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 RESIDENTIAL CODE® INTERNATIONAL WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE 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

Introductioniv
Public Comment Office Location iv
ICC Website
Referenced Standards Updatev
Modifications by Public Commentv
Final Action Considerationv
Call for Adoption Informationv
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 hearing the hearing the hearing the hearing 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 IEBC IFC	International Building Code (E, FS, G, S) International Existing Building Code (EB) International Fire Code (F)
IFGC IMC	International Fuel Gas Code (FG) 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 (ÉC)
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.
- **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 thereofshall 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 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 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	АМ	D	
AS	Simple Majority	² / ₃ Majority	Simple Majority	
АМ	² / ₃ Majority	Simple Majority to sustain the Public Hearing Action or; 2/3 Majority on additional modifications and 2/3 on overall AM	Simple Majority	
D	² / ₃ Majority	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 General Means of Egress Structural	2 43 90 135
International Existing Building Code	212
International Fire Code	232
International Fuel Gas Code	
International Mechanical Code	301
International Plumbing Code	
International Residential Code Building Plumbing Mechanical	
International Wildland-Urban Interface Code	
CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS FOR FINAL ACTION OC NOVEMER 1, 2010 IN CHARLOTTE, NC	TOBER 28 –
ICC Administrative Code Provisions	437
International Energy Conservation Code	
International Property Maintenance Code	505
International Residential Code Energy	512
International Zoning Code	515

CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS FOR FINAL ACTION:

MAY 14 – 23, 2010 DALLAS, TEXAS

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

The deadline for public comments is February 8, 2010.

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

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

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

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

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE Fire Safety Code Development Committee

Daniel Nichols, PE - Chair

Fire Protection Engineer State of New York Division of Code Enforcement Albany, NY

Gene Boecker, AIA - Vice Chair

Project Manager Code Consultants Inc. St. Louis, MO

Anthony Apfelbeck, CBO

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

Kenneth Bush

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

Douglas Evans, PE

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

W. Jay Hall, CBO

Codes Specialist Virginia Masonry Association Mechanicsville, VA

Marcelo Hirschler GBH International Mill Valley, CA

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

Steve Mills, CBO

Director of Building and Codes City of Hendersonville Hendersonville, TN

Lorin Neyer

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

Tim Pate, CBO

Senior Plans Analyst City and County of Broomfield Building Department Broomfield, CO

Michael Pokorny, PE

Fire Protection Engineer Montgomery County Department of Permitting Service Rockville, MD

Michael Shannon, PE, CBO

Development Services Engineer City of San Antonio, Development Services Department San Antonio, TX

Jerry Tepe, FAIA

Architect JRT-AIA-Architect Hopkinton, NH

Michael Whalen

Code Specialist New Jersey Department of Community Affairs Trenton, NJ

Staff Secretariat:

Ed Wirtschoreck, LA Manager, Standards International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS

FS1-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS2-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS3-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS4-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS5-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

. . .

FS6-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

None

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

Assembly Action:

FS7-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

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

Assembly Action:

FS8-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS9-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS10-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

FS11-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS12-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS13-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

Assembly Action:

FS14-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS15-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

FS16-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS17-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS18-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS19-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS20-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS21-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

6

FS22-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS23-09/10

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

Analysis: The standard was not received by ICC staff.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS24-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS25-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS26-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS27-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

FS28-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS29-09/10

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

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

Assembly Action:

PART II- IFC Committee Action:

Replace the proposal as follows:

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

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

Assembly Action:

FS30-09/10

FS31-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that high merchandise display in Group M occupancies is a fire safety concern, which warrants the 3 hour separation regardless of the display area or the presence of automatic sprinklers. None

Assembly Action:

FS32-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS33-09/10 Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

8

FS34-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS35-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS36-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS37-09/10

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

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS38-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS39-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

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

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

708.13.1 Rubbish and laundry chute enclosures. A shaft enclosure containing a rubbish or laundry chute shall not be used for any other purpose and shall be enclosed in accordance with Section 708.3.1 and 708.4. Openings into the shaft, Fire-rated chute intake door assemblies as well as openings including those from access rooms and termination rooms, shall be protected in accordance with this section and Section 715. Openings into chutes shall not be located in corridors. Doors Fire-rated chute intake door assemblies_shall be self- or automatic-closing upon the actuation of a smoke detector in accordance with Section 715.4.8.3, except that heat-activated closing devices shall be permitted between the shaft and the termination room. Fire-rated chute intake door assemblies shall additionally comply with Sections 715.4.8 and 715.4.8.1.1.

708.13.3 Rubbish and laundry chute access rooms. Access openings Openings into access rooms for rubbish and laundry chutes shall be located in rooms or compartments enclosed by not less than 1-hour fire barriers constructed in accordance with Section 707 or horizontal assemblies constructed in accordance with Section 712, or both. Openings into the access rooms shall be protected by opening protectives having a fire protection rating of not less than 3/4 hour. Doors shall be self- or automatic-closing upon the detection of smoke in accordance with Section 715.4.8.3.

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

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

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action:

FS40-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS41-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS42-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS43-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

10

None

Disapproved

FS44-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS45-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exceptions:

(Exceptions to remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action:

FS46-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS47-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS48-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed replacing bottom seal with "horizontal of vertical seal" is more appropriate in that it reflects current testing practices.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

FS49-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS50-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS51-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS52-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS53-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS54-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

- -

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

FS55-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS56-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Note: The following modification was considered editorial:

712.1.4 Penetrations. Penetrations by pipe, tube, conduit, wire, cable and vents shall be protected in accordance with Section 714 712.4.

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Assembly Action:

FS57-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS58-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS59-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS60-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

FS61-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exceptions:

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

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

Assembly Action:

FS62-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS63-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS64-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

FS65-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS66-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Disapproval was to avoid conflict with previously approved proposal FS56-09/10. Additionally, the term horizontal assembly is used throughout the code and each individual instance should be scrutinized against the intent of this proposal.

Assembly Action:

FS67-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS68-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS69-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS70-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS71-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

15

None

Approved as Submitted

FS72-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS73-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS74-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS75-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS76-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS77-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Modified

FS78-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS79-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS80-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS81-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS82-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS83-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS84-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved
FS85-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS86-09/10

Committee	Action:
-----------	---------

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

Assembly Action:

FS87-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS88-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exception: Voids created at the intersection of the exterior curtain wall assemblies and such floor assemblies where the vision glass extends down to the finished floor level shall be permitted to be sealed with an approved material to prevent the interior spread of fire. Such material shall be securely installed and <u>capable</u> cable of preventing the passage of flame and hot gases sufficient to ignite cotton waste where subjected to ASTM E119 time-temperature fire conditions under a minimum positive pressure differential of 0.01 inch (0.254 mm) of water column (2.5 Pa) for the time period at least equal to the fire-resistance rating of the floor assembly.

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

Assembly Action:

FS89-09/10

FS90-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

FS91-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS92-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS93-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS94-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS95-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS96-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

FS97-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action: FS98-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS99-09/10 **Committee Action:**

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

Assembly Action:

FS100-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS101-09/10

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

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

Assembly Action:

PART II- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS102-09/10 **Committee Action:**

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

FS103-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

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

Note: The following modification was considered editorial:

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

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Assembly Action:

FS104-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that there was no substantiation provided to show that the 1-1/2 hour protection was not appropriate for openings within exterior walls with a rating greater than 1 hour.

Assembly Action:

FS105-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS106-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS107-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS108-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

FS109-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS110-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS111-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS112-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS113-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS114-09/10

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

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

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

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

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

22

None

None

Disapproved

None

requirements:

- 3.1. The duct shall not exceed 100 square inches (0.06 m2).
- 3.2. The duct shall be constructed of steel a minimum of 0.0217 inch (0.55 mm) in thickness.3.3. The duct shall not have openings that communicate the *corridor* with adjacent spaces or
- rooms.
- 3.4. The duct shall be installed above a ceiling.
- 3.5. The duct shall not terminate at a wall register in the fire-resistance-rated wall.
- 3.6. A minimum 12-inch-long (305 mm) by 0.060-inch-thick (1.52 mm) steel sleeve shall be centered in each duct opening. The sleeve shall be secured to both sides of the wall and all four sides of the sleeve with minimum 11/2-inch by 11/2-inch by 0.060-inch (38mmby 38mmby 1.52 mm) steel retaining angles. The retaining angles shall be secured to the sleeve and the wall with No. 10 (M5) screws. The *annular space* between the steel sleeve and the wall opening shall be filled with mineral wool batting on all sides.
- 4. Such walls are penetrated by ducted HVAC systems, have a required fire-resistance rating of 1 hour or less, and are in buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2. For the purposes of this exception, a ducted HVAC system shall be a duct system for conveying supply, return or exhaust air as part of the structure's HVAC system. Such a duct system shall be constructed of sheet steel not less than 26 gage thickness and shall be continuous from the air-handling appliance or equipment to the air outlet and inlet terminals.

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS115-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS116-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS117-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

. ..

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

FS118-09/10

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

Modify the proposal as follows:

717.2.1 Fireblocking materials. Fireblocking shall consist of the following materials:

- Two-inch (51 mm) nominal lumber. 1.
- Two thicknesses of 1-inch (25 mm) nominal lumber with broken lap joints. 2.
- One thickness of 0.719-inch (18.3 mm) wood structural panels with joints backed by 0.719-inch (18.3 3. mm) wood structural panels.
- One thickness of 0.75-inch (19.1 mm) particleboard with joints backed by 0.75-inch (19 mm) 4. particleboard.
- One-half-inch (12.7 mm) gypsum board. 5.
- One-fourth-inch (6.4 mm) cement-based millboard. 6.
- Batts or blankets of mineral wool, mineral fiber or other approved materials installed in such a manner 7. as to be securely retained in place.
- 8. Spray-applied cellulose insulation installed as tested for the specific application

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

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Modify proposal as follows:

R302.11.1 Fireblocking materials. Except as provided in Section R302.11, Item 4, fireblocking shall consist of the following materials:

- Two-inch (51 mm) nominal lumber. 1.
- Two thicknesses of 1-inch (25 mm) nominal lumber with broken lap joints. 2.
- One thickness of 23/32-inch (18.3 mm) wood structural panels with joints backed by 23/32-inch (18.3 3. mm) wood structural panels.
- 4. One thickness of ¾-inch (19.1 mm) particleboard with joints backed by ¾-inch (19 mm) particleboard.
- 5. One-half-inch (12.7 mm) gypsum board.
- One-quarter-inch (6.4 mm) cement-based millboard. 6.
- Batts or blankets of mineral wool or glass fiber or other approved materials installed in such a manner 7. as to be securely retained in place.
- 8. Spray-applied Cellulose insulation installed as tested for the specific application.

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

Assembly Action:

FS119-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

FS120-09/10

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Modified

None

Approved as Modified

None

None

Approved as Submitted

FS121-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS122-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS123-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS124-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL **Committee Action:**

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

Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IPC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on the committee's action on FS124-09/10 Part I.	
Assembly Action:	None
PART III - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved

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

Assembly Action:

FS125-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

None

FS126-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS127-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS128-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action: FS129-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS130-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS131-09/10

Com	mittee	Action [.]
COIII	millee	ACTION.

