied without additional joint seals.
2. Where a duct connection is made that is partially inaccessible, three screws or rivets shall be equally spaced on the exposed portion of the joint so as to prevent a hinge effect.
3. Continuously welded and locking type longitudinal joints and seams in ducts operating at static pressures less than 2 inches of water column (500 Pa) pressure classification shall not require additional closure systems.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: The proposal requires that proper listed materials be used for duct sealing. The modification is editorial.

Assembly Action:

None

M106-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The 10 foot interval proposed for deletion gave good guidance. The proposed text offers no guidance for the approval of other support methodologies.

Assembly Action:

None

M107-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text is too restrictive and too broad in scope. Non-public areas would not be allowed the necessary space for ducts.

Assembly Action:

None

M108-09/10

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

Analysis: The standard was not submitted for review.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

None

M109-09/10

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, Sections 3.6.2.1, 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on M26-09 /10. Testing and balancing is already covered in Chapter 3.

Assembly Action: **None**

M110-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: A conflict can be created where incomplete (partial) provisions are taken from the IECC. Residential and commercial provisions need to be separated as they are in the IECC.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed terminology; “unconditioned space” and “outside of building” is not clear as to intent.

Assembly Action: **None**

M111-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason Labeling assists the inspection process.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: : Approval was based on the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M112-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: More data is needed to justify the prohibition. The insulation manufacturer should be able to determine the suitability of their product for such applications.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval is based on the proponent's request and the action taken on Part I.

Assembly Action: **None**

M113-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed revision does not allow the designer to design a system with a "design capacity" based on equipment choices and duct static pressures.

Assembly Action: **None**

M114-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. Labeling assists the inspection process.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: : Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M115-09/10

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 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M116-09/10

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 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. Approval is consistent with action taken on M115-09/10. Labeling assists the inspection process.

Assembly Action: **None**

M117-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: : Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M118-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed revisions provide a uniform set of requirements and helps assure that such products are safe. Labeling assists the inspection process.

Assembly Action: **None**

M119-09/10

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

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

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: : Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M120-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Rebuilt or rehabilitated cooling towers would have to be listed if they were not already listed before they could be re used or reinstalled. An optional standard is needed. Major components such as cooling towers should not be required to be listed. Some towers are huge structures that might not be able to be listed.

Assembly Action: **None**

M121-09/10

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

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

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M122-09/10

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.

Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Revise as follows:

912.4.3 Support. Infrared radiant heaters shall be fixed in a position independent of fuel and electric supply lines. Hangers and brackets shall be of noncombustible material.

912.1 General. Electric infrared radiant heaters shall comply with UL 499.

2. Add new standard to Chapter 15 as follows:

UL
499-05 Electric Heating Appliances – with revisions through August 2008.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. The modification moves the proposed new text to a separate section as it does not relate to the subject of Section 912.1, support.

Assembly Action: **None**

M123-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M124-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M125-09/10

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 standards did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The clearance inspection requirement of proposed Section 928.2 is not enforceable because of the reference to NFPA 70.

Assembly Action: **None**

M126-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed text gives the code user direction for the installation of this equipment without having to search the codes for the numerous applicable provisions.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

Delete and substitute as follows:

M1413.1 General. Evaporative cooling equipment and appliances shall be installed:

1. according to the manufacturer's installation instructions
2. on level platforms in accordance with Section M1305.1.4.1
3. so that openings in exterior walls are flashed in accordance with Section R703.8
4. so as to protect the potable water supply in accordance with Section P2902
5. so that air intake opening locations are in accordance with Section R303.4.1

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason. The modification adds the appropriate term "appliances" based on the definition of the term.

Assembly Action: **None**

M127-09/10

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 3.6.3.2.

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M128-09/10

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 3.6.3.2.

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: : Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M129-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M130-09/10

PART I - IMC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART II - IRC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

M131-09/10

PART I - IMC

Withdrawn by Proponent

PART II – IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

M1411.6 Locking access port caps. Refrigerant circuit access ports located outdoors shall be fitted with locking-type tamper-resistant caps or shall be otherwise secured to prevent ~~protected from~~ unauthorized access. ~~in an approved manner.~~

Reason: During the last code cycle, the provision requiring locking-type tamper-resistant caps to restrict access to refrigerants was approved at the Final Action Hearings. This proposal would expand the means of restricting access to other approved methods. An example would be the placement of the equipment in inaccessible locations. Also, we are aware of only one locking-type tamper-resistant cap.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason. The modification makes the text less restrictive, allowing more options.

Assembly Action:

None

M132-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed revision offers more options to secure the intent to prevent tampering.

Assembly Action:

None

M133-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Legal action will likely ensue for those cases where the service personnel fail to install the devices. The locking caps are an "honest man's" lock and if someone is intent on getting refrigerant from the system, they will find a way to overcome the locking caps. Refrigerant can be obtained by making a hole in the coil tubing or connecting piping. The service personnel should not be made responsible for this. The proposed text conflicts with the intent of Section 102.2.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II - IRC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text is retro-active and unenforceable. The IPMC is the more appropriate place for such text.

