

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

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

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

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

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



First Printing

Publication Date: December 2009

Copyright © 2009

By

International Code Council, Inc.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. This 2009/2010 Code Development Cycle Report of the Public Hearing on the 2009 Editions of the *International Codes* is a copyrighted work owned by the International Code Council, Inc. Without advanced written permission from the copyright owner, no part of this book may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including, without limitations, electronic, optical or mechanical means (by way of example and not limitation, photocopying, or recording by or in an information storage retrieval system). For information on permission to copy material exceeding fair use, please contact: Publications, 4051 West Flossmoor Road, Country Club Hills, IL 60478 (Phone 1-888-422-7233).

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

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Send to:

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

Acronym ICC Code Name (Code change number prefix)

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

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

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

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

ICC WEBSITE - WWW.ICCSAFE.ORG

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

REFERENCED STANDARDS UPDATES

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

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

MODIFICATIONS BY PUBLIC COMMENT

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

FINAL ACTION CONSIDERATION

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

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

CALL FOR ADOPTION INFORMATION

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

CP# 28-05 CODE DEVELOPMENT

Approved: 9/24/05

Revised: 2/27/09

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

1.0 Introduction

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

2.0 Code Development Cycle

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.0 Submittal of Code Change Proposals

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

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

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

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

3.4 Number: One copy of each code change proposal, two copies of each proposed new referenced standard and one copy of all substantiating information shall be submitted. Additional copies may be requested when determined necessary by the Secretariat to allow such information to be distributed to the code development committee. Where such additional copies are requested, it shall be the responsibility of the proponent to send such copies to the respective code development committee. A copy of the code change proposal in electronic form is preferred.

3.5 Submittal Deadline: Each code change proposal shall be received at the office of the Secretariat by the posted deadline. Such posting shall occur no later than 120 days prior to the code change deadline. The submitter of a proposed code change is responsible for the proper and timely receipt of all pertinent materials by the Secretariat.

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

3.6.1 Code References:

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

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

3.6.2 Standard Content:

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

3.6.2.2 The standard shall be appropriate for the subject covered.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.6.3 Standard Promulgation:

3.6.3.1 Code change proposals with corresponding changes to the code text which include a reference to a proposed new standard or a proposed update of an existing referenced shall comply with this section. The standard shall be completed and readily available prior to Final Action Consideration based on the cycle of code development which includes the proposed code change proposal. In order for a new standard to be considered for reference by the Code, such standard shall be submitted in at least a consensus draft form in accordance with Section 3.4. Updating of standards without corresponding

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

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

4.0 Processing of Proposals

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

5.0 Public Hearing

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5.5.1 Discussion Order:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Committee Action	Desired Assembly Action		
	ASF	AMF	DF
AS	--	² / ₃ Majority	² / ₃ Majority
AM	² / ₃ Majority	² / ₃ Majority	² / ₃ Majority
D	² / ₃ Majority	² / ₃ Majority	--

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

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

6.0 Public Comments

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7.0 Final Action Consideration

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.0 Appeals

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

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

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

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

CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS FOR FINAL ACTION:

**MAY 14 – 23, 2010
DALLAS, TEXAS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL
BUILDING/ENERGY CODE COMMITTEE**

Thomas Meyers, CBO - Chair

Building Official
City of Central, CO

Donald LeBrun, CBO – Vice Chair

Assistant Director, Code Enforcement;
State of Indiana-Indiana Dept. of
Homeland Security
Indianapolis, IN

Eric Borsting

Rep: National Association of Home
Builders
President
ESB Professional Consulting
Stockton, CA

Anthony Bumbalis, PE

President
Anthony Bumbalis
Cleveland, OH

Michael Christoffersen, CPBD

Rep: National Association of Home
Builders
President
Architectural Designs, Inc.
Fort Wayne, IN

Chip Dence

Rep: National Association of Home
Builders
East End Builders
Victoria, TX

Helen Kessler DiFate, AIA

President
DIFATE GROUP, PC
St. Louis, MO

Robert Eugene

Senior Staff Engineer
Underwriters Laboratories
Spokane, WA

Kathleen Osmonson

Building Official/Fire Marshal
City of Mounds View
Mounds View, MN

Roger Robertson

Chief of Inspections
Chesterfield County Department of
Building Inspections
Chesterfield, VA

Alan Steinle, PE

Rep: NCSEA (National Council of
Structural Engineers Association)
President
Steinle Construction Engineers Inc.
Wilmington, DE

Jim Zengel

Rep: National Association of Home
Builders
President
Zengel Construction Co.
Dayton, OH

Staff Secretary:

Larry Franks, PE

Senior Staff Engineer
International Code Council

David Bowman, PE

Manager of Codes
International Code Council

**INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL
BUILDING/ENERGY CODE COMMITTEE
HEARING RESULTS –
BUILDING PORTION**

RB1-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change will correlate the definition and make it consistent with the definition in the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB2-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this would be easily misinterpreted to define other elements such as sidewalks and driveways. The primary use of a patio is not a walking surface. Terms such as this should be left to the ordinary accepted meaning.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB3-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that the definition contains technical requirements and criteria that should be in the code text and not in a definition.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB4-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change will make the definition less confusing and will be consistent with the IBC definition. This is consistent with the definition in RB1-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB5-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

RB6-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

RB7-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Monograph:

Analysis: Review of 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. and 3.6.2.11.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is confusing and the standard does not comply with the ICC criteria. The revision to the standard is not complete. Also, there are issues with the electrical provisions that might be a conflict with respect to the standard.

Assembly Action:

None

RB8-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a complex issue with respect to location and additions. If the proponents of the previous proposals on fire protection of floors reach a consensus, then this is not needed. The proponent requests disapproval in order to improve the proposal.

Assembly Action:

None

RB9-09/10

PART I - IRC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB8-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IFC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval in order to improve the proposal.

Assembly Action:

None

RB10-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this change attempts to bring patio covers into the code piecemeal from Appendix H and the proper structural considerations are not being brought forth. This should remain in Appendix H.

Assembly Action:

None

RB11-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The definition of screen enclosure is too broad and needs to be reworked. This could be interpreted to place restrictions on temporary tents. This is consistent with the committee's action on RB10-09/10.

Assembly Action:

None

RB12-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this clarifies how the code is to be used with respect to wind and seismic and when to use the alternate reference standards. This change clarifies that although the wind and seismic provisions may not be applicable, the other portions of the code still apply.

Assembly Action:

None

RB13-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee feels that the concerns with respect to roof sheathing nails, wind bracing, uplift connectors and wall-to-wall connections have been resolved and it is appropriate to restore the 110 mph basic wind speed as the threshold for high wind design.

Assembly Action:

None

RB14-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

R301.2.1.2 Protection of openings. Exterior glazing in buildings located in windborne debris regions shall be protected from windborne debris. Glazed opening protection for windborne debris shall meet the requirements of the Large Missile Test of ASTM E 1996 and ASTM E 1886 referenced therein. The applicable wind zones for establishing missile types in ASTM E 1996 are shown on Figure R301.2(4)C. Garage door glazed opening protection for windborne debris shall meet the requirements of an *approved* impact resisting standard or ANSI/DASMA 115.