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

Assembly Action:

FS132-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

FS133-09/10

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action: Committee Rea son: the committee felt that this proposal could prohibit the use of a product for new construction that may meet the code for such a use. Further, requirements for change of occupancy belongs in Chapter 34 or the International Existing Building Code for existing buildings. Assembly Action: PART II- IBC STRUCTURAL **Committee Action:** Committee Reason: Based on the committee's action on FS133-09/10 Part I. **Assembly Action:**

FS134-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS135-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Note: The following modification was considered editorial:

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

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

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Assembly Action:

FS136-09/10

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II- IFC **Committee Action:**

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

27

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

FS137-09/10

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

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS138-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS139-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS140-09/10

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

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

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

FS141-09/10

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

Disapproved

FS142-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS143-09/10

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

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

None

FS144-09/10

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

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

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

Approved as modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

...

Disapproved

FS145-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS146-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS147-09/10

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

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

Assembly Action:

FS148-09/10

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS149-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

mm) o.c. providing a minimum 1.125-inch (29 mm) penetration into each stud and with 8d common nails at 8 inches (203 mm) o.c. into top and bottom plates or with equivalent wire ties. There shall be not less than a 0.1055-inch (2.68 mm) corrosion-resistant wire, or approved equal, looped through the mesh for every 2 square feet (0.2 m2) of stone veneer. This tie shall be a loop having legs not less than 15 inches (381 mm) in length, so bent that it will lie in the stone veneer mortar joint. The last 2 inches (51 mm) of each wire leg shall have a right-angle bend. One-inch (25 mm) minimum thickness of cement grout shall be placed between the backing and the stone veneer.

3. With cold-formed steel stud backing, a 2-inch by 2-inch (51 by 51 mm) 0.0625-inch (1.59 mm) corrosion-resistant-zinc-coated or non-metallic coated wire mesh with two layers of water-resistive barrier in accordance with Section 1404.2 shall be applied directly to steel studs spaced a maximum of 16 inches (406 mm) o.c. The mesh shall be attached with 2-inch-long (51 mm) corrosion-resistant #8 self-drilling, tapping screws at 4 inches (102 mm) o.c. providing a minimum 0.5-inch (12.7 mm) penetration into each stud, and at 8 inches (203 mm) o.c. into top and bottom tracks or with equivalent wire ties. All screws shall extend through the steel connection a minimum of three exposed threads. There shall be not less than a 0.1055-inch (2.68 mm) corresion-resistant zinc-coated or non-metallic coated wire, or approved equal, looped through the mesh for every 2 square feet (0.2 m2) of stone veneer. This tie shall be a loop having legs not less than 15 inches (381 mm) in length, so bent that it will lie in the stone veneer mortar joint. The last 2 inches (51 mm) of each wire leg shall have a right-angle bend. One-inch (25 mm) minimum thickness of cement grout shall be placed between the backing and the stone veneer. The cold-formed steel framing members shall have a minimum unceated bare steel thickness of 0.04283 inches (1.0879 mm).

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

Assembly Action:

FS150-09/10

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS151-09/10

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

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

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

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

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

FS152-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS153-09/10

FS154-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS155-09/10

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS156-09/10

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

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC B/E

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

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

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

TABLE R703.3.1 REQUIREMENTS FOR FOAM PLASTIC SHEATHING IN EXTERIOR WALL COVERING ASSEMBLIES^{1.2}

Foam	Foam Sheathing	Maximum Wind Speed (mph) – Exposure B ⁴				
Plastic	<u>Thickness</u> (in) ³	Walls with Interio	or Finish ^⁵	Walls without Interior Finish		
<u>Sheathing</u> Material ³		16"oc framing 24	" <u>oc framing</u> 10	5" <u>oc framing</u> 24	" <u>oc framing</u>	
Siding Offset from Foam Sheathing per Section R703.3.2.2						
EPS	<u>3⁄4"</u> <u>1"</u> ≥1-1/2"	95 125 130	<u>NP</u> <u>85</u> 130	<u>NP</u> <u>105</u> <u>130</u>	<u>NP</u> <u>NP</u> 105	

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

SIDING MATERIAL (inches		JOINT RESISTIVE TREATMENT BARRIER REQUIRED	WATER RESISTIVE	TYPE OF SUPPORTS FOR THE SIDING MATERIAL AND FASTENERS $^{\mathrm{b},\mathrm{c},\mathrm{d}}$					
	NOMINAL THICKNESS [®]			Wood or wood	Fiberboard	Gypsum	Foam plastic	Direct	Number or
	(inches)		REQUIRED	structural s	sheathing	eathing sheathing	sheathing t	to	spacing of fasteners ^{bb}
				sheathing		into stata	stud ^{aa}	51005	lusteners
i. Wood board sidings applied vertically shall be nailed to horizontal nailing strips or blocking set 24 inches									

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

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

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

A permeable water-resistive barrier shall be provided in accordance with Section R703.2 ever all sheathing, with horizontal overlaps in the membrane of not less than 2 inches (51mm) and vertical overlaps of not less than 6 inches (152 mm). Where furring strips are used, they shall be 1 inch by 3 inches or 1 inch by 4 inches (25mmby 76 mm or 25mm by 102 mm), and shall be fastened horizontally to the studs with 7d or 8d box nails. For application over foam plastic sheathing, furring strips shall be fastened in accordance with Section R703.3.2.2. and Furring strips shall be spaced a distance on center equal to the actual weather exposure of the shakes or shingles to allow for expansion shall not exceed 1/4 inch (6 mm), and between adjacent shakes, it shall not exceed 1/2 inch (13 mm). The offset spacing between joints in adjacent courses shall be a minimum of 11/2 inches (38 mm).

R703.11.2.1 Basic wind speed not exceeding 90 miles per hour and Exposure Category B. Where the basic wind speed does not exceed 90 miles per hour (40 m/s), the Exposure Category is B and gypsum wall board or equivalent is installed on the side of the wall opposite the foam plastic sheathing, the minimum siding fastener penetration into wood framing shall be 11/4 inches (32 mm) using minimum 0.120-inch diameter nail (shank) with a minimum 0.313-inch diameter head, 16 inches on center. The foam plastic sheathing minimum thickness shall comply with Section R703.3.1 and shall not exceed a maximum thickness of 1.5 inches (38mm) for a 0.120-inch diameter nail or 2.0 inches (51 mm) for a 0.135-inch diameter nail. shall be 1/2-inch-thick (12.7 mm) (nominal) extruded polystyrene per ASTM C578, 1/2-inch-thick (12.7 mm) (nominal) polyisocyanurate per ASTM C1289, or 1-inch-thick (25 mm)(nominal) expanded polystyrene per ASTM C578. Vinyl siding shall be permitted to be installed on furring strips in accordance with Section R703.2.2 using the siding manufacturer's installation instructions when foam plastic sheathing thickness complies with Section R703.3.1.

(Portions of proposal not shown, remain the unchanged)

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

FS157-09/10

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

Assembly Action:

FS158-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS159-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS160-09/10

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

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

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

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

Assembly Action:

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

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

Assembly Action:

FS161-09/10

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

Analysis: The standard was not received by ICC staff.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on previous committee action on FS160-09/10 Part I and the proponent's request for disapproval. **Assembly Action:** None

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

34

None

FS162-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

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

Note: The following modification was considered editorial:

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

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

Assembly Action:

None

FS163-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action:

FS164-09/10

Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

FS165-09/10

FS166-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that these were appropriate technical requirements for the new finish material and that suggested improvements related to referencing equivalent testing standards can be

Assembly Action:

FS167-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

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

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

Assembly Action:

FS169-09/10

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

None

36

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

proposed in the public comment period for Final Action consideration.

FS168-09/10

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS170-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS171-09/10

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS172-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS173-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

None

None

FS174-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS175-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS176-09/10

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

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

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

Assembly Action: FS177-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS178-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS179-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None



Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

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

Committee Action:

FS180-09/10

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

Assembly Action:

FS181-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS182-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exceptions:

(Exception remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action:

FS183-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS184-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that foam plastic cores are used with FRP composite panels and

Assembly Action:

mentioning the installation instructions. None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

as such the code requirements of Chapter 26 are applicable and should be referenced.

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

FS185-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action:

FS186-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS187-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS188-09/10

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

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

FS189-09/10

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

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

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

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS190-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS191-09/10

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS192-09/10

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS193-09/10

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS194-09/10

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

41

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

FS195-09/10

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

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II- IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS196-09/10

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

FS197-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the average total heat release (3 MJ/m^2) and the heat flux of 50 kW/m² were too low and required further justification. Also test method ASTM E1354, which tests for low combustibility, is inappropriate to determine equivalence to the ASTM E136 test method for noncombustibility.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

ustibility.

Disapproved

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE General Code Development Committee

Dan Weed, CBO - Chair

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

Mark Stim ac, RA, CB O - Vice Chair

Director of Building and Zoning City of Troy Troy, MI

Don Davies

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

Christina Jamison

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

Vickie Lovell

President InterCode Incorporated Delray Beach, FL

Homer Maiel, PE, CBO Senior Engineer City of San Jose

City of San Jose, Building Division San Jose, CA

Anthony Merlino

Construction Official Village of Ridgewood Ridgewood, NJ

John Morgan, MCP

Building Commissioner City of Frontenac Frontenac, MO

Agustin Mujica

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

Sharon Myers

Master Plans Examiner State of Ohio Reynoldsburg, OH

Gregory Nicholls, AIA

Chief Building Official City of Mason Mason, OH

Carroll Pruitt, FAIA

President/CEO Pruitt Consulting, Inc. Keller, TX

Sarah Rice, CBO

SRice Consulting Cincinnati, OH

Carol Sue Rouw, AIA, LEED, AP

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

Scott Satula

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

Staff Secretariat: Kermit Robinson, CBO Senior Technical Staff International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE GENERAL COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS

G1-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G2-09/10

This code c hange was heard by the IBC Fire Safety Code Dev elopment Committee.

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II – IRC – B/E Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G3-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G4-09/10

Committee Action:

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

None

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

G5-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

VAPOR PERMEABLE <u>MEMBRANE</u>. A material or covering <u>The property of having a moisture vapor</u> permeance rating of <u>5</u> 40 perms (<u>2.9</u> 5.7 x 10⁻¹⁰ kg/Paesem2) or greater, when tested in accordance with the desiccant method using Procedure A of ASTME 96. A vapor permeable material permits the passage of moisture vapor.

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

Assembly Action:

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

Modify the proposal as follows:

VAPOR PERME ABLE MEMBRANE. A material or covering Having a moisture vapor permeance rating of <u>5</u> 40 perms (<u>2.9</u> 5.7 x 10^{-10} kg/Pa•s•m²) or greater, when tested in accordance with the desiccant method using Procedure A of ASTME 96. A vapor permeable material permits the passage of moisture vapor.