Assembly Action:

None

M134-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. The proposed revisions update the table based on the chemicals being used today.

Assembly Action:

None

M135-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Revise as follows:

1105.6 Ventilation. Machinery rooms shall be mechanically ventilated to the outdoors.

Exception: Where a refrigerating system is located outdoors more than 20 feet (6096 mm) from any building opening and is enclosed by a penthouse, lean-to or other open structure, natural or mechanical ventilation shall be provided. Location of the openings shall be based on the relative density of the refrigerant to air. The free-aperture cross section for the ventilation of the *machinery room* shall be not less than:

$$F = \sqrt{G}$$

(Equation 11-1)

For SI:

$$F = 0.138 \sqrt{G}$$

where:

F = The free opening area in square feet (m^2).

G = The mass of refrigerant in pounds (kg) in the largest system, any part of which is located in the *machinery room*.

2. Add new text as follows:

1105.6.3 Ventilation rate. ~~For other than ammonia systems,~~ The mechanical ventilation systems shall be capable of exhausting the minimum quantity of air both at normal operating and emergency conditions, as required by Sections 1105.6.3.1 and 1105.6.3.2. ~~The minimum required ventilation rate for ammonia shall be in accordance with IAR-2.~~

Multiple fans or multispeed fans shall be allowed to produce the emergency ventilation rate and to obtain a reduced airflow for normal ventilation.

3. Revise as follows:

1105.6.3.1 Quantity—normal ventilation. During occupied conditions, the mechanical ventilation system shall exhaust the larger of the following:

1. Not less than 0.5 cfm per square foot ($0.0025 m^3/s \cdot m^2$) of *machinery room* area or 20 cfm ($0.009 m^3/s$) per person; or
2. A volume required to limit the room temperature rise to 18°F ($10^\circ C$) taking into account the ambient heating effect of all machinery in the room.

1105.6.3.2 Quantity—emergency conditions. Upon actuation of the refrigerant detector required in Section 1105.3, the mechanical ventilation system shall *exhaust air* from the *machinery room* in the following quantity:

$$Q = 100 x \sqrt{G}$$

(Equation 11-2)

For SI: $Q = 0.07 x \sqrt{G}$

Where:

Q = The airflow in cubic feet per minute (m^3/s).

G = The design mass of refrigerant in pounds (kg) in the largest system, any part of which is located in the *machinery room*.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: The proposed revision consolidates text into one section to improve usability. The modification deletes references to ammonia and IAR2 because the revised version of the standard is yet to be completed.

Assembly Action:

None

M136-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent asked for disapproval to allow the proposal to be reworked and resubmitted as a public comment. The provisions for the discharge of pressure relief valves are lacking.

Assembly Action: **None**

M137-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M138-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: ASME B31.9 is currently an option in the code. Deleting the code text eliminates a prescriptive option to a referenced standard. ASME B31.9 is still an option under current code. The referenced standard is an additional expense and the code would contain nothing but a reference to a standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

M139-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Some of the proposed standards allow alloys that promote dezincification. Some of the referenced standards are not currently in Chapter 15. Copper and other materials need to be added.

Assembly Action: **None**

M140-09/10

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

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

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M141-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M142-09/10

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

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

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M143-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Delete without substitution:

1203.1.1 Joints between different piping materials. Joints between different piping-materials shall be made with approved adapter fittings.

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Committee Reason: Dielectric fittings can leak and should not be mandated. The modification retains the first sentence to continue to allow approved adapter fittings.

Assembly Action: **None**

M144-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Disapproval is based upon the action taken on M143-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

M145-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M146-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is consistent with the action taken on M147- 09/10. This allows existing technology consistent with the IPC.

Assembly Action: **None**

M147-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Such joints are allowed by the IPC with a good performance history.

Assembly Action: **None**

M148-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed text is not product specific and is not tied to a specific standard, thus, confusion can result. Current Section 1201.3 allows ASME B31.9 as an option. The text "certified by a third party agency" is unique to the IPC and is not defined in the IMC. The codes should be consistent in referencing an "approved agency."

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **DF**

Reason:

M149-09/10

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 standards did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M150-09/10

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 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M151-09/10

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

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

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M152-09/10

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

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

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M153-09/10

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, Sections 3.6.3.1, 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal would result in an outdated standard being referenced. The currently referenced edition complies with Council Policy #28. Going backwards in time violates CP # 28.

Assembly Action: **None**

M154-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.
The figures do not correlate with any text in the code. NFPA 31 is not related to the appendix figures. The IFGC covers this subject.

Assembly Action: **None**

M155-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

M156-09/10

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

PART II – IBC

Revise as follows:

1203.1 General. Buildings shall be ventilated with natural ventilation in accordance Section 1203.4, or mechanical ventilation in accordance with the International Mechanical Code.

Where the air infiltration rate in a dwelling unit is less than 5 air changes per hour when tested with a blower door at a pressure of ~~33.5 psf~~ 0.2 inch w.c. (50 Pa) in accordance with Section 402.4.2.1 of the International Energy Conservation Code, the dwelling unit shall be ventilated by mechanical means in accordance with Section 403 of the International Mechanical Code.