Exception: Wood structural panels with a minimum thickness of 7/16 inch (11 mm) and a maximum span of 8 feet (2438 mm) shall be permitted for opening protection in one- and two-story buildings. Panels shall be precut and attached to the framing surrounding the opening containing the product with the glazed opening. Panels shall be predrilled as required for the anchorage method and shall be secured with the attachment hardware provided. Attachments shall be designed to resist the component and cladding loads determined in accordance with either Table R301.2(2) or ASCE 7, with the permanent corrosion resistant attachment hardware provided and anchors permanently installed on the building. Attachment in accordance with Table R301.2.1.2 is permitted for buildings with a mean roof height of 33 feet (10 058 mm) or less where located in Wind Zones 1 and 2 in accordance with Figure R301.2(4)C.

Revise Chapter 44 as follows:

ASCE 7-~~05~~ 10 Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: This change will update and coordinate the wind speed maps with the current ASCE 7. ASCE 7 is the permitted design standard and it is important to bring it into the IRC, especially for wind speeds. The modification updates the ASCE 7 to the 2010 edition and clarifies that the wind borne debris protection of openings is for exterior glazing.

Assembly Action:

None

RB15-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change clarifies the code and eliminates an exception.

Assembly Action:

None

RB16-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee feels that the failures may have been noncompliance rather than inadequate code. No data or substantiation was submitted to show that the code is inadequate.

Assembly Action:

None

RB17-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change updates the code to permit the use of ASCE 24 in Coastal A Zones as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB18-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change improves the code and clarifies Table R301.7, as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB19-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels there is no compelling reason to change the 5 feet separation distance. This is consistent in the Assembly Action on RB184-09/10. The ICC membership voted for the 5 feet separation in past code cycles and the committee supports that.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB20-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this change is not needed as Table R302.1 already addresses projections. Also, referring to structures is vague and a list of specific structures would be more appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB21-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this change would prohibit more than one accessory structure adjacent to a dwelling on a lot unless the second accessory structure has rated protection. The garage provision is not necessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB22-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee recognizes there are similar occupancies in the IBC that allows 1-hour rated separation with fire sprinkler systems. The 1-hour rating should be retained as an incentive to local jurisdictions to retain the fire-sprinkler system.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB23-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language of this change is unclear and confusing. The details are not clear how they relate to tested assemblies. There are a lot of terms that are not defined. The figures limit the prescriptive solution to one specific way and there may be many others that would be acceptable. This should be reworked and brought back.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB24-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This change would impose severe restrictions on penetration at the roof. This does not mirror the IBC requirement on this issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB25-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: An NFPA 13D sprinkler system will not provide the same protection as the NFPA 13 system. The difference between the NFPA 13 and NFPA 13D is more than 1/2 hour.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB26-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no data presented to substantiate the need for the door closer. This is a fire-rated door in a non-rated wall assembly and there is no reason for sealing or a closer. Other doors are permitted without a closer. The owner can disable this manually upon the certificate of occupancy.

Assembly Action: **Approved as Submitted**

RB27-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a good addition as this will make it easier for the building official to verify compliance.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB28-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The language of this change does not clear up the issue but adds confusion.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB29-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB28-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB30-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels the term "or equivalent" is sufficient and there is no need to add a list of products.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB31-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a good start and the proponent should work with the proponents of RB85-09/10 through RB88-09/10 to bring back a solution that protects the firefighters and the occupants. The modification that was ruled out of order would be a good basis to begin for rework and bring back. There should be ways other than fire-rating to achieve the solution. Also, this change would force the use of dimensional lumber.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB32-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this change would eliminate some options that are very needed. The existing language is sufficient and the use of fire-retardant coatings is controlled by Section R104.11 alternate methods.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB33-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change aligns the alternate test method with the similar provisions in the IBC and as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB34-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a needed change and provides a good pointer to the foam plastic insulation requirements. However, it would be better if it were in the body of the section rather than an exception.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB35-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is product driven and it would limit the options available to seal around the dryer duct exhaust. This change would require protection around a penetration in a non-rated wall assembly.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB36-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB37-09/10. No documentation was submitted to show that 500 square feet is the appropriate number.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB37-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels the existing 1000 square feet threshold is adequate. The issues cited were code violations and there is no need to change the code. Going to cubic feet would make it difficult to enforce. This is more appropriate for modular housing and not stick built.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB38-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that this change will cause confusion and would permit a ceiling height that is unusable.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB39-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this change is unnecessary and it contains a circular reference.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB40-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a needed change and provides a good option. This change will provide safety from tripping and falling on stairs with adjacent glazing. This will be consistent with the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB41-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change will more clearly define how the measurement of the sill height is to be taken.

Assembly Action:

None

RB42-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent's request for disapproval. The proponent will work with industry on this issue and bring this back later.

Assembly Action:

None

RB43-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a much needed change. This is needed for any window well but is especially important for the emergency escape and rescue windows so as not to hinder egress.

Assembly Action:

None

RB44-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent's request for disapproval. This section gives the requirements for landings but the proposal gives requirements for doors. This proposal is inconsistent with the intent of the section.

Assembly Action:

None

RB45-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on proponent's request for disapproval. The proposal would require the door to not swing or not have a floor or landing. The proponent should rework and bring back later.

Assembly Action:

None

RB46-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

R311.7.4.1 Risers height. The maximum riser height shall be 73/4 inches (196 mm). The riser shall be measured vertically between leading edges of the adjacent treads. The greatest riser height within any flight of stairs shall not exceed the smallest by more than 3/8 inch (9.5 mm). Risers shall be vertical or sloped from the underside of the leading edge nosing of the tread above at an angle not more than 30 degrees (0.51 rad) from the vertical. Open risers are permitted provided that the opening between treads does not permit the passage of a 4-inch diameter (102 mm) sphere.

Exception: The opening between adjacent treads is not limited on stairs with a total rise of 30 inches (762 mm) or less.

R311.7.4.2 Treads depth. The minimum tread depth shall be 10 inches (254 mm). The tread depth shall be measured horizontally between the vertical planes of the foremost projection of adjacent treads and at a right

angle to the tread's leading edge. The greatest tread depth within any flight of stairs shall not exceed the smallest by more than 3/8 inch (9.5 mm). ~~Consistently shaped winders at the walkline shall be allowed within the same flight of stairs as rectangular treads and do not have to be within 3/8 inch (9.5 mm) of the rectangular tread depth.~~

R311.7.4.2.1 Winder treads. Winder treads shall have a minimum tread depth of 10 inches (254 mm) measured between the vertical planes of the foremost projection of adjacent treads at the intersections with the walkline. Winder treads shall have a minimum tread depth of 6 inches (152 mm) at any point within the clear width of the stair. Within any flight of stairs, the largest winder tread depth at the walkline shall not exceed the smallest winder tread by more than 3/8 inch (9.5 mm). Consistently shaped winders at the walkline shall be allowed within the same flight of stairs as rectangular treads and do not have to be within 3/8 inch (9.5 mm) of the rectangular tread depth.

R311.7.4.3 Nosings. The radius of curvature at the nosing shall be no greater than 9/16 inch (14 mm). A nosing not less than 3/4 inch (19 mm) but not more than 1 1/4 inches (32 mm) shall be provided on stairways with solid risers. The greatest nosing projection shall not exceed the smallest nosing projection by more than 3/8 inch (9.5 mm) between two stories, including the nosing at the level of floors and landings. Beveling of nosings shall not exceed 1/2 inch (12.7 mm).