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

Assembly Action:

G6-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

G7-09/10

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

Assembly Action:

G8-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Modified

Approved as Modified

None

None

Disapproved

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

Assembly Action:

G9-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G10-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G11-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G13-09/10

G12-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G14-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

Banquet halls Casinos (gaming areas)

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Withdrawn by Proponent

None

Approved as Modified

None

Night clubs Restaurants Taverns and bars

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

Assembly Action:

G15-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G16-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G17-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G18-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G19-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

None

G20-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

DETOXIFICATION F ACILITIES. Facilities that <u>provided provide</u> treatment for substance abuse serving care recipients who are incapable of self-preservation or who are harmful to themselves or others.

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

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

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

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action:

G21-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G22-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G23-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

G24-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G25-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G26-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G27-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G28-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II – IRC – B/E Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exceptions:

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

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

G29-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G30-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G31-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G32-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G34-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G35-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G36-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G37-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

51

None

Disapproved

None

None

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G40-09/10

This code c hange was heard by the IBC Struc tural Cod e Dev elopment Committee.

Committee Action:

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

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

Assembly Action:

None

G41-09/10

This code c hange was heard by the IBC Fire Safety Code Dev elopment Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

G38-09/10

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change provides consistency with Section 402.12.1.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

G39-09/10

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

G42-09/10

This code c hange was heard by the IBC Fire Safety Code Dev elopment Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G43-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

None

None

G44-09/10

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

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

Both parts of this co de change proposal were heard by the IBC Ge neral Code Development Committee.

PART I- IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II- IFC Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G45-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted
2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

G46-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G47-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G48-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G49-09/10

Committee Action:

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

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

Assembly Action:



None

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

. .

Disapproved

G50-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G51-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G52-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code **Development Committee.**

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G53-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

SECTION 406 MOTOR-VEHICLE RELATED OCCUPANCIES

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

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

G54-09/10

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

G55-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

G56-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Replace the proposal with the following: The modi fication completely replaces the ori ginal proposal and contains a single revision to Item 1 of Section 406.1.4.

406.1.4 Separation. Separations shall comply with the following:

- The private garage shall be separated from the *dwelling unit* and its *attic* area by means of 1. a minimum 1/2-inch (12.7 mm) gypsum board applied to the garage side. Garages beneath habitable rooms shall be separated from all habitable rooms above by not less than a 5/8inch (15.9 mm) Type X gypsum board or equivalent and ½ -inch (12.7 mm) gypsum board applied to structures supporting the separation from habitable rooms above the garage. Door openings between a private garage and the dwelling unit shall be equipped with either solid wood doors or solid or honeycomb core steel doors not less than 1 3/8 inches (34.9 mm) thick, or doors in compliance with Section 715.4.3. Openings from a private garage directly into a room used for sleeping purposes shall not be permitted. Doors shall be selfclosing and self-latching.
- 2. and 3. (no change to current text)

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

Assembly Action:

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

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

Assembly Action:

G57-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G58-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

56

Disapproved

None

None

G59-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G60-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G61-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G62-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G63-09/10

G64-09/10

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

PART I- IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II- IFC Committee Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

57

vehicles. Many common vehicles exceed that weight. The committee also felt there was not sufficient justification provided for listing these as a Class I commodity based on the fuel load present. Proponent should reconsider the classification.

Committee Rea son: The committee questioned the selection of the 6500 pound limit for the

Assembly Action:

None

G65-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action:

G66-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

None

G67-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

G68-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G69-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G70-09/10

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G71-09/10

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G72-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exceptions: (Exceptions not shown remain unchanged.)

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

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

Assembly Action:

None

G73-09/10

Both parts of this cod e chang e proposal were heard by the IFC Code **Development Committee.**

Part I - IBC **Committee Action:**

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

Assembly Action:

Part II - IFC **Committee Action:**

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

G74-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G75-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

Assembly Action:

None

60

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

None

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

G76-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G77-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G78-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G79-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code **Development Committee.**

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action: G80-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G81-09/10

Committee Action:

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

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

61

Disapproved

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

Assembly Action:

None

None

Disapproved

G82-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G83-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria. The standard is currently referenced in the IMC code change referenced the 2004 edition, however the 2009 was reviewed anticipating a modification request from the proponent.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G84-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G85-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G86-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

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

Assembly Action:

G87-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G88-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G89-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G90-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G91-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G92-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

None

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

Assembly Action:

None

G93-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action:

None

None

G94-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

G95-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

G96-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

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

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

Assembly Action:

G97-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G98-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G99-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G100-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G101-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

G102-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G103-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G104-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G105-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G106-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G107-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

G108-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G109-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G110-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G111-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G112-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

G113-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G114-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G115-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G116-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G117-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

G118-09/10

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

TABLE 508.4																									
	REQUIRED SEPARATION OF OCCUPANCIES (HOURS)																								
Use	A- 1	A- 2 ^e	A- 3	A- 4	A- 5	B⁵E	F-	1	F- 2	H- 1	H- 2	H- 3	H- 4	H- 5	I-1 I-	2 -	3	1-4	M⁵	R- 1	R- 2	R- 3, R- 4	S- 1	S- 2°	U
A-1		2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	NP	4	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
A- 2 ^e			2	2	2	2	2	3	2	NP	4	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
A-3				2	2	2	2	3	2	NP	4	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
A-4					2	2	2	3	2	NP	4	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
A-5						2	2	3	2	NP	4	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
B							2	3	2	NP	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
E								3	2	NP	4	3	2	4 <u>3</u>	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
F-1									3	NP	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
F-2										NP	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	<u>2-1</u>
H-1											NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
H-2												1	2	2	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	2	2	1
H-3													1	1	4	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	1	1	1
H-4														1	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	1	1	1
H-5															4	4	4	3	1	4	4	4	1	1	3
I-1																2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	3	2
I-2																	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
1-3																		2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
1-4																			2	2	2	2	3	2	1
M ^b																				2	2	2	3	2	1
R-1																					2	2	3	2	1
R-2																						2	3	2	1
R-																							3	2 ^d	1 ^d
3, R-4																									
S-1																								3	3
S- 2°																									1
U																									

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

G119-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

												/						
	A ^d . E		1-1.1-3.1-4		1-2		R		F-2. S-2 ^b . U		B. F-1.M. S-1		H-1		H-2		H-3. H-4. H-5	
OCCUPANCY	S	NS	S	NS	s	NS S	NS		S	NS	s	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS
A ^d , E	N	N	1	2	2	NP	1	2	N	1	1	2	NP	NP	3	4	2	3ª
I-1, I-3, I-4			N ^g	N ^g	2	NP	1	NP	1	2	1	2	NP	NP	3	NP	2	NP
I-2					Ν	N	2	NP	2	NP	2	NP	NP	NP	3	NP	2	NP
R							N ^g	N ^g	1 ^c	2 ^c	1	2	NP	NP	3	NP	2	NP
F-2, S-2 ^b , U									N	N	1	2	NP	NP	3	4	2	3 ^a
B, F-1, M, S-1											N	N	NP	NP	2	3	1	2 ^a
H-1													Ν	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
H-2															N	NP	1	NP
H-3, H-4, H-5																	1 ^{e,f}	NP

TABLE 508.4 REQUIRED SEPARATION OF OCCUPANCIES (HOURS)

a. For Group H-5 occupancies, see Section 903.2.4.2.

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

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

Assembly Action:

None

G120-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

Approved as Modified

TABLE 508.4 REQUIRED SEPARATION OF OCCUPANCIES (HOURS)

(Portions of table not shown are unchanged)

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

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

Assembly Action:

G121-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G122-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G123-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G124-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G125-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G126-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

10.

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

71

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

G127-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:	None
G128-09/10	

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G129-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G130-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G131-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G132-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G133-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G134-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

72

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

G135-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G136-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G137-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G138-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G139-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G140-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

G141-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G142-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G143-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G144-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G145-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II – IRC- B/E Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

G146-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II – IRC-B/E Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G147-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II – IRC-B/E Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G148-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

G153-09/10

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

PART I- IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

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

G149-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G150-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G151-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G152-09/10

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

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal because they felt that the requirement

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

PART II- IFC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproved for consistency with the action taken on Par	t I.
Assembly Action:	None
PART III- IPMC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproved for consistency with the action taken on Part	s I and II.
Assembly Action:	None

Committee Action:

G154-09/10

Assembly Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G155-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G156-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G157-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

Disapproved

G158-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

None

G159-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

Assembly Action:

None

G160-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

G161-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

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

Assembly Action:

G162-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G163-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G164-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G165-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

G166-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code **Development Committee.**

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

None

G167-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code **Development Committee.**

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G168-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code **Development Committee.**

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G169-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code **Development Committee.**

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G170-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code **Development Committee.**

Committee Action:

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

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

Assembly Action:

None

G171-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

None

None

Disapproved

None

G172-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

- 1. The operation <u>of</u> an automatic sprinkler system complying with Section 3008.6;
- 2. Smoke detectors required by another provision of the code; or required as an alternative standard complying with Section 3008.1.1.
- 3. Approved manual controls.

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

Assembly Action:

G173-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G174-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

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

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

Assembly Action:

None

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

G175-09/10

G176-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G177-09/10

This code c hange proposal was heard by the IBC Me ans of Egress Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G178-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G179-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

82

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

G180-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G181-09/10

This code c hange was heard by the IBC Struc tural Cod e Dev elopment Committee.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G182-09/10 Note: The following analysis was not in the Code (

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standards indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standards do not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section Sections 3.6.2.1 and 3.6.2.4, Mandatory language.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G183-09/10 Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G184-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

83

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

G185-09/10

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

PART I- IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action: PART II- IFC Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G186-09/10

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

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G187-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G188-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

84

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

Assembly Action:

None

None

G189-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G190-09/10

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G191-09/10

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G192-09/10

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G193-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Disapproved

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

None

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

None

G194-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Wind loads for this evaluation shall be those prescribed in Section 1609. Earthquake loads for this evaluation, if required, shall be permitted to be seventy-five percent of those prescribed in Section 1613. Where the existing seismic force resisting system is a type that can be designated ordinary, values of R, Ω_0 , and C_d for the existing seismic force-resisting system shall be those specified by this code for an ordinary system unless it is demonstrated that the existing system will provide performance equivalent to that of a detailed, an intermediate or special system.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged.)

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

Assembly Action:

None

G195-09/10

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

G196-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

G197-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

G198-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL

PART II- IEBC

G199-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G200-09/10

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G201-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G202-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G203-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Withdrawn by Proponent

Withdrawn by Proponent

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

87

G204-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC -B/E

Committee Action: Committee Reason: The committee agrees the table needs updating, but the values may be low.

There is no substantiation provided for the values and more data is needed.