PART III – IRC

Insert new section as follows (renumber current Section 303.4 and those following as appropriate):

R303.4 Mechanical ventilation. Where the air infiltration rate of a dwelling unit is less than 5 air changes per hour when tested with a blower door at a pressure of ~~33.5 psf~~ 0.2 inch w.c. (50 Pa) in accordance with Section N1102.4.2.1, the dwelling unit shall be provided with whole-house mechanical ventilation in accordance with Section M1507.3.

Reason: Everyone can agree that when dwelling units become “too” tight, they need mechanical ventilation. The question is, “how tight is too tight?” This code change proposal offers five air changes per hour at 50 Pascal as the “too tight” limit, and directs builders to provide mechanical ventilation at this point.

Why is whole-house mechanical ventilation needed?

Indoor air quality has direct impact on the health of building occupants. Poor indoor air quality is listed by the EPA as being the fourth largest environmental threat to our country.¹ A 2007 California study revealed formaldehyde exposure in most new homes is beyond limits recommended by the California Air Resources Board. Multiple studies have shown that relying on window operation to provide ventilation is not sufficient in practice.^{2,3} If unchecked, pollutants from cleaning chemicals, finishes, furniture, and occupant activities can cause serious health effects on building occupants. Whole-house mechanical ventilation reduces occupant exposure to such pollutants.

Why 5 ACH 50?

Traditionally, 0.35 natural air changes per hour has been the consensus ventilation rate at which it is believed that sufficient fresh air is being provided to building occupants. This ventilation rate was typically achieved without mechanical ventilation because homes were built without an effective air barrier. As building practices have improved, homes have become tighter, and as homes become tighter, mechanical ventilation must be introduced to provide sufficient levels of ventilation.

ASHRAE Standard 136 was developed to enable calculation of natural air changes per hour as a function of air changes at various pressures. By following the calculation procedures in this standard, it can be shown that a natural infiltration rate of 0.35 air changes per hour is equivalent to somewhere between 7 ACH 50 to 10 ACH 50, depending on the local climatic conditions of the home. Because most dwellings are built this tight, ASHRAE 62.2 requires mechanical ventilation for all homes, with few exceptions. However, based on ASHRAE 136, a conservative code might prescribe whole-house mechanical ventilation for any home with an infiltration leakage rate of 10 ACH 50 or less.

As a second point of reference, California’s 2005 Title 24 Chapter 6 requires that, “Continuous mechanical ventilation (either exhaust or supply ventilation) must be installed when the target SLA is below 3.0”. California’s SLA of 3.0 is roughly equivalent to 6 ACH 50. As a third point of reference, NAHB’s National Green Building Standard requires whole-house mechanical ventilation when the infiltration rate falls below 5.0 ACH 50. This requirement provides clear recognition from a consensus standard that whole-house mechanical ventilation should be provided for all homes that meet this threshold.

Based on the previous references, there is broad consensus across states and within consensus standards that whole-house mechanical ventilation should be required when a dwelling’s infiltration falls below 5.0 ACH 50.

What states are now requiring whole-house mechanical ventilation?

Several states now require mechanical ventilation in dwellings, including MN, VT, WA, CA, and ME.

References:

1. ASHRAE Standard 62.2-2007 *Ventilation and Acceptable Indoor Air Quality in Low-Rise Residential Buildings*. <http://www.ashrae.org/technology/page/548>
2. Price, P.N. and M.H. Sherman “Ventilation Behavior and Household Characteristics in New California Houses,” April 2006. LBNL-59620 <http://epb.lbl.gov/Publications/lbnl-59620.pdf>
3. Offermann, F.J., et al., “Window usage, ventilation, and formaldehyde concentrations in new California homes: summer field sessions”, in *IAQ 2007, Healthy and Sustainable Buildings*. 2007, American Society of Heating Refrigerating, and Air Conditioning Engineers, Inc.: Baltimore, MD. p. 497-526 (preprints); <http://www.iee-sf.com/pdf/SummerFieldResults.pdf>

Cost Impact: Where homes have infiltration rates less than 5.0 ACH 50, and those homes are not already providing whole-house mechanical ventilation, the cost of construction will increase.

PART I - IMC

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The tightening of the thermal envelope necessitates mechanical ventilation in some cases. The proposal does not require that a blower door test be conducted, but rather, acts on the results of any such test that is conducted by choice. If Section 403 is applied by choice, no testing is required.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IBC

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: Same reason as given for approval of M 156-09/10 Part I. The modification corrects the pressure to be consistent with 50 Pa.

Assembly Action:

None

PART III – IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

Insert new section as follows (renumber current Section 303.4 and those following as appropriate):

R303.4 Mechanical ventilation. Where the air infiltration rate of a dwelling unit is less than 5 air changes per hour when tested with a blower door at a pressure of 33.5 psf (50 Pa) in accordance with Section N1102.4.2.1, the dwelling unit shall be provided with whole-house mechanical ventilation in accordance with Section M1507.3.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: The proposed threshold is appropriate for determining where mechanical ventilation is required. This provides the builder with options. The modification corrects the pressure to be consistent with 50 Pa.

Assembly Action:

None