Exception:

A nosing is not required where the tread depth is a minimum of 11 inches (279 mm).

Committee Reason The committee feels this change makes the code easier to use by breaking out the winder text into its own section. The modification corrects the term "leading edge" to "nosing" and moves the winder walking criteria into the new winder section.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB47-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB46-09/10. The committee prefers the rewrite of RB46-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB48-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that the definition of winders historically works for the geometry that is here. If the proposed geometry is specific to a specific type of stairway then a new code section specifically addressing the problem is needed. The last sentence is such that it would allow a landing less than 36 inches. This should be reworked and brought back.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB49-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a good change that is a necessary addition to clarify the condition of continuity of the handrail at windows.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB50-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that exit discharge requirements are not covered in the IRC. There was no data submitted to substantiate that this is a problem and is needed. The intent of the change is not clear.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB51-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee feels that although there isn't a specific definition of open sided walking surfaces, it is understood what a walking surface is and the difference is not significant enough to limit to the items proposed. This change would delete the fixed seating requirements. The committee likes getting rid of open sided walking surface. The proponent should get together with the proponent of E100-09/10, Part II and rework and bring back.

Assembly Action:

None

RB52-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The documentation submitted was for a guard with openings that were not code compliant. There was no justification provided to show this change is needed.

Assembly Action:

None

RB53-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

RB54-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Sprinklers are a life safety feature in the IBC and they should remain in the IRC. This change would weaken the code relative to life safety without sufficient justification. The committee recognizes there is a cost associated with sprinklers. However, the cost for sprinklers may be a nominal cost for the added life safety feature and other life safety features of the code may cost substantially more. Sprinklers will provide added safety for the elderly and handicapped.

The committee feels the ICC membership desires that sprinklers remain a requirement of the IRC. This requirement was placed into the code by an overwhelming majority of the members at the Final Action in Minneapolis and it should therefore be left to the full membership to remove the provision by a large majority in the Final Action Hearing. This is a contentious issue that has led to much debate and leaving this provision in the code will allow the debate to play out the way it should.

Assembly Action:

None

RB55-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This change is not needed as the requirement is already in Section P2904.

Assembly Action:

None

RB56-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB54-09/10.

Assembly Action:

None

RB57-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

RB58-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change is a good addition to the code and will make it easier for the building official to verify compliance with UL 217.

Assembly Action:

None

RB59-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change will permit wireless interconnection where it is difficult to hardwire, especially for alterations and repairs. The UL 217 referenced in Section R314.1 will apply for wired or wireless smoke alarms.

Assembly Action:

None

RB60-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee feels that deleting carbon monoxide detectors would weaken the code relative to life safety. Carbon monoxide detectors are within the intent of the IRC and the ICC membership voted to place them into the code.

Assembly Action:

None

RB61-09/10

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: The committee prefers the language of FS160-09/10, Part II.

Assembly Action:

None

RB62-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

R316.5.3 Attics. The thermal barrier specified in Section R316.4 is not required where all of the following apply:

1. Attic access is required by Section R807.1.
2. The space is entered only for purposes of repairs or maintenance.
3. The foam plastic insulation is protected against ignition using one of the following ignition barrier materials:
 - 3.1. 1 ½-inch-thick (38mm) mineral fiber insulation;
 - 3.2. ¼-inch-thick (6.4mm) wood structural panels;
 - 3.3. 3/8-inch (9.5 mm) particleboard;
 - 3.4. ¼-inch (6.4mm) hardboard;
 - 3.5. 3/8-inch (9.5mm) gypsum board;
 - 3.6. Corrosion-resistant steel having a base metal thickness of 0.016 inch (0.406mm);
 - 3.7. 1.5-inch thick (38mm) cellulose loose-fill insulation.

The above ignition barrier is not required where the foam plastic insulation has been tested in accordance with Section R316.6.

Committee Reason: The committee feels this gives another option for ignition barrier as stated in the proponent's published reason. The modification will permit other forms of cellulose by removing "loose-fill". The committee would like to see a standard for ignition barrier rather than continue to add products to the list.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB63-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on S207-09/10, Part II.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB64-09/10

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: The committee feels there are a number of different products this could apply to and just limiting it to deck boards is going to create a number of issues. The definition is too broad, primarily is vague and thermoplastic requires chemical knowledge. Also, the issue of labeling as stated on the committee's previous action on S207-09/10, Part II. This should be reworked and brought back later.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB65-09/10 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

RB66-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is already addressed in the code in Section R104.4. The text is confusing with respect to "before operating". This needs reworking and bring back later.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB67-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that observation of non-compliance of a code provision is not sufficient justification to remove a requirement. The use of mat or raft foundation under limited conditions should remain in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB68-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This addition is a good clarification and points out the need for breakaway walls or no obstructions. The term "free of obstruction" could present an enforcement issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB69-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels the current language is adequate for surface drainage away from the structure. This change could cause confusion with respect to drainage away from piers inside a crawl space.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB70-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's statement that this is not ready and needs more work. The figure is confusing and the language is not code style. The committee suggests the proponent rework and bring back. The following deficiency needs to be addressed; eccentric loading on the footing, footing size required for the lintels, limited to CMU, pilaster reinforcement and limited to basement.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB71-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This change is lacking a definition of a pier and beam foundation.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB72-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This change would make the IRC inconsistent with the IBC and the NEHRP recommendations. The proponent should rework and bring back later.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB73-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The definition of sill plate and sole plate is unclear. The proponent should get with industry and rework this with the modification that was ruled out of order and bring this back to Final Action.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB74-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This change would create a conflict within the code as other sections permit a sill plate to span over an opening in a foundation wall. This should be reworked and brought back.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB75-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The reference in the proposed new item 4 is for top plates and does not apply to bottom plates.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB76-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that this proposal is flawed as patio covers and screen enclosures are not the same. This attempts to move parts of Appendix H into the code piece meal.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB77-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels it is inappropriate to add construction document requirements to this section. This belongs in Section R106.1.1 of the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB78-09/10

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: This change adds the proper reference standard for flat ICF wall systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB79-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels the proponent has misinterpreted the pier and curtain wall figure in the code. It is not appropriate to delete the SDC D₀, D₁, and D₂ requirement without providing a solution.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB80-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee likes the concept but feels that there is potential for conflict or unintended consequences with Section R606.6. There is a concern about the sill plate bearing on the face shells. The proponent should rework and bring this back later.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB81-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this section needs additional clarification but this does not address it properly. The added text is for foundation walls and this section addresses retaining walls. This should be reworked and brought back.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB82-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal adds many difficult provisions that appear to be arbitrary. Bringing the wood foundation drainage in is not appropriate. There is no justification to increase the drain to 4 inches. Changing vapor retarder to moisture barrier adds confusion and will cause a conflict within the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB83-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change will provide flexibility to install the vapor retarder as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB84-09/10

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: Sprinklers are a code requirement and this section is not needed. The committee recognizes some jurisdictions will amend out the sprinklers, but we cannot add requirements based on "what ifs". This proposal does not address light-frame construction and gives no option if there are no sprinklers.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB85-09/10

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: Based on the committee's previous action on RB31-09/10. ASTM E84 is not the appropriate test for structural integrity. The floor furnace test is more appropriate. The proponent should work with the proponent of RB86-09/10 through RB88-09/10 to bring back a solution that protects the fire fighters and the occupants.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB86-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request and the committee's previous action on RB85-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB87-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request and the committee's previous action on RB85-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB88-09/10

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: Based on the proponent's request and the committee's previous action on RB85-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB89-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change recognizes new technology for end-jointed lumber and provides a means to identify it.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB90-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change will improve the efficacy of the code by collecting all of the deck requirements into one section and makes the code easier to use.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB91-09/10

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: This change adds a much needed definition and standard for structural composite lumber as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB92-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change will clarify the use of the default hold-down device and as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action:

None

RB93-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee feels the placement description is too confusing and should be presented in tabular form.