Assembly Action:

G206-09/10

G205-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

PART II - IFC **Committee Action:**

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

Assembly Action:

G207-09/10

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

G208-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed footnote is so complex with so many references out of the

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

88

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

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

Assembly Action:

None

G209-09/10

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

Both parts of this code change pro posal were heard by the IEBC Cod e Development Committee. PART I- IBC GENERAL Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action:

PART II- IEBC Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None
2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE Means of Egress Code Development Committee

Stephen Thomas, CBO - Chair

President Colorado Code Consulting Denver, CO

Jim Budzinski – Vice Chair Fire Chief (Retired) Tamarac, FL

Bart Alspaugh, MCP

Building Inspector II City of Lake Saint Louis Lake St. Louis, MO

Jason Averill

Group Leader National Institute of Standards and Technology Gaithersburg, MD

Tom Barrs

Senior Plans Examiner City of Scottsdale Scottsdale, AZ

Neil Burning, CBO

Manager, Plans Examination Clark County Development Services-Bldg Div. Las Vegas, NV

James Dawson

Fire Marshal Chesterfield County Fire and EMS Chesterfield, VA

David Frable

Senior Fire Protection Engineer U.S. General Services Administration, Bldg Services Geneva, IL

Jeffrey Heiss

Construction Official Township of Warren, NJ

James Hodgens

Deputy Chief New York City Fire Department Brooklyn, NY

Gary Lampella

Building Official City of Redmond Redmond, OR

Larry Lehman

Building Division Chief State of Michigan Department of Energy, Labor & Economic Growth Bureau of Construction Codes Lansing, MI

Paul Martin

Rep: National Association of State Fire Marshals Acting Chief - Bureau of Fire Prevention New York State Office of Fire Prevention and Control Albany, NY

Brad Schiffer, AIA

Architect Brad Schiffer/TAXIS Inc. Naples, FL

John Stovall

Rep: National Association of Home Builders NS Architects Rockville, MD

Staff Secretariat: Kimberly Paarlberg, RA Senior Staff Architect International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE MEANS OF EGRESS COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS

E1-09/10

Committee Reason: This proposal would provide uniformity throughout the cod es. This will assure that all means of egress issues in the IFC and IBC are addressed before the certificate of occupancies is issued. This will assist the fire department when they perform means of egress maintenance reviews.

Assembly Action:

E2-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: T he change in the definition could cause confusion for applications for fire -resistance-rated corridors. The entire chapter should be investigated for possible consequences.

Assembly Action:

E3-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The list of components in the definition is n ecessary for und erstanding what an exit is. The text about separation requirements should not be removed because it makes the user look for the separation requirements. Adding the "or public way" is confusing when the exit is not directly on a street or public sidewalk. It appears to eliminate the 'exit discharge' component of the means of egress system.

Assembly Action:

E4-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Adding the "or public way" is confusing when the exit is not directly on a street or public sidewalk. It appears to eliminate the 'exit discharge' component of the means of egress system.

Assembly Action:

E5-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Both parts were by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The r evisions for stairways will clarify when exit access stair ways (i.e., monumental, convenience and mezzanines stair ways) are part or the means of egress, including protection, travel distance and enclosure requirements. The proposal coordinates the issue throughout the codes for this important issue. The committee proposal also coordinates with the proposal for vertical openings, FS56-09/10.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

atraat or publ

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

91

PART II- IFC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The changes to sections controlled by the International Fire Code should be revised to be consistent with the terminology and intent in Part I.

Assembly Action: E6-09/10

Committee Action:

The ter m "transition point" would add ress travel distance measurements at open Committee Rea son: stairway; however, it would be confusing for situations were there is a door on a stairway enclosure.

Assembly Action:

E7-09/10

E8-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Part I was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee, Part II was heard by the IRC Building/Energy Code **Development Committee.**

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposed definition for projected t read depth is unclear. The proponent should provide figures so this definition can be fully understood. The definition for 'riser' by inclusion of the word "vertical" could be interpreted to not allow the 30 degree slope on risers currently permitted.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: This is a g ood definition and it clarifies the meaning of "riser" as it r elates to a step or stair. The definition does not require the riser to be 90° vertical. A slope is permitted in the code.

Assembly Action:

E9-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Expanding the requirement to include all three parts of the means of egress would clarify that no steps or elevation changes would be permitted in the exit access route as well as at horizont al exits, or in the path for exit discharge. B y leaving "throughout a story", it is clear that it is not intended to eliminate exit stairways that provide access between stories.

Assembly Action:

E10-09/10

Committee Action:

Replace the proposal with the following: The portions of the proposal shown remain unchanged. Proposed revisions to Section 1004.2 through 1005.3 were removed.

SECTION 1004 OCCUPANT LOAD

1004.1 (IFC [B] 1004.1) Design occupant load. In determining means of egress requirements, the number of

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Modified

None

Approved as Submitted

Withdrawn by Proponent

occupants for whom means of egress facilities shall be provided shall be determined in accordance with this section. Where occupants from accessory areas egress through a primary space, the calculated occupant load for the primary space shall include the total occupant load of the primary space plus the number of occupants egressing through it from the accessory area.

1004.1.1 (IFC [B] 1004.1.1) Cumulative occupant loads. Where the path of egress travel includes intervening rooms, areas or spaces, cumulative occupant loads shall be determined in accordance with this section.

1004.1.1.1 (IFC [B] 1004.1.1.1) Intervening spaces. Where occupants egress from one room, area or space through another, the design occupant load shall be based on the cumulative occupant loads of all rooms, areas or spaces to that point along the path of egress travel.

1004.6 1004.1.1.2 (IFC [B] 1004.6 1004.1.1.2) Mezzanine Adjacent levels. The occupant load of a mezzanine or story level with egress onto through a room, or area or space on an adjacent level below shall be added to that room or area's the occupant load of that room, area or space. and the capacity of the exits shall be designed for the total occupant load thus established.

1004.1.1 1004.1.2 (IFC [B] 1004.1.1 1004.1.2) Areas without fixed seating. (No change to text)

TABLE 1004.1.1 1004.1.2 (IFC [B] 1004.1.1 1004.1.2) MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA ALLOWANCES PER OCCUPANT

(No change to table)

Committee Reason: The modification will limit this revision to those dealing with convergence. This issue outside of Section 1004.1 will be addressed in E22-09/10. The revision will clarify how to a ddress egress issues in spaces where occupants from different areas are level will merge.

Assembly Action:

E11-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This is a g ood editorial cle an up that m eets the intent of the code w hen d etermining occupant load and will make the text consistent with the headings in Table 1004.1.1.

Assembly Action:

E12-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The change in the heading for the Table will be consistent with the terms used throughout the code.

Assembly Action:

E13-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Section 1004 already allows for code officials to approve the actual occupant load in large spaces with minimal occupants. There was no te chnical justification to support this occupant load across the industry: for example, is this consistent with small airplane manufacturers.

Assembly Action:

E14-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Good substantiation was provided for a realistic occupant load for exhibition galleries and museums citing existing facilities. There really is no good match in the current uses listed in the t able when looking for occu pant load for the se types of ex hibit viewing spaces. Section 302 .1 will address the occupant load for spaces where owners want to use the space for more than one use such as parties or lectures.

Assembly Action: E15-09/10

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

None

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: It is not clear how to count the area on stairs and in elevators for multi-story buildings. No technical justification was provided for the occupant I oad in the circulations spaces and toilet rooms. The proposal does not deal with queuing areas in corridors in such facilities as multi-plex theaters. There could be confusion when there are corridors that area already covered by gross floor area requirements.

Assembly Action:

E16-09/10

Committee Action:

Editorial correction. Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 1004.1.1 (IFC [B] TABLE 1004.1.1) MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA ALLOWANCES PER OCCUPANT

FUNCTION OF SPACE	FLOOR AREA IN SQ. FT. PER OCCUPANT
Mall Buildings - Covered mall building. <u>and</u> Open air mall building	See Section 402.4.1

(Portions of Table not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The editorial correction was for coordination with the term used in Section 402.4.1 and for proper location within the table. The refere nce will direct code users to the appropriate oc cupant load information for malls.

Assembly Action:

E17-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: T he requirement needs stroke w idth of visible requirements. The proposal does not t indicate what should be posted f or multi-purpose rooms. The occ upant load indicated should be a pproved by the code official/fire official.

Assembly Action:

E18-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The revision provides the appropriate occupant load for wheelchair spaces.

Assembly Action:

E19-09/10

Committee Action:

Errata: Replace the proposal with the following. A portion of the new text in the last sentence in the main paragraph was not underlined.

1004.8 (IFC [B] 1004.8) Outdoor areas. Yards, patios, courts and similar outdoor areas accessible to and usable by the building occupants shall be provided with means of egress as required by this chapter. The occupant load of such outdoor areas shall be assigned by the building official in accordance with the anticipated use. Where outdoor areas are to be used by persons in addition to the occupants of the building, <u>and the area</u> is confined by barriers, and the path of egress travel from the outdoor areas passes through the building, means of egress requirements for the building shall be provided from the area without passing through the building. based on the sum of the occupant loads of the building plus the outdoor areas.

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Exceptions:

- 1. For areas not confined by barriers, the path of egress travel from the outdoor areas are permitted to pass through the building. Means of egress requirements for the building shall be based on the sum of the occupant loads of the building plus the outdoor areas.
- Outdoor areas used exclusively for service of the building need only have one means of egress.
- 23. Both outdoor areas associated with Group R-3 and individual dwelling units of Group R-2.

Committee Reason: The proposal is not clear in what would be considered a barrier. The code sh ould allow for egress back through the building from are as such as balconies, central court yards and occupied roofs. There is a conflict in the text in that if there is a barrier you cannot egress through the building, but if there is not a barrier you can egress through the building. There are no allowances for exterior stairways for egress.

Assembly Action:

E20-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Both parts were heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

PART I- IBC MEANS OF EGRESS **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proponent's reason statement mentioned the NIST study for the World Trade Center. Because there was an election that day, the building was not fully occupied. This report does not cover if the building was fully occupied. If the building had been fully occupied many people would not have gotten out. In the towers there were three means of egress, however, two of the stairways were compromised that day, so we do need a third staircase. Another committee member clarifi ed that the official find ing were not as indicated in the reason statement, but if the building had been fully occupied, it was predicated that possibly 14.000 people would have died.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IFC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: With the di sapproval of Part I, the t ext in the IFC needs to remain for corridor width in existing buildings.

Assembly Action:

E21-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Both parts were heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Studies have shown that most people do not react to an initial alarm, therefor e, requiring a voice alarm will increase safety by providing occupants with additional information about the emergency and evacuation. The current egress width requirement will mostly affect buildings with high occupant loads that are not highrise buildings. With the addition of many safety features to highrise buildings, such as the f ire service access elevators, and occupant evacuation elevat ors, highrise buildings will be much safer. O ne of the other concerns in the NIST report was counter flow in the stairways. That has also been addressed through the new highrise requirements. No technical ju stification for the increased width for me ans of egress was provided in the original change in the last cy cle. The additional width requirements for all buildings went too far. This is a good compromise.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IFC **Committee Action:**

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Part II was approved for consistency with the committee's action on Part I.

Assembly Action:

None

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

E22-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The revisions bring the capacity concept forward in the width determination. Breaking this into parts will add clarity and readability in the code when dealing with mean s of egress w idth. This is consistent with the committee approval of E10-09/10.

Assembly Action:

E23-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re	ason:	This is not the correct lo	cation for this	requirement.	A b etter	place for t	his might be
Section 1008.	Other p	rovisions of the code alrea	dy cover the wi	dth of doorway	ys, so this	item is not	needed.

Assembly Action:

E24-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal cleans up h andrails vs. door projections for corridors. This organization will be easier to use and systematically go through the requirements for projections.

Assembly Action:

E25-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This prop osal was disapproved based on committee action to E24-09/10 which deals with the same issue.

Assembly Action:

E26-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Luminous egress path markings are a back-up and should not be used as a replacement for means of egress illumination. Maintenance is an issue for these products in high traffic areas.

Assembly Action:

E27-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Lighting in an electrical room is a task lighting issue, not a means of egress issue.

Assembly Action:

E28-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1006.3 (IFC [B] 1006.3) Emergency power illumination. The power supply for means of egress illumination shall normally be provided by the premises' electrical supply.

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

In the event of power supply failure, an emergency electrical system shall automatically illuminate all of the following areas:

- Aisles and unenclosed egress stairways in rooms and spaces that require two or more means of 1. egress
- 2 Corridors, exit enclosures and exit passageways in buildings required to have two or more exits.
- 3 Exterior egress components at other than their levels of exit discharge until exit discharge is accomplished for buildings required to have two or more exits.
- exit discharge elements, as permitted in Section 1027.1, in buildings required to have two or 4. Interior more exits
- Exterior landings as required by Section 1008.1.6 for exit discharge doorways in buildings required to 5. have two or more exits.

The emergency power system shall provide power for duration of not less than 90 minutes and shall consist of storage batteries, unit equipment or an on-site generator. The installation of the emergency power system shall be in accordance with Chapter 27.

1006.3.1 (IFC [B] 1006.3.1) Emergency power illumination level. Emergency lighting facilities shall be arranged to provide initial illumination that is at least an average of 1 foot-candle (11 lux) and a minimum at any point of 0.1 foot-candle (1 lux) measured along the path of egress at floor level. Illumination levels shall be permitted to decline to 0.6 foot-candle (6 lux) average and a minimum at any point of 0.06 foot-candle (0.6 lux) at the end of the emergency lighting time duration. A maximum-to-minimum illumination uniformity ratio of 40 to 1 shall not be exceeded.

Committee Rea son: The modification will para llel the title to Section 1006.2. The revisions in title and movement of Section 1006.4 to 1 006.3.1 will clarify the purpose of the requirements and separate emergency lighting from general means of egress illumination.

Assembly Action:

E29-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: There was no technical ju stification for the reduction in lighting levels. The greatest activation of emergency lighting is loss of pow er, not fire, and the rational does not address these. In a fir e situation, the smoke can reduce visibility, so again, the illumination level should not be reduced. There is a lack of square footage limitation on this exception, so this could be a very large building.

Assembly Action:

E30-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The curr ent text is clear on the points raised by the proponent. There is no need for a reference to ICC A117.1 since that is already in Chapter 11. Section 1007.2 needs the list. Section 1007.8, the exception in confusing by having an exception within an exception.

Assembly Action:

E31-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The term "other accessible elements" is t oo broad for consistent interpret ation and enforcement. Without the additional explanation from the p roponent during the testimon y the t ext was not understandable as intended. This could be interpreted to require accessible means of egress from all levels that included the car route to an d from the accessible par king spaces, not just t he level with the accessible spaces.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

E32-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The term 'practical' is not specific enough language for consistent interpretation. If this is an issue a measurement is needed – perhaps using the 30 feet minimum used in the stairway separation.

Assembly Action:

E33-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: An elevat or that is part of an accessible means or egres s must have standby power. This proposal c ould send you to any elevator. The committee prefers E34-09/10 for addressing the t ravel distance issue.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

E34-09/10

Committee Reason: Travel distance should be met for all accessible means of egress, not just to those that contain areas of refuge.

Assembly Action:

E35-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The a dditional pointers do not clarif y the require ments for what can be part of an accessible means of egress.

Assembly Action:

E36-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The addition of e xit access stairw ays is c onsistent with the current text for two story office buildings with open stairways.

Assembly Action:

E37-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The revisions to the separation requirements provide additional options and clarify requirements for the exterior area of assisted rescue. T he current text could is c onfusing with the sprinkler exceptions for areas of refuge at exit stairways and this revision clears that up. This proposal works well for the level of exit discharge.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

E38-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Allowing for exterior areas of assisted rescue in smoke protected or open air assembly spaces is appropriate. There was a concern about coordination with E37-09/10.

Assembly Action:

E39-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed text is unclear as to how the exceptions would be applicable to horizontal exits. For example, where would the two doors be located?

Assembly Action:

E40-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed exception is not needed as levels not required to be served by an accessible route are already exempted by the main text.

Assembly Action:

E41-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal is the opposite of what the committee approved in E36-09/10. The committee felt that E36-09/10 addressed the issue of using open exit access stairways as part of the accessible means of egress.

Assembly Action:

E42-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that E36-09/10 addressed the issue of allowing open exit access stairways as part of the accessible means of egress. With that in Section 1007.1 the exception should stay in 1007.3.

Assembly Action:

E43-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: No technical justification was provided indicating why additional two way communication systems should be provided in a building. The text does not clearly indicate that the exception for area of refuge separation is still permitted in sprinklered buildings.

Assembly Action:

E44-09/10

Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: The horizontal exit option for accessible means of egress is a good option and should not be deleted.

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

99

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

E45-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Residential occupancies are sprinklered under the IBC, so it is not clear what the proponent is trying to achieve with the additional exceptions. The exception for areas of refuge in sprinklered buildings is applicable in Group R so these exceptions are not needed.

Assembly Action:

E46-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Code change proposal heard by the Fire Safety Committee – FS59 and FS61-09/10 – have addressed the concern of the fire barrier continuity requirements at areas of refuge. No technical justification was provided to indicate why the level of protection can be reduced from fire barriers to fire partitions around areas of refuge.

Assembly Action:

E47-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Deletion of the last sentence in Section 1007.8 would send the wrong message. Pressurizing the elevator lobby and shaft when the lobby is used as an area of refuge is needed as an option.

Assembly Action:

E48-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Since the current text states that the wheelchair space cannot reduce the means of egress width, there is no way that the wheelchair space could block the door into the stairway, therefore the first proposed sentence is not needed. It could be interpreted that the turning space could not overlap the means of egress and the wheelchair spaces, therefore, this could result in a very large landing requirement.

Assembly Action:

E49-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The prescriptive language in the current text is easier to understand than the subjective language proposed. There was no technical justification for removal of the horizontal exit option.

Assembly Action:

E50-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The location of the signage must be standardized. The new term "area for assisted rescue" and "call station for assisted rescue" is new and may confuse the public.

Assembly Action:

E51-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The current exceptions already address this option, therefore, this text is not needed.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

E52-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The current exceptions already address this option, therefore, this text is not needed.

Assembly Action:

E53-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The additional language clarifies what spaces you are talking about and re-affirms a long standing practice for application of this door swing requirement.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

E54-09/10

Committee Reason: The current text requires full width and assumes that the headroom height will be provided immediately. Since these doors move up, the proposal needs to address when the full height for the means of egress would be provided – this is critical for adequate headroom during egress. It is a concern that these doors, when not yet fully open, may be a hazard for a visually impaired person during egress. There are issues for the change in forces and lifting vs. pushing to open the door in manual operation – information is needed on if this operation is doable by all persons using the means of egress. This new technology should be in a separate section to deal with the specific provisions/concerns for this type of door rather than trying to fit this in with horizontal sliding doors. The section should address requirements to prevent vertical sliding doors from coming down without warning.

Assembly Action:

E55-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with FS95-09/10. This text is not needed since this is already covered by other sections of the code. This will also be in conflict with Section 715.4.8.2.

Assembly Action:

E56-09/10

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:

Errata to modify the proposal as follows:

UL – Underwriters Laboratories, Inc. ANSI / UL 294-1999 – Access Control System Units with revisions through <u>August</u> 2009

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: Providing a listing requirement for these types of locks is important and will provide additional assistance to the code officials reviewing/inspecting these systems. The standard is currently used extensively by the industry.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

101

E57-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: As it is a cknowledged that this sect ion needs work, the committee would like the proponent to come back with a public comment to address this obvious tripping haz ard issue. The redundancy of the par agraphs regarding t hresholds is too repetitiv e. In one of the t hree cases, there is also an inconsistency in the text. The intent of "at the required exit door" is not clear. Section 1008.1.5, Exception 1.1 where it says "level floor level landing ... is not required"; does this mean the landing can be sloped?

Assembly Action:

E58-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Part I was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee, Part II was heard by the IRC Building/Energy Committee.

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: T his change clarifies that t he measurement of the threshold height is take n from the finished surface of the landing o r floor. Also, this eliminates the potential for a ste p over threshold. This will help with consistent enforcement.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: This change clarifies that the measurement of the threshold height is taken from the finished surface of the landing or floor. Also, this eliminates the potential for a step over threshold.

Assembly Action:

E59-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The change is mainly editorial, however, the revised format provides for easier and more consistent interpretation by the code official.

Assembly Action:

E60-09/10

This is a 3 part co de change. Part I & II was heard by the IBC Mea ns of Egress Code Development Committee, Part III was heard by the IRC Building/Energy Code **Development Committee.**

PART I- IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Dead bolts at the proposed location should be a choice, not a requirement. No technical justification was provided to indicate a need for this requirement.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IPMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Part II was disapproved for the same reasons as and consistency with Part I.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

PART III- IRC B/E Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The use of a deadbolt lock helps the security but will not prevent break-ins. Sliding doors are not addressed and they are the main entry point for break-ins. This is appropriate for renters but the owner should have a choice of security device.

Assembly Action:

E61-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The reference to Section 1 008.1.9.2 for height provides direction for the code official for where the "night latch, dead bolt or security chain" in hotel rooms must be installed when these locks are used for purposes other than just security.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

E62-09/10

Committee Rea son: It is not clear w hich side of the door (i.e., inside or outside) the signage should be located on. The reference to Se ction 1004.8 could include y ards and courts where egress may be directly provided without going through the building. The rewere questions about the two-way communication system: Who would it go to? What is the pur pose? This could be problematic with smaller facilities or with multiple balconies.

Assembly Action:

E63-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposals addresses the unique locking arrangements in Group I-2 where the need is also to protect the clients, ho wever, some of the facilities where this is needed a re not necessarily medical facilities.

Assembly Action:

E64-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: An y door that looks like a means of egress must meet means of e gress door requirements. The correct enforcement at do ors where they are intended for the movement of equipment and not for a means of egress w ould be to prohibit hard ware on the door so it w as obvious that it is not normally operational – the proposal would allow hardware on the inactive leaf.

Assembly Action:

E65-09/10

Committee Action:

Replace the proposal with the following:

1008.1.9.8 (IFC [B] 1008.1.9.8) Electromagnetically locked egress doors. Doors in the means of egress that are not otherwise required to have panic hardware in buildings with an occupancy in Group A, B, E, M, R-1 or R-2 and doors to tenant spaces in Group A, B, E, M, R-1 or R-2 shall be permitted to be electromagnetically locked if equipped

with listed hardware that incorporates a built-in switch and meet the requirements below:

 The listed hardware that is affixed to the door leaf has an obvious method of operation that is readily operated under all lighting conditions.