Assembly Action:

None

RB94-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee feels that a prescriptive method should not be removed from the code but alternate methods should be added. The proponent should work with industry and bring back a solution using other methods.

Assembly Action:

None

RB95-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change appropriately adds a reference to the cutting of wood floor members and clarifies Figure R502.8 to insure it implies that wood members 4 inches or greater cannot be notched on the tension side.

Assembly Action:

None

RB96-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

R502.11.2 Bracing. Trusses shall be braced to prevent rotation and provide lateral stability in accordance with the requirements specified in the *construction documents* for the building and on the individual truss design drawings. In the absence of specific bracing requirements, trusses shall be braced in accordance with accepted industry practices, such as, the Building Component Safety Information (BCSI) Guide to Good Practice for Handling, Installing & Bracing of Metal Plate Connected Wood Trusses.

R505.1.3 Floor trusses. Cold-formed steel trusses shall be designed, braced and installed in accordance with AISI S100, Section D4. In the absence of specific bracing requirements, trusses shall be braced in accordance with accepted industry practices, such as, the Cold-Formed Steel Building Component Safety Information (CFSBCSI), Guide to Good Practice for Handling, Installing & Bracing of Cold-Formed Steel Trusses. Truss members shall not be notched, cut or altered in any manner without an *approved* design.

R802.10.3 Bracing. Trusses shall be braced to prevent rotation and provide lateral stability in accordance with the requirements specified in the *construction documents* for the building and on the individual truss design drawings. In the absence of specific bracing requirements, trusses shall be braced in accordance with accepted industry practices, such as, the Building Component Safety Information (BCSI) Guide to Good Practice for Handling, Installing & Bracing of Metal Plate Connected Wood Trusses.

R804.3.7 Roof trusses. Cold-formed steel trusses shall be designed and installed in accordance with AISI S100, Section D4. In the absence of specific bracing requirements, trusses shall be braced in accordance with accepted industry practices, such as, the Cold-Formed Steel Building Component Safety Information

(CFSBCSI), Guide to Good Practice for Handling, Installing & Bracing of Cold-Formed Steel Trusses. Trusses shall be connected to the top track of the load-bearing wall in accordance with Table R804.3, either with two No.10 screws applied through the flange of the truss or by using a 54 mil (1.37 mm) clip angle with two No.10 screws in each leg.

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's published reason. The modification clarifies these documents are acceptable industry practice with respect to bracing of trusses.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB97-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB98-09/10 and the proponent's request for disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB98-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change corrects the code language to comport with the controlling reference standard.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB99-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change provides an accepted standard to use as an alternate to the prescriptive code.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB100-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change appropriately removes a provision that provides for something in the future. There is no justification for requiring a vapor retarder to be required for an attached unheated garage based upon future use.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB101-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

R702.7 ~~R703.1.3~~ Vapor retarders. Class I or II vapor retarders are required on the interior side of frame walls in Zones 5, 6, 7, 8 and Marine 4.

Exceptions:

1. *Basement walls.*
2. *Below grade portion of any wall.*
3. *Construction where moisture or its freezing will not damage the materials.*

702.7.1 R703.4.3.4 Class III vapor retarders. Class III vapor retarders shall be permitted where any one of the conditions in Table ~~R702.7.1 R604.3.4~~ is met.

TABLE R702.7.1 R703.4.3.4
CLASS III VAPOR RETARDERS
(No change to table values or footnote)

R702.7.2 R703.4.3.2 Material vapor retarder class. The vapor retarder class shall be based on the manufacturer's certified testing or a tested assembly.

The following shall be deemed to meet the class specified:

- Class I: Sheet polyethylene, unperforated aluminum foil.
- Class II: Kraft-faced fiberglass batts.
- Class III: Latex or enamel paint.

R702.7.3 R703.4.3.3 Minimum clear air spaces and vented openings for vented cladding. For the purposes of this section, vented cladding shall include the following minimum clear air spaces. Other openings with the equivalent vent area shall be permitted.

1. Vinyl lap or horizontal aluminum siding applied over a weather resistive barrier as specified in Table R703.4.
2. Brick veneer with a clear airspace as specified in Section R703.7.4.2.
3. Other *approved* vented claddings.

Committee Reason: This change groups the vapor retarders in a single location and makes them readily available. The modification addresses placement of this element to the correct section for internal rather than exterior.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB102-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

EXTERIOR WALL COVERING. A material or assembly of materials applied on the exterior side of exterior walls for the purpose of providing a weather-resistive barrier, insulation or for aesthetics, including but not limited to, veneers, siding, exterior insulation and finish systems, architectural trim and embellishments such as cornices, soffits, and fascias, ~~gutters and leaders~~.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee feels this new language will be an added improvement and will distinguish between structural wall covering and exterior wall covering. The modification deletes gutters and leaders from the definition since they are not external wall coverings.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB103-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change clarifies that the alternate fastener only applies to Table R602.3(1) and is only good for less than 100 mph for roof sheathing.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB104-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

R602.7 Headers. For header spans see Tables R502.5(1) and R502.5(2) and 602.7.1. ~~Alternative header applications in accordance with this section shall be permitted.~~

R602.7.1 Single member headers. in exterior bearing walls. ~~Single member headers in exterior bearing~~

walls shall be permitted in accordance with Table R602.7.1. Single headers shall be framed top and bottom with a flat wise 2x member. To make up the remaining space, cripples shall be installed above the header. See Figure R602.7.1(1). Alternatively, the header can be sized to fill the space between the wall top plate and a flat wise 2x member. See Figure R602.7.1(2). The header assembly shall bear on a minimum of one jack stud at each end. Single headers shall be framed with a single flat 2-inch nominal member or wall plate not less in width than the wall studs on the top and bottom of the header in accordance with Figures R602.7.1(1) and R602.7.1(2).

**TABLE R602.7.1
SPANS FOR MINIMUM No.2 GRADE SINGLE HEADER
FOR EXTERIOR BEARING WALLS^{a,b,c,f}**

f. The header shall bear on a minimum of one jack stud at each end.