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

None

103

- 2. The listed hardware is capable of being operated with one hand.
- 3. Operation of the listed hardware directly releases to the electromagnetic lock and unlocks the door immediately.
- 4 Loss of power to the listed hardware automatically unlocks the door.
- Where panic or fire exit hardware is required by Section 1008.1.10 operation of the listed panic or fire 5. exit hardware also releases the electromagnetic lock.

Committee Rea son: Panic ha rdware should be permitted where electromagnetic locks are utilized. The modification to Items 3 and 5 clarifies that the release of the lock must be automat ic with the operation of the panic bar.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

E66-09/10

Committee Reason: While there are security issues in low rise buildings, the proposed language would allow the locking of the exit discharge door at the level of exit discharge.

Assembly Action:

E67-09/10 **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: A charging statement is needed for each main section of the code. The propose d language begins to clarify that means of egress stairways are not required for unoccupied areas in a building, such as mechanical penthouses.

Assembly Action:

E68-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Technical justification was not provided for r this increa sed width for s tairways in Educational occupancies. The corridor width for Educational is based on students with bi-directional flow during passing periods based on ther e being lockers in the corridor. This is not an issue during emergency egress. The proponent has misapplied the idea of minimum width vs. capacity. There is also a concern for the е increased width not considering the 30 inch reach for handrails.

Assembly Action:

E69-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The narrow width may be acceptable for very limited applications, however, there would be reservations for large facilities and fire department access. Technical justification should be provided for the 30 inch width specified. The term "industrial application" is too broad for these exceptions.

Assembly Action:

E70-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Part I was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee, Part II was heard by the IRC Building/Energy Code **Development Committee.**

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The code official cannot control the owner's decision on carpet. Removing 'carpet' would be a conflict with allowing rugs or runners which are a form of carpet. Measuring the stairs without carpets, rugs or runners provides a consistent application.

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

104

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change does not clarify the section with respect to inspection with carpet. The IRC does not regulate floor finishes.

Assembly Action:

E71-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Part I was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee, Part II was heard by the IRC Building/Energy Code Development Committee.

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Committee Reason: For uniform application of this requirement the stair should be measured without the carpet installed. Waiting for the carpet to be installed before the stairway uniformity can be checked is not practical within the construction sequences.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal does not clarify what to do or how to do it. The code does not regulate items that could be added or deleted by the occupant.

Assembly Action:

E72-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Part I was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee, Part II was heard by the IRC Building/Energy Code Development Committee.

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Committee Reason: If this was approved, the owner changing the carpet would circumvent the requirements. The phrase "in place at final inspection" is not typical code language. The measurement should be to the fixed part of the stairs to allow for uniform application. If the stairs fail at final inspection would the owner be asked to rip the carpet up and put down something less thick or totally redesign the stairs – this does not work with the construction sequence.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proponent has provided data that this is a problem and has attempted to address it. However, this presents an enforcement problem with respect to material that is not regulated elsewhere in the code. The proponent should rework this and bring it back.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

E73-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal is mainly editorial and uses defined terms.

Assembly Action:

E74-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Part I was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee, Part II was heard by the IRC Building/Energy Code **Development Committee.**

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The injury data is not correlated with the type of stairways in the International Building Code. The data is subjective (i.e., "I felt comfortable on the stairs.").

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: The committee feels the data submitted seems to be a gray area in what the data is revealing. The solution does not necessarily show that it is related to the problem. The committee feels the "7 3/4-10" standard is a good standard and prefers to keep it.

Assembly Action: E75-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Part I was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee, Part II was heard by the IRC Building/Energy Code **Development Committee.**

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Committee Reason: By breaking the current text into smaller sections the proposal clarifies the requirements for stair nosings and risers.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: The committee feels the code already addresses this and it is an enforcement and education issue. There is a concern about correlation of this with the previous action on RB46-09/10. The committee suggests both parties work together and bring this back later.

Assembly Action:

E76-09/10 Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the line of travel measurement along landings.

Assembly Action:

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

106

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Assembly Action:

E77-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The term "continuous radius" is not clear and will lead to inconsistent in	iterpretations.
Assembly Action:	None
E78-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The additional language does not clarify the code and is not needed prefers E79-09/10.	I. The committee
Assembly Action:	None
E79-09/10	
Committee Action: Approved a	s Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies how the treads are measured for alternating tread	device stairways.
Assembly Action:	None
E80-09/10	
Committee Action: Approved a	s Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies where the handrail requirements differ for ramps assembly seating areas.	s and stairways in

E81-09/10 **Committee Action:**

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: A blanket exception for handrails on stairways and ramps leading to a stage is too broad. Handrails are necessary for stability on all stairs and ramps that access a stage. A handrail is minimal and will not be an obstruction for line of site. All stairs are required to have two handrails in the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

E82-09/10

Committee Reason: The current exception allows for an alternative for sidewalks that move up with grade that should not be removed.

Assembly Action:

E83-09/10

E84-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The phrase "adjacent support" is too broad for consistent enforcement. While this may be a problem in existing courtrooms, this should be achievable in new construction.

Withdrawn by proponent

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

E85-09/10

Committee Action: Disapp

Committee Reason: While ladder access may be a viable a Iternative for roof access, requirements for w hat type of ladder would be permitted are needed (i.e., fixed).

Assembly Action:

E86-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: While this safet y issue for hatch access on a roof should be addressed, for consistent enforcement additional information is needed for height and attachment of the handholds. Perhaps this w ould be better locate d in the Internati onal Mechanical Code of International Plumbing Code since this deals w ith unoccupied roofs.

Assembly Action: None

E87-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This is a d esign issue for t he accessible le vel. There are concerns for the cross slope and lack of landings for an accessible means of egress route.

Assembly Action:

E88-09/10

E89-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The supporting reason does not include a consumption analysis for energy used by exit signs. There is an issue for ho wa code official could enforce signs turning on when there were occupants present. What are the procedures for turning on exit signs and allowing to lighting go off. This allowance could potentially hurt battery life. The exception did not address when emergency responders move into a building and their need for exit signage.

Assembly Action:

E90-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This would be a conflict in industrial fa cilities where high ceilings are needed to move equipment or to signs are locate d high in order to s ee them over obstructions. The proponent m ay choose to narrow this do wn to certain occupancies w here high ceilings are foun d but clearances are n eeded (i.e., restaurants).

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

Withdrawn by proponent

None

Disapproved

None

roved

None

E91-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Technical justification was not provided to indicate how these floor exit signs would assist exiting in Hotels. If there is smoke in the corridor, the proper approach in a hotel room is to close the door and wait for assisted rescue, not to crawl to the exit or try and make it past the fire. The geometry indicating locations may be a conflict with other parts of the codes (i.e., minimum bottom rails on accessible door). There needs to be UL requirements for these signs. If this is an issue for hotels, it should include Group R-2 transient as well as Group R-1.

Assembly Action:

E92-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal is too far reaching. The ICC A117.1 now allows for signage to be on the door, therefore, the exception in Section 1011.3 should be removed. The signage does not allow for other way finding options. Section 1110 and E111 give enough direction already.

Assembly Action:

E93-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Both Parts were heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There was no technical justification indicating that these additional exit signs are needed for these occupancies. NFPA 101 only addresses low level exit signage in such unusual situation as fun houses where means of egress is not apparent, not all the uses indicated. Requiring this on all exit access door requirements is too far reaching, effectively requiring signs on almost every door. If this is required there needs to be a limit on which doors and occupancies. Low level signs will be visually blocked for the occupants by the person in front of them. There must be impact testing on the doors signs to ensure maintenance. Not allowing "next to" would prohibit lighted signs as an option. "Any material" is too broad; there should be technical requirements (i.e., UL924). What is the height and stroke width for the letters on the sign?

Assembly Action:

PART II- IFC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Part II is disapproved for the same reasons and consistency with Part I. Since Section 1030 is maintenance, it is not clear if this requirement for low level exit signage is intended to be retroactive. There are questions about signs being marked or destroyed by their location on the door, especially on the push side of accessible manual doors. No requirements were specified for the International Fire Code Chapter 46 for existing buildings.

Assembly Action:

E94-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as following:

1012.2 (IFC [B] 1012.2) Height. Handrail height, measured above stair tread nosings, or finish surface of ramp slope shall be uniform, not less than 34 inches (864 mm) and not more than 38 inches (965 mm). Handrail height of alternating tread devices and ship ladders, measured above tread nosings, shall be uniform, not less than 30 inches (762 mm) and not more than 34 inches (864mm).

Exception: When handrail fittings or bendings are used to provide continuous transition between flights, transition at winder treads, transition from handrail to guard, or when used at the start of a flight, the handrail height at the fittings or bendings shall be permitted to exceed the maximum height.

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: The modification removed text that would conflict with handrail extension requirements. The current text does not specifically address the height of the handrail over landings. The new exception would allow for consistent enforcement for handrail heights along landings. This would allow for handrails to be installed with a consistent slope rather than a jog, therefore, this allowance would provide for a safer use of the handrail.

Assembly Action:

E95-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Goosenecks portions of the handrails (as illustrated in the proponent's reason statement) can result in a vertical handhold on the railing which can be a safety issue for occupants using that portion of the handrail.

Assembly Action:

E96-09/10 **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: More feedback is needed from the disabled community for Type II handrails to be permitted in all occupancies. There needs to be additional research to see if Type II handrails would be considered to provide "equivalent graspability" so that there will not be a conflict with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Assembly Action:

E97-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Part I was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee, Part II was heard by the IRC Building/Energy Code **Development Committee.**

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Errata to reason statement: (It was stated during the testimony by the proponent that in the Reason statement in the paragraph immediately following Figure 2, the second sentence should be modified as follows.)

The Type II handrails tested were not consistent with the handrails sold and installed.

Committee Reason: No testimony was provided indicating that Type II handrails does not meet "or provide equivalent graspability" that is currently permitted in Section 1012.3 and was proposed to be maintained by the proponent. The option of Type II handrails should be permitted in Group R-2 and R-3 dwelling and sleeping units.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: This proposal would severely limit the types of handrails that could be used. Also, the statement of equivalency requires judgment and could present enforcement problems.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

E98-09/10

Committee Reason: A minimum cross section width of 1 inch for a Type I handrail is needed for graspability.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

110

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

E99-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed revision from 'handrail' to 'side' clarifies what that projection means and allows for the supports for handrails.

Assembly Action:

E100-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Part I was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee, Part II was heard by the IRC Building/Energy Code Development Committee.

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Committee Reason: In Section 1013.2, Item 2, there was no substantiation for the 22 inch separation between the fixed seating and the guard. The task force needs to work with experts in assembly seating. The front row concept does not address all the issues for the line of site in venues such as sports stadiums where the event is over the field and not a point.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee feels this does address the issue but it does not address it fully. It will create some gray areas that will require interpretation of what the code intends. This needs more work. The committee suggests the addition of figures would improve the clarity on the intent.

Assembly Action:

E101-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as following:

1013.2 (IFC [B] 1013.2) Height. Required guards shall be not less than 42 inches (1067 mm) high, measured vertically above the adjacent walking surfaces, adjacent fixed seating or the line connecting the leading edges of the treads.

Exceptions:

- For occupancy Group R-3 not more than three stories above grade in height and <u>within</u> individual dwelling units in occupancy Group R-2 not more than three stories above grade in height with separate means of egress, required guards shall not be less than 36 inches (914 mm) high measured vertically above the adjacent walking surfaces, <u>or</u> adjacent fixed seating or the line connecting the leading edges of the treads.
- For occupancies in Group R-3, and within individual dwelling units in occupancies in Group R-2, guards on the open sides of stairs shall have a height not less than 34 inches (864 mm) measured vertically from a line connecting the leading edges of the treads.
- 3. For occupancies in Group R-3, and within individual dwelling units in occupancies in Group R-2, where the top of the guard also serves as a handrail on the open sides of stairs, the top of the guard shall not be less than 34 inches (864 mm) and not more than 38 inches (965 mm) measured vertically from a line connecting the leading edges of the treads.
- 4. The height in assembly seating areas shall be in accordance with Section 1028.14.
- Along alternating tread devices and ship ladders, guards whose top rail also serves as a handrail, shall have height not less than 30 inches (762 mm) and not more than 34 inches (864 mm), measured vertically from the leading edge of the device tread nosing.

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The modification to take out the option along the leading edge of treads was becaause it is not needed as it is already addressed in Exception 2. Adding "within" clarifies that the exception is limited to inside the unit, and not outside the unit. The addition of Exception 1 will eliminate the current disconnect between guard height requirements in this occupancy in IBC and IRC. The change is needed so that the height of the guard is consistent from the stair to the landing.

Assembly Action:

E102-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Children are in many other occupancies than Group E, therefore the proposed limitation is not broad e nough. There is no technical justification provided to justify the reduction in height of the gua rd. There can be a very significant fall over the side rails to the landing below even if there is a limited space between the stair flights.

Assembly Action:

E103-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: No technical support was provided that identified this as a problem. The proposed text is not needed. The concern of egr ess through several rooms is already addressed in Item 1. These t ypes of Assembly and E ducational spaces s hould not be required to egress through corrid ors if there a re more open options available where the path of egress is clear. This would cause confusion in Group A-3 and A-5 facilities that use concourses or open air circul ation routes behind the seating. T here was no justification for additional requirements for the split at 500 and 1000 occupants.

Assembly Action:

E104-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The revisions clarifies that these requirements are specific to care suites in hospitals, not anything that could be called a suite. The rea rrangement of requirements clarifies requirements for egr ess within the different types of care suites.

Assembly Action:

E105-09/10

Committee Action:

Errata: Math symbols are missing from the heading for the 3rd and 4th column. Column 3 should read "OL is less than or equal to 30" and Column 4 should read, "OL is greater than 30". The reference in Note 'c' should be to Section 1028.8.

Committee Reason: The table format is easier to read and brings clarity to the requirements for common path of egress travel.

Assembly Action:

E106-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The occupants of a dw elling unit are familia r with the space; therefore, where two exits are required for Group R-3 occupancy, the common path of travel should be applicable in the same manner as a Group R-2 unit.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

112

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

E107-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: No technical justification was provided for the 25 feet separation requirement. Highrise provisions are alread y a ddressed in Section 403, and th is requirement may be to o restrictive for very small buildings. The term 'exit access' door is not applicable to exit enclosures.

Assembly Action:

E108-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The revised text loses the allowance for fully sprinklered buildings to have t wo open exit access stairways. It is not clear if the stairways in Section 1022.1 Exception 1 are interior or exterior stairways, or if the y are exit or exit access stairways. Tec hnical justification should be provided to indicate that open stairways should be permitted between floors. It is not clear how this will work with the provisions a ccepted in E5-09/10. This proposal seems to be taking protection away from stairways.

Assembly Action:

E109-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Boeing should be commended for their fire model analysis on this issue, however, ther e are concerns about the assumptions in the model: for example what is the technical basis for the size of the fire; what are the ten ability methods used; why the one location for the fire vs. moving it around; What is the growth of the fire. The American Society for Protection Engineers d oes have standar ds for per formance based analysis or tenability methods from ISO that could be investigated. The egress analysis did not include people with mobility impairments or consideration of occupant delays upon alarm notification. The study should have a third party peer review. Quantitative information on the size and types of fuel loads and the resulting fire size should be provided – this is im portant as the i ndustry moves t o using more composite materials that ma y increase fuel loads. The t echnical data is applicable for larg e airplanes; however, a concern would be if this was applicable for small aircraft facilities. The anticipated occupant loading and how the occupants are notified were not included in the reason. Did the sprinkler systems activate?

Assembly Action:

E110-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: Aisle w idths are not cur rently addressed in the code. The proposed requirements for aisles are consistent with corridors widths and are a reasonable w idth for Group B and M as w ell as Group A where fixed seating is not provided.

Assembly Action: E111-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The ratio 2.5:1 is commonly used for rel evator lobbies off corridors for dead end provisions. If there is an exception for the construction this could be interpreted as requiring a rating for the corridor but not the elevator lobby. Defining corridors in this manner could affect rooms.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

E112-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as following:

1018.1 (IFC [B] 1018.1) Construction. Corridors shall be fire-resistance rated in accordance with Table 1018.1. The corridor walls required to be fire-resistance rated shall comply with Section 709 for fire partitions.

Exceptions:

- A fire-resistance rating is not required for corridors in an occupancy in Group E where each room that is used for instruction has at least one door opening directly to the exterior and rooms for assembly purposes have at least one-half of the required means of egress doors opening directly to the exterior. Exterior doors specified in this exception are required to be at ground level.
- 2. A fire-resistance rating is not required for corridors contained within a dwelling or sleeping unit in an occupancy in Group R.
- 3. A fire-resistance rating is not required for corridors in open parking garages.
- 4. A fire-resistance rating is not required for corridors in an occupancy in Group B which is a space requiring only a single means of egress complying with Section 1015.1.
- Corridors adjacent to the exterior walls of buildings shall be permitted to have unprotected openings on the <u>unrated</u> exterior wall where <u>unrated walls are</u> permitted by <u>Table 602 and</u> <u>unprotected openings are permitted by</u> Table 705.8 and <u>Table 602</u>.

Committee Reason: The modification clarified the references to Table 602 and Table 705.8. The allowance for exterior walls of corridors is reas onable and would not reduce protection for occupants. It was suggested the term "adjacent" might be misinterpreted; perhaps "where a corridor has an exterior wall" would be clearer.

Assembly Action:

E113-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: If you take away the trade off for spinklers vs. rated corridors the result will be many more schools designed without sprinklers – sprinklered schools are safer during a fire event than schools with rated corridors. The antidotal data v s the NFPA da ta does not justify the significant increase in the e cost of construction. In addition there will be issues with maintaining the fire resistance rating of the walls especially to automatic closers on the doors being in-place and functional. The fire doors with automatic closer s will be a problem for access to classrooms. This would also require rated corridors in day care facilities, which would be excessive. Information w as not provided for the justification for the 30 occupant exception for the proposed ratings

The proponents continually brought up the possibility of a fire event during a lockdown situation. Rating of a corridor is a means of egress issue, not a security issue. Rated corridors will not protect students from terrorists during a lockdow n situation. If there is, a con cern for a fire event during a lock-dow n th at ne eds to be addressed with the emergency responders in the fire and safety evacuation plans, not through a corridor rating. In addition, there are other safet y concerns in sc hools. Schools commonly have do ors with vision panels and sidelights for observation of the classrooms and student/teac her interaction. Requiring rated doors at these locations would either significantly raise the costs for the opening protective and/or result in solid doors w ithout this necessary observation feature.

Assembly Action:

E114-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Buildings in earth quake and hurricane areas are already designed to a high er standard, therefore this rated corridor requirement is not ne eded. Structural robustness is not related to fire-resistance-rated corridors. Technical just ification was not pr oviding indicating that the fire in cidences are higher for the specified buildings in earthquake and hurricane areas. This w ould require rated corridors in schools, police stations, fire stations, all emergency shelters (i.e., churches, schools, community centers, football stadiums). This would be a serious operational issue for Group I-2 functions where this would require rated corridors.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

E115-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Placing the base requirement and exceptions in a table makes the requirements easier to understand.

Assembly Action:

E116-09/10

Committee Action: Disapp

Committee Reason: This may jeopardize the tenability of the corridors moving smoke into the corridor. The justification for this revision is not clear.

Assembly Action:

E117-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The additional text clarifies that when an open exit access stairway is utilized in a situation where a rated corridor is required, the rated corridor continuity would include the exit access stairway.

Assembly Action:

E118-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The code a lready allows this exception for exit discharge through lobbies and vestibules so the proposed text is not needed. The allow ances for lobbies and vestibules is not considered a reduction of the level of protection, the option is an alternative.

Assembly Action:

E119-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as following:

1021.1.3 (IFC [B] 1021.1.3) Single-story or multi-story dwelling units. Individual single-story or multi-story dwelling units shall be permitted to have a single exit <u>within and</u> from the dwelling unit provided <u>that</u> all of the following criteria are met:

- 1. The dwelling unit complies with Section 1015.1 as a space with one means of egress and
- 2. Either the exit from the dwelling unit is located discharges directly to the exterior at the level of exit discharge, or the exit access outside the dwelling unit's entrance door provides access to not less than two approved independent exits.

Exception: Single exits designed in accordance with Section 1021.2

(Remainder of proposal remains unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The modification to add " within and" is in current S ection 1021.1 Item 4 and addresses stairways within a dwelling unit, not just the exit d oor from the whole unit. This also allow s for the option of a dwelling unit opening onto a dead end corridor and extending the common path of travel allow ance down that dead end to the main corridor. A dding "discharges directly to the exterior" clarifies where you leave the unit. The proposal is primarily editorial and clarifies the application of the single means of egress out of a n individual dwelling unit.

Assembly Action:

None

115

Disapproved

roved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Modified

...

E120-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal addresses a design issue w here exits may be located wholly within tenant spaces.

Assembly Action:

None

E121-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as following:

TABLE 1021.2(1) (IFC [B] TABLE 1021.1(1)) SINGLE EXITS STORIES WITH ONE EXIT OR ACCESS TO ONE EXIT FOR R-2 OCCUPANCIES

STORY	OCCUPANCY	MAXIMUM NUMBER OF	MAXIMUM EXIT
		DWELLING UNITS PER	ACCESS TRAVEL
		FLOOR SERVED BY A	DISTANCE
		SINGLE EXIT AND	
		TRAVEL DISTANCE TO	
		THE EXIT	
Basement, first, second	R-2ª	4 dwelling units and 125	<u>125 feet</u>
or third story		feet travel distance	
Fourth story and above N	PNA	NA	

For SI: 1 foot = 3048 mm.

a. Buildings classified as Group R-2 equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2 and provided with emergency escape and rescue openings in accordance with Section 1029.