(Portion of proposal not shown remains unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a good change that provides value engineering of the framing and provides additional energy savings. The detail has been in use and has been tested. The modification simplifies the language and puts it into code format and adds a clarifying note to the table.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB105-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

R602.3.5 Braced wall panel uplift load path. Braced wall panels located at exterior walls that support roof rafters or trusses (including stories below top story) shall have the framing members connected in accordance with one of the following:

1. Fastening in accordance with Table R602.3(1) where:
 - 1.1 The basic wind speed does not exceed 90 mph (40 m/s), the wind exposure category is B, the roof pitch is 5:12 or greater, and the roof span is 32 feet (9754 mm) or less, or
 - 1.2 The net uplift value at the top of a wall does not exceed 100 plf (146 N/mm). The net uplift value shall be determined in accordance with Section R802.11 and shall be permitted to be reduced by ~~40-60~~ 57-86 plf (~~57-86~~ N/mm) for each full wall above ~~and 40 plf (57 N/mm) for each floor platform above.~~
2. Where the net uplift value at the top of a wall exceeds 100 plf (146 N/mm), installing approved uplift framing connectors to provide a continuous load path from the top of the wall to the foundation or to a point where the uplift force is 100 plf (146 N/mm) or less. The net uplift value shall be as determined in Item 1.2 above.
3. Wall sheathing and fasteners designed in accordance with accepted engineering practice to resist combined uplift and shear forces.

**TABLE R802.11
REQUIRED STRENGTH OF TRUSS OR RAFTER CONNECTIONS
TO RESIST WIND UPLIFT FORCES^{a,b,c,e,f}
(Pounds per connection)
(No change to table values)**

a. through e. (No change)

f. For wall-to-wall and wall-to-foundation connections, the capacity of the uplift connector is permitted to be reduced by 100 pounds for each full wall above. (For example, if a 600-pound rated connector is used on the roof framing, a 500-pound rated connector is permitted at the next floor level down).

**TABLE R602.10.3(4)
SEISMIC ADJUSTMENT FACTORS TO THE REQUIRED LENGTH OF WALL BRACING**

ADJUSTMENT BASED ON:	STORY/ SUPPORTING	CONDITION	ADJUSTMENT FACTOR ^{a,b} (Multiply length from Table R602.10.3(1) by this factor)	APPLICABLE METHODS
Story height (Section 301.3)	Any story	≤10 ft	1.0	All methods
		>10 ft ≤ 12 ft	1.2	
Braced wall line spacing, townhouses in SDC C	Any story	≤35 ft	1.0	
		>35 ft ≤ 50 ft	1.43	
Braced wall line	Any story	≥25 ft ≤30 ft	1.2	

spacing, in SDC D ₀ , D ₁ , D ₂ ^c		>30 ft ≤ 35 ft	1.4	
Wall dead load	Any story	> 8 ft < 15 ft <8 psf	1.0 0.85	
Roof/ceiling dead load for wall supporting	Roof only or roof plus one or two stories	<15 psf	1.0	
	Roof only	>15 psf ≤ 25 psf	1.2	
	Roof plus one or two stories	>15 psf ≤ 25 psf	1.1	
Walls with stone or masonry veneer	Any story	See Section R703.7		
Interior gypsum board finish (or equivalent)	Any story	Omitted from inside face of braced wall panels	1.5	DWB, WSP, SFB, PBS, PCP, HPS, CS-WSP, CS-G, CS-SFB

R602.10.11 Cripple wall bracing. In Seismic Design Categories other than D₂, cripple walls shall be braced with a length and type of bracing as required for the wall above in accordance with Tables R602.10.3(1) and R602.10.3(3) with the following modifications for cripple wall bracing:

1. The length of bracing as determined from Tables R602.10.3(1) and R602.10.3(3) shall be multiplied by a factor of 1.15, and
2. The wall panel spacing shall be decreased to 18 feet (5486 mm) instead of ~~25~~ 20 feet (7620 mm).

(Portion of proposal not shown remains unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a much needed improvement and adds considerable clarification to the wall bracing provisions while reducing the number of pages from 25 to 23. The modifications corrects for the proper wall load in R602.3.5, item 1.1.2, adds a deleted footnote to Table R802.11, corrects an inequality sign (<25 ft should be >25 ft) in Table R602.10.3(4) and corrects the 25 ft to 20 ft in Section R602.10.11 to comport with Section R602.10.2.2.

Assembly Action:

None

RB106-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change adds needed changes and adds clarifying changes to the cripple wall bracing section and into the table for bracing requirements based on Seismic Design Categories.

Assembly Action:

None

RB107-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows: (Delete remainder of section)

~~**R602.12.1.3 Braced wall panel construction.** Braced wall panels shall be constructed of sheathing with a thickness of not less than 7/16 inch nailed with 8d common nails spaced 4 inches on center at all panel edges and 12 inches on center at intermediate supports. The end of each braced wall panel shall have a hold down device in accordance with Table R602.12(2) installed at each end. Size, height and spacing of wood studs shall be in accordance with Table R602.3(5).~~

Committee Reason: This change gathers the wall bracing associated with masonry veneer and moves it into the wall bracing section thus making the bracing for this type of wall bracing more conveniently located. The modification deletes a sentence in Section R602.12.1.3 that was inadvertently left in.

Assembly Action:

None

RB108-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB105-09/10, this issue is adequately addressed.

Assembly Action:

None

RB109-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

R602.10.6.2 Connections to roof framing. Top plates of exterior *braced wall panels* shall be attached to rafters or roof trusses above in accordance with Table R602.3(1) and this section. Where required by this section, blocking between rafters or roof trusses shall be attached to top plates of *braced wall panels* and to rafters and roof trusses in accordance with Table R602.3(1). A continuous band, rim, or header joist or roof truss parallel to the *braced wall panels* shall be permitted to replace the blocking required by this section. Blocking shall not be required over openings in continuously-sheathed *braced wall lines*. In addition to the requirements of this section, lateral support shall be provided for rafters and ceiling joists in accordance with Section R802.8 and for trusses in accordance with Section R802.10.3. Roof ventilation shall be provided in accordance with R806.1.

1. For SDC A, B and C and wind speeds less than 100 miles per hour (45 m/s), where the distance from the top of the *braced wall panel* to the top of the rafters or roof trusses above is 9 1/4 inches (235 mm) or less, blocking between rafters or roof trusses shall not be required. Where the distance from the top of the *braced wall panel* to the top of the rafters ~~or roof trusses~~ above is between 9 1/4 inches (235 mm) and 15 1/4 inches (387 mm) blocking between rafters ~~or roof trusses~~ shall be provided above the *braced wall panel* in accordance with Figure R602.10.6.2(1). ~~Where the distance from the top of the braced wall panel to the top of the roof trusses above is between 9 1/4 inches and 15 1/4 inches lateral load transfer shall be provided in accordance with Section R802.10.3.~~
2. For SDC D₀, D₁ and D₂ or wind speeds of 100 miles per hour (45 m/s) or greater, where the distance from the top of the *braced wall panel* to the top of the rafters or roof trusses is 15 1/4 inches (387 mm) or less, blocking between rafters or roof trusses shall be provided above the *braced wall panel* in accordance with Figure R602.10.6.2(1).
3. Where the distance from the top of the *braced wall panel* to the top of the rafters or roof trusses exceeds 15 1/4 inches (387 mm), the top plates of the *braced wall panels* shall be connected to perpendicular rafters or roof trusses above in accordance with one or more of the following methods:
 - 3.1. Soffit blocking panels constructed in accordance with Figure R602.10.6.2(2),
 - 3.2. Vertical blocking panels constructed in accordance with Figure R602.10.6.2(3),
 - 3.3. Full -height engineered blocking panels designed in accordance with the AF&PA WFCM.
 - 3.4. Blocking, blocking panels, or other methods of lateral load transfer designed in accordance with accepted engineering practice.

(Portion of proposal not shown remains unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee feels this change simplifies the language and addresses the requirements for rafters and trusses. The modification aligns the blocking requirements for trusses with the blocking requirement for rafters.

Assembly Action:

None

RB110-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

R602.10.8 Panel joints. All vertical joints of panel sheathing shall occur over, and be fastened to common studs. Horizontal joints in *braced wall panels* shall occur over, and be fastened to common blocking of a minimum 1 1/2 inch (38 mm) thickness.

Exceptions:

1. Vertical joints of panel sheathing ~~shall be permitted to occurring over a double studs, fastened in accordance with Table R602.3(1), item 11, shall be permitted to be fastened to the adjoining studs where adjoining panel edges are attached to separate studs with the required panel edge~~

fastening schedule, and the adjacent studs are attached together with 2 rows of 10d box nails (3" x 0.128") at 10" o.c.

2. Blocking at horizontal joints shall not be required in wall segments that are not counted as *braced wall panels*.
3. Where the bracing length provided is at least twice the minimum length required by Tables R602.10.1.2(1) and R602.10.1.2(2) blocking at horizontal joints shall not be required in *braced wall panels* constructed using Methods WSP, SFB, GB, PBS or HPS.
4. When Method GB panels are installed horizontally, blocking of horizontal joints is not required.

Committee Reason: This is a needed code change to address panel joints for modular panels. The modification clarifies and improves the fastening of modular panels together.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB111-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a much needed simplified wall bracing method for structures in low seismic areas and as stated in the proponent's published reason..

Assembly Action: **None**

RB112-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agrees with the intent and this is a needed addition, however the Final Report or the full-scale shake-table test is needed in order to further evaluate this issue.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB113-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that a truly quantified result is not available that would allow this change, based on the previous action on RB112-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB114-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a good idea but it is a guide and should be in the commentary. It contains terms that are inconsistent with code terms. It only gives strength option and ignores the proportion option and compressive strength is not a good indicator of quality.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB115-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This change removes important requirements such as the requirement for filled cellular spaces when used to support beams and girders.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB116-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB80-09/10 and the proponent's request for disapproval with intent to rework and bring back to Final Action.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB117-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels the current table should remain in the code as it is consistent with the table in ASTM C 270. The requirements for mortar cement and masonry cement must remain separate.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB118-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change clarifies the requirements for wall ties for hollow masonry units.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB119-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that this change does not clearly define who is responsible for the instructions, the manufacturer or the code. ASTM E 2112 needs to be brought into compliance and brought into the code and that would resolve these issues. It is not clear that this is adequate for all openings.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB120-09/10

PART I - IRC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART II - IBC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

RB121-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a good change to relocate these provisions to Chapter 3. This makes it easier to locate and is appropriately located in the Building Planning chapter.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB122-09/10

PART I - IRC
Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels the 24 inch height has not been in use long enough to accumulate needed data to justify a change to 36 inches.

Assembly Action: **None**

**PART II - IBC Fire Safety
Committee Action:**

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that increasing the current 24 inch sill height requirement to 36 inches was justified by the data submitted by the proponent.

Assembly Action:

None

RB123-09/10

**PART I - IRC
Committee Action:**

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

R612.3 Window opening control devices. ~~When required elsewhere in this code,~~ Window opening control devices shall comply with ASTM F 2090. The window opening control device, after operation to release the control device allowing the window to fully open, shall not reduce the minimum net clear opening area of the window unit to less than the area required by Section R 310.1.1. ~~The device or any portion thereof shall not project more than 1 inch into the required net clear opening for a length not exceeding 3 inches when the window is in the fully open position.~~

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a good change and the ICC CTC and industry has reached a consensus for a solution to the window opening control devices and achieves consistency with the IBC. The modification requires all window opening control devices to comply with the standard and eliminate the proposed language about hardware projection.

Assembly Action:

None

**PART II - IBC Fire Safety
Committee Action:**

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1405.13.2.1 Window opening control devices. ~~When required elsewhere in this code, w~~Window opening control devices shall comply with ASTM F 2090. The window opening control device, after operation to release the control device allowing the window to fully open, shall not reduce the minimum net clear opening area of the window unit to less than the area required by Section 1029.2. ~~The device or any portion thereof shall not project more than 1 inch into the required net clear opening for a length not exceeding 3 inches when the window is in the fully open position.~~

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that it was appropriate to have consistency between the IRC and the IBC with respect to the provisions for window sills and window opening control devices. The modification appropriately removes projection requirements that have not been justified.

Assembly Action:

None

RB124-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

RB125-09/10

**PART I - IRC
Committee Action:**

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request for disapproval and the committee's previous action on RB123-09/10.

Assembly Action:

None

**PART II - IBC Fire Safety
Committee Action:**

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on the proponents request for disapproval and to be consistent with previous actions.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB126-09/10

PART I - IRC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this proposal contains confusing language and needs reworking and to be consistent with previous action. The term "rough opening sill" is confusing. The height should be to the final opening dimension.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IBC Fire Safety

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponents request for disapproval and to be consistent with actions taken on RB123-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB127-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Monograph:

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.1.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a needed change and reflects industry practice as stated in the proponent's published reason. The new reference standard is in draft form and must be available by Final Action.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB128-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change makes the code consistent with readily available materials and based on the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB129-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The SIP Panels are an engineered product and the code cannot provide a prescriptive requirement. The penetration will have to be approved by the manufacturer and will be shown on the engineered drawings.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB130-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action. Without RB3-09/10 this change is meaningless.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB131-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

RB132-09/10

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: This change adds a standard that is needed and to be consistent with the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB133-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that ASTM C 1658 is not suitable for this application.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB134-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that given the amount of floor modifications proposed, the proponent should get with the interested parties and rework this and bring it back to Final Action. The definition could be reduced to one sentence. Should look at the disconnect, with respect to flashing, created by deleting R703.1.1. Need to address in R703.2, side lap.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB135-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

- d. Nails or staples shall be aluminum, galvanized, or rust-preventative coated and shall be driven into the studs where fiberboard, gypsum, or foam plastic sheathing backing is used. Where wood or wood structural panel sheathing is used, ~~nails~~ fasteners shall be driven into studs unless otherwise permitted to be driven into sheathing in accordance with the siding manufacturer's installation instructions.

(Portions of proposal not shown remains unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee feels this provides further clarity to the code and gives options where not nailed into studs. This helps to bring new products into the code. The modification changes the word "nails" to "fasteners" and will add flexibility to the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB136-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on proponent's request for disapproval. The proponent will work with industry and bring this back for Final Action.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB137-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request for disapproval. The committee feels the proponent should work with interested parties on a consensus of what is required for anchored and adhered veneer and bring this back to Final Action.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB138-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The intent of the code is that the space be completely open or completely filled. This change will require grout and delete slushing of mortar which will assure the space is completely filled.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB139-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change adds needed information for the amount of masonry to be provided above the opening. This will allow the use of the prescriptive composite beam design for the lintel.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB140-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is an improvement and it is more conservative than the standard. The committee recognizes this needs more work and the proponent should work with interested parties and bring back in a public comment the modification that was ruled out of order and address Seismic Design Category C as needed.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB141-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change brings the tie spacing up to date with the standard as stated in the proponent's published reason. Also, the new spacing will assure the ties are attached to the studs spaced 16 inches on center.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB142-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action RB140-09/10. This change would create a conflict with the table in RB140-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB143-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This change is attempting to fix a problem that already is properly addressed in the flashing section. This is an issue of code compliance. Also, there is an incorrect reference to the proper section.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB144-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent's request for disapproval. The proposed reference standard does not comply with the ICC criteria.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB145-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is close but needs more work. Item 1.1 is confusing and should be a list rather than text. Also, the term "other approved methods" needs to be defined.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB146-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this needs to be addressed but it belongs in Chapter 9. The proponent needs to rework and bring this back. This needs a detail or definition of "kick out flashing".

Assembly Action: **None**

RB147-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that the deleting of this section may unfairly penalize the use of vinyl siding. Section R703.11.2 contains permissive language. There is a conflict between Footnote b in the proposed new table and Table R703.4. Also, Footnote c requires contact with the manufacture for higher wind loads.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB148-09/10

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 proposed new standards indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, these standards did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee has serious concerns about the product as to the effect of time after installation will have the fire test results. The committee feels that NFPA 289 is not the appropriate test for the product application.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB149-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels the language may allow the condition to be worse. This should be reworked to specifically address slabs and bring back to Final Action.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB150-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change corrects an error that lapped ceiling joist need only to be fastened in accordance with Table R602.3(1).

Assembly Action: **None**

RB151-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's published reason. This change makes improvements to the figure.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB152-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change adds clarification for cutting, drilling and notching of roof members. Adds figures for rafter notch and ceiling joist taper cut.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB153-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change allows the use of wood roof trusses for structures within the scope of the IRC.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB154-09/10

Errata: Change Table R802.11 to read as shown:

**TABLE R802.11
RAFTER OR TRUSS UPLIFT CONNECTION FORCES FROM WIND
(POUNDS PER CONNECTION)**

Rafter or Truss Spacing	Roof Span (feet)	EXPOSURE B							
		Basic Wind Speed (MPH)							
		85		90		100		110	
		Roof Pitch		Roof Pitch		Roof Pitch		Roof Pitch	
		<5:12	≥5:12	<5:12	≥5:12	<5:12	≥5:12	<5:12	≥5:12
<u>12" o.c.</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>127</u>	<u>110</u>
	<u>18</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>165</u>	<u>144</u>
	<u>24</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>145</u>	<u>126</u>	<u>202</u>	<u>176</u>
	<u>28</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>163</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>227</u>	<u>197</u>
	<u>32</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>180</u>	<u>157</u>	<u>252</u>	<u>219</u>
	<u>36</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>126</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>198</u>	<u>172</u>	<u>277</u>	<u>241</u>
	<u>42</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>124</u>	<u>225</u>	<u>196</u>	<u>315</u>	<u>274</u>
	<u>48</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>101</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>138</u>	<u>251</u>	<u>218</u>	<u>353</u>	<u>307</u>
<u>16" o.c.</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>124</u>	<u>108</u>	<u>169</u>	<u>147</u>
	<u>18</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>103</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>138</u>	<u>219</u>	<u>191</u>
	<u>24</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>124</u>	<u>108</u>	<u>193</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>269</u>	<u>234</u>
	<u>28</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>138</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>217</u>	<u>189</u>	<u>302</u>	<u>263</u>
	<u>32</u>	<u>113</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>153</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>239</u>	<u>208</u>	<u>335</u>	<u>291</u>
	<u>36</u>	<u>124</u>	<u>108</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>146</u>	<u>264</u>	<u>230</u>	<u>369</u>	<u>321</u>
	<u>42</u>	<u>139</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>190</u>	<u>165</u>	<u>299</u>	<u>260</u>	<u>420</u>	<u>365</u>
	<u>48</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>212</u>	<u>184</u>	<u>335</u>	<u>291</u>	<u>471</u>	<u>410</u>
<u>24" o.c.</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>124</u>	<u>108</u>	<u>186</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>254</u>	<u>221</u>
	<u>18</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>238</u>	<u>207</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>286</u>
	<u>24</u>	<u>140</u>	<u>122</u>	<u>186</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>290</u>	<u>252</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>351</u>
	<u>28</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>134</u>	<u>208</u>	<u>181</u>	<u>326</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>454</u>	<u>395</u>
	<u>32</u>	<u>170</u>	<u>148</u>	<u>230</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>360</u>	<u>313</u>	<u>504</u>	<u>438</u>
	<u>36</u>	<u>186</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>252</u>	<u>219</u>	<u>396</u>	<u>345</u>	<u>554</u>	<u>482</u>
	<u>42</u>	<u>209</u>	<u>182</u>	<u>285</u>	<u>248</u>	<u>449</u>	<u>391</u>	<u>630</u>	<u>548</u>
	<u>48</u>	<u>232</u>	<u>202</u>	<u>318</u>	<u>277</u>	<u>502</u>	<u>437</u>	<u>706</u>	<u>614</u>
Rafter or Truss Spacing	Roof Span (feet)	EXPOSURE C							
		Basic Wind Speed (MPH)							
		85		90		100		110	
		Roof Pitch		Roof Pitch		Roof Pitch		Roof Pitch	
		<5:12	≥5:12	<5:12	≥5:12	<5:12	≥5:12	<5:12	≥5:12
<u>12" o.c.</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>114</u>	<u>99</u>	<u>157</u>	<u>137</u>	<u>206</u>	<u>179</u>
	<u>18</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>146</u>	<u>127</u>	<u>204</u>	<u>177</u>	<u>268</u>	<u>233</u>
	<u>24</u>	<u>146</u>	<u>127</u>	<u>179</u>	<u>156</u>	<u>251</u>	<u>218</u>	<u>330</u>	<u>287</u>
	<u>28</u>	<u>164</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>201</u>	<u>175</u>	<u>283</u>	<u>246</u>	<u>372</u>	<u>324</u>
	<u>32</u>	<u>182</u>	<u>158</u>	<u>224</u>	<u>195</u>	<u>314</u>	<u>273</u>	<u>414</u>	<u>360</u>
	<u>36</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>174</u>	<u>246</u>	<u>214</u>	<u>346</u>	<u>301</u>	<u>456</u>	<u>397</u>
	<u>42</u>	<u>227</u>	<u>197</u>	<u>279</u>	<u>243</u>	<u>394</u>	<u>343</u>	<u>520</u>	<u>452</u>
	<u>48</u>	<u>254</u>	<u>221</u>	<u>313</u>	<u>272</u>	<u>441</u>	<u>384</u>	<u>583</u>	<u>507</u>
<u>16" o.c.</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>125</u>	<u>109</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>132</u>	<u>209</u>	<u>182</u>	<u>274</u>	<u>238</u>
	<u>18</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>139</u>	<u>194</u>	<u>169</u>	<u>271</u>	<u>236</u>	<u>356</u>	<u>310</u>
	<u>24</u>	<u>194</u>	<u>169</u>	<u>238</u>	<u>207</u>	<u>334</u>	<u>291</u>	<u>439</u>	<u>382</u>
	<u>28</u>	<u>218</u>	<u>190</u>	<u>267</u>	<u>232</u>	<u>376</u>	<u>327</u>	<u>495</u>	<u>431</u>
	<u>32</u>	<u>242</u>	<u>211</u>	<u>298</u>	<u>259</u>	<u>418</u>	<u>364</u>	<u>551</u>	<u>479</u>
	<u>36</u>	<u>266</u>	<u>231</u>	<u>327</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>460</u>	<u>400</u>	<u>606</u>	<u>527</u>

	<u>42</u>	<u>302</u>	<u>263</u>	<u>372</u>	<u>324</u>	<u>524</u>	<u>456</u>	<u>691</u>	<u>601</u>
	<u>48</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>294</u>	<u>416</u>	<u>362</u>	<u>587</u>	<u>511</u>	<u>775</u>	<u>674</u>
24" o.c.	<u>12</u>	<u>188</u>	<u>164</u>	<u>228</u>	<u>198</u>	<u>314</u>	<u>273</u>	<u>412</u>	<u>358</u>
	<u>18</u>	<u>240</u>	<u>209</u>	<u>292</u>	<u>254</u>	<u>408</u>	<u>355</u>	<u>536</u>	<u>466</u>
	<u>24</u>	<u>292</u>	<u>254</u>	<u>358</u>	<u>311</u>	<u>502</u>	<u>437</u>	<u>660</u>	<u>574</u>
	<u>28</u>	<u>328</u>	<u>285</u>	<u>402</u>	<u>350</u>	<u>566</u>	<u>492</u>	<u>744</u>	<u>647</u>
	<u>32</u>	<u>364</u>	<u>317</u>	<u>448</u>	<u>390</u>	<u>628</u>	<u>546</u>	<u>828</u>	<u>720</u>
	<u>36</u>	<u>400</u>	<u>348</u>	<u>492</u>	<u>428</u>	<u>692</u>	<u>602</u>	<u>912</u>	<u>793</u>
	<u>42</u>	<u>454</u>	<u>395</u>	<u>558</u>	<u>485</u>	<u>786</u>	<u>684</u>	<u>1040</u>	<u>905</u>
	<u>48</u>	<u>508</u>	<u>442</u>	<u>626</u>	<u>545</u>	<u>882</u>	<u>767</u>	<u>1166</u>	<u>1014</u>

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee feels like this change should be merged with RB156-09/10. This change should be brought back with a public comment to correlate with RB156-09/10.

Assembly Action:

None

RB155-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB154-09/10 and RB156-09/10.

Assembly Action:

None

RB156-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change adds a simplified method for roof uplift connections as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action:

None

RB157-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee feels there is no technical justification for this change. There are questions about the amount of ventilation needed. The committee would like to see this combined with RB159-09/10 and brought back.

Assembly Action:

None

RB158-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent's request for disapproval. This change needs additional work and will be brought back.

Assembly Action:

None

RB159-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent's request for disapproval. This change needs additional work and will be brought back.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB160-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this additional text is unnecessary as it is already addressed in the code. Also, this would require ventilators to be provided.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB161-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

R806.4 Unvented attic and unvented enclosed rafter assemblies. Unvented ~~attic and unvented enclosed rafter~~ assemblies (spaces between the ceiling joists of the top *story* and the roof rafters) and unvented enclosed rafter assemblies (spaces between ceilings that are applied directly to the underside of roof framing members/rafters and the structural roof sheathing at the top of the roof framing members/rafters) shall be permitted if all the following conditions are met:

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: This change clarifies and adds direction for unvented attics and cathedral ceilings and as stated in the proponent's published reason. The modification clarifies the section title and deletes redundant text.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB162-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB146-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB163-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change removes the hail hazard map that was adopted without sufficient supporting data as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB164-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels the existing language is clear and the new text is not needed and is confusing.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB165-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The shingle, not the adhesive strip, is what is required to be wind resistant. Shingle rigidity is a factor in wind resistant. The term "adhesive strips" implies more than one is required. This would exclude interlocking shingles.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB166-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no technical data justifying this change and it exceeds the tested manufacturer's specification.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB167-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This change is not necessary. Additional fasteners are not the controlling factor for shingle blow off, the shingle is. Improvement in the shingle and ASTM D 7158 has improved the wind resistance of shingles.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB168-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request for disapproval. The language is unclear and too restrictive. The proponent will work with industry and submit a public comment for Final Action.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB169-09/10

PART I - IRC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal as written could create a potential problem for misapplication, for example where a dormer sidewall and roof intersect would require the flashing to stop 4 inches above the roof.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IBC Fire Safety

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is too confusing as it relates to achieving compliance with the proponents intent. It is unrealistic to require these provisions for all exterior wall coverings installed on a vertical surface.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB170-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This is a good change that will provide protection of the shingles and gives rigidity to the shingle edges. This is consistent with the IBC.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB171-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based upon the committee's previous action on RB163-09/10 and the proponent's request for disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB172-09/10

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change broadens the scope of this section and clarifies it.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB173-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Decorative shrouds that are part of the entire listed system are also listed.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB174-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB173-09/10.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB175-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee has a concern on how the building official is to determine "directly connected to a watercourse".

Assembly Action: **None**

RB176-09/10

PART I - IRC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

PART II - IBC **Withdrawn by Proponent**

RB177-09/10

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 proposed new standards indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standards did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I - IRC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that this change is not needed at this time. The Federal Law will cover this and we have an approved ANSI/APSP-7 Standard. ICC is developing a Swimming Pool Code and this issue should be considered within that process.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II - IBC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved consistent with the action taken on Part I and at the proponent's request. ICC has begun the process of developing a swimming pool code. The development process for the new code will provide a better forum to resolve the various contentious issues related to this proposal and similar proposals heard by the IRC – Building and Energy Code Development Committee.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB178-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

RB179-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request for disapproval and ICC has begun the process of developing a Swimming Pool Code.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB180-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a local issue and this should remain in the Appendix. The map should be updated to provide the building official additional data. This should include structures in the IBC also. Bringing this into the code requires closer scrutiny of the Appendix and reveals many issues that will need revising, for example Section R325.4.7 would render the air handler unit inoperable. This should be reworked and brought back. Also, a test should be developed to test the site before construction begins to predict if mitigation is required.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB181-09/10

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 proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request for disapproval. Data needs to be provided that identifies what percentage of homes are in Zone 1 that actually tests positive for 4pCi/L.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB182-09/10

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB90-09/10. The committee feels there are conflicts within this proposal. The proponent should look at improving what is in the code rather than an appendix for decks.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB183-09/10

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 proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is outside the scope of the IRC and would be better if left to the Zoning Code. UL 325 is already in the code and would provide the required safety without ASTM F 2200. Sections AR104.1 and AR105.1 is handled elsewhere in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB184-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that sprinklers inside one house will not protect the adjacent house that may or may not be sprinklered. The footnote to the table invokes entire subdivisions and conditions that may or may not exist and this is way outside the scope of the IRC.

Assembly Action: **Approved as Submitted**

RB185-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that the need for this change has not been established since the code already addresses projections and the venting. This change would be overly restrictive since it would apply to all building regardless of separation.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB186-09/10

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee feels this change sacrifices safety without an appropriate return. This change would permit the windows to have bars and would prevent escape and rescue. Although this is permitted for IBC occupancies, a more robust sprinkler system is required.

Assembly Action: **None**

RB187-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee feels that smoke alarms will respond with an early warning and sprinklers respond after fire growth. Based on the opponent's testimony, there seems to be some confusion because of the way this is written and it should be reworked and brought back.

Assembly Action:

None