TABLE 1021.2(2) SINGLE EXITS STORIES WITH ONE EXIT OR ACCESS TO ONE EXIT FOR OTHER OCCUPANCIES

STORY OCC	UPANCY	MAXIMUM OCCUPANTS PER <u>STORY</u> FLOOR AND TRAVEL DISTANCE TO THE <u>EXIT</u>	MAXIMUM EXIT ACCESS TRAVE DISTANCE
First story or basement	A, B ^d , E ^e , F ^d , M, U, S ^d	49 occupants and 75 feet travel distance	<u>75 feet</u>
	H-2, H-3	3 occupants and 25 feet travel distance	<u>25 feet</u>
	H-4, H-5, I, R-1, R-2 ^{c,†} , R- 4	10 occupants and 75 feet travel distance	<u>75 feet</u>
	Sª	29 occupants and 100 feet travel distance	<u>100 feet</u>
Second story	B ^b , F, M, S ^a	29 occupants and 75 feet travel distance	<u>75 feet</u>
Third story and above NF	NA	NA	

For SI: 1 foot = 3048 mm.

a. For the required number of exits for parking structures, see Section 1021.1.1.

b. For the required number of exits for air traffic control towers, see Section 412.3.

c. Buildings classified as Group R-2 equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2 and provided with emergency escape and rescue openings in accordance with Section 1029.

d. Group B, F and S Occupancies in buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 shall have a maximum travel distance of 100 feet.

e. Day care occupancies shall have a maximum occupant load of 10.

f. This Table is used for R-2 occupancies consisting of sleeping units. For R-2 occupancies consisting of dwelling units, use Table 1021.2(1).

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Rea son: The modifications were for coordination with E5-09/10 which was the CT C proposal approved by the committee. The modification also eliminated the committee's concern about a single row table in Table 1021.2(1). The two tables separate occupants from number of dwelling units when dealing with single exit buildings, which will simplify application.

Assembly Action:

E122-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Part I was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee, Part II was heard by the IRC Building/Energy Code **Development Committee.**

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The first s entence in Section 1021.2 is red undant with the text in Section 1 021.1 and 1015.1. This should be correlated with the committee actions on E119 and E121.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: The committee recognizes there is a need for th is in large mansions. However, this proposal is unclear and confusing on how to apply. The 1000 square foot threshold is an arbitrary number. The remoteness of the tw o means of egress is not addressed. There is no data for de aths or injuries associated with this situation

Assembly Action:

E123-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal addresses mixed occupancy buildings in a ratio manner similar to the floor area limitations. The current text would allow for occupant loads in mixed occupancy building in excess of what would be considered safe for single occupancies.

Assembly Action:

E124-09/10

Committee Action: Disapp

Committee Reason: The current text for openings and penetrations is clear. It is not clear what the proponent was trying to address in the revisions.

Assembly Action:

E125-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proponent is misinterpreting the cur rent text. Doors between the exit stair enclosure and lobb y/vestibule are permitted by current text. The proposed language allowing for 'protected' openings' would allow any type of opening (i.e., windows, storage closets) in the exit enclosure on the lobby level.

Assembly Action: E126-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Membra ne penetration in the w alls of exit enclosures is a common practice. The allowance maintains a reasonable level of safety.

Assembly Action:

117

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

roved

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

None

Assembly Action:

identification

E128-09/10

E127-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal reduces wording and repeated requirements with a specific reference.

Assembly Action:

E129-09/10 **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Exit passageways when connected to an exit stairway at the level of exit discharge or at upper levels should have a consistent le vel of protection throughout. The reduction of the fire resistance rating is not justified.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

E130-09/10

Committee Reason: This proposal clarifies that transfer passageways at upper floors between exit enclosures are permitted and that the rating must be consistent for the entire enclosure.

Assembly Action:

E131-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: While this ne w technolog y will allow gre ater flex ibility, t his proposal is not clear on electrical backup and sup ervision requirements. There is still the issue of mainten ance of the battery system. Would 'loss of power' be loss of power to the building or loss of emergency power?

Assembly Action:

E132-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Several of the proponents and opponent brought up possible revisions to clarify the text that need to be brought for ward at the public comment phase. The proposal needs to clarify if the term "assembly" includes the supporting constr uction or not. "Essentially open", while it is currently in code text, leaves too much open for interpretation.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Rea son: Clarifies the purpose, t ype of sign and w hat information is required for stairway

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

E133-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal will keep the ex terior exit stairway provisions together in a p lace that is easier to find. This proposal may need correlation with E5 revisions.

Assembly Action:

E134-09/10

None

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as following:

1026.6 (IFC [B] 1026.6) Exterior ramps and stairway protection. Exterior exit ramps and stairways shall be separated from the interior of the building as required in Section 1022.1. Openings shall be limited to those necessary for egress from normally occupied spaces.

Excepti ons:

- 1. Separation from the interior of the building is not required for occupancies, other than those in Group R-1 or R-2, in buildings that are no more than two stories above grade plane where a level of exit discharge serving such occupancies is the first story above grade plane.
- 2. Separation from the interior of the building is not required where the exterior ramp or stairway is served by an exterior ramp or balcony that connects two remote exterior stairways or other approved exits, with a perimeter that is not less than 50 percent open. To be considered open, the opening shall be a minimum of 50 percent of the height of the enclosing wall, with the top of the openings no less than 7 feet (2134 mm) above the top of the balcony.
- 3. Separation from the interior of the building is not required for an exterior ramp or stairway located in a building or structure that is permitted to have unenclosed interior stairways in accordance with Section 1022.1.
- 4. Separation from the interior of the building is not required for exterior ramps or stairways connected to open-ended corridors, provided that the adjacent exterior wall and openings comply with Section 1022.6 and Items 4.1 through 4.4 <u>4.5</u> are met:
 - 4.1 The building, including corridors and ramps and stairs, shall be equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2.
 - 4.2 The open-ended corridors comply with Section 1018.
 - 4.3 The open-ended corridors are connected on each end to an exterior exit ramp or stairway complying with Section 1026.
 - <u>4.4</u> <u>The exterior walls and openings adjacent to the exterior exit ramp or stairway comply with</u> Section 1022.6.
- 4.4 <u>4.5</u> At any location in an open-ended corridor where a change of direction exceeding 45 degrees (0.79 rad) occurs, a clear opening of not less than 35 square feet (3.3 m²) or an exterior ramp or stairway shall be provided. Where clear openings are provided, they shall be located so as to minimize the accumulation of smoke or toxic gases.

Committee Rea son: The pr oposed modification provides a bet ter format for the revision. The revision to these requirements will clarify what are the wall and opening requirements around the exterior exit stairways.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

E135-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: No technical justification was provided for the increase separation requirements – this has been in the codes since the 1950s. This will be a conflict with air lock/energy requirements for vestibules. While the current text "equivalent to wired glass" may need add ressing the proposal does not dot his – wired glass is most often tested as h aving a 45 minu tera ting. The proposed requirements in Ex ception 2.3 will prohibit double doors in a 10 foot wall of the vestibule.

Assembly Action:

E136-09/10

Committee Reason: This is a limited application, which should already be covered by the code text. The base requirement under Exception 5 is a conflict with the definition of exit discharge by saying it can terminate in a court and not a public way. A concern would be if the passageway did not provided a clear line of site to the outside that some type of exit signage would be required. The wording in 5.2 is not clear that the passage goes through the wall to the outside rather than just up to the wall.

Assembly Action:

E137-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The current reference to Section 705 is more expansive than the proposed reference to Section 705.2. The reference could get put the exit discharge much closer to the property line than currently permitted. Technical justification was not provided to indicate why this reduction should be permitted.

Assembly Action:

E138-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: It would be preferable to close the identified loophole in Section 705.8 rather that allow exit discharge so close to the lot line.

Assembly Action:

E139-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The relocation of the requirements out of exit discharge properly places the requirements to the egress balconies and exterior stairways in their respective code sections and makes the code easier to understand.

Assembly Action:

E140-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies applications for spaces used for assembly purposes that are located in facilities that are not strictly Group A. This is especially important for assembly spaces with less than 50 occupants. The proposal clears up requirements for aisles vs. aisle accessways. This coordinates with the Americans with Disabilities Act/Architectural Barriers Act (ADA/ABA) Accessibility Guidelines in small spaces that include assembly seating.

Assembly Action: None E141-09/10 Committee Action: Disapproved Committee Reason: The committee prefers the broader fix of this issue in E140-09/10/ Assembly Action: None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

120

None

Committee Action:

E142-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

Disapproved

Modify the proposal as following:

1028.1.1.1 (IFC [B] 1028.1.1.1) Spaces under grandstands and bleachers. When spaces under grandstands or bleachers are used for purposes other than toilet rooms and ticket booths less than 100 sq.ft. (9.29 m²) and toilet rooms, such spaces shall be separated by fire barriers complying with Section 707 and horizontal assemblies complying with Section 712 with not less than 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction.

Committee Reason: The modification clarifies that the exemption is for toilet rooms of an y size and the 100 sq.ft. limit is only applicable to t he ticket booths. The p roposal identifies information that is missing in the current text to address hazards under bleachers.

Assembly Action:

E143-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal moves the p rovisions for stepped aisles to a more logical location. The current location as an exception for level or ramped aisles is incorrect.

Assembly Action:

E144-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee prefers the format for stepped aisles in E143-09/10.

Assembly Action:

E145-09/10

-			
Com	mittoo	Action	
COIII	IIIIIIEE	ACTION.	

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies that h andrails can be on one side of the aisle in assembly seating areas.

Assembly Action:

E146-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The current language is adequate for c ross ai sles. A blan ket exception as propose d would conflict w ith the America ns with Disabilit ies Act/Architectural Barriers Act (ADA/ABA) Accessibi lity Guidelines.

Assembly Action:

E147-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Using a walking surface measurement is a ppropriate to get the level of saf ety we are looking for when using self rising chairs. The proponents and CTC committee should work together to address this issue of guards heights adjacent to different types of seats in assembly venues.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

121

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

E148-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal is too broad as written for uniform enforceability. The proponents and CTC committee should work together to address this issue of guards heights adjacent to different t ypes of seats in assembly venues.

Assembly Action:

E149-09/10

Committee	Action:
-----------	---------

Committee Reason: The proposal removes redundant text.

Assembly Action:

E150-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Part I was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee, Part II was heard by the IRC Building/Energy Code Development Committee.

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Group R-3 is unique in that it is only required to have one means of egress, therefore the redundancy of the emergency escape window is needed. Early suppression and early detection saves lives, but there are no maintenance re quirements for a NFPA13D system, therefore, there is a concern that the chance of these systems to be out of service is high enough that removal of the requirement for a secondary exit through the emergency esc ape window is not warranted. There is no aler t element on an NFPA13D system, and while smoke detectors are good at detection, they are not always the best at alerting. In a person's home the may be sleeping, into xicated or unable to ev acuate without assistance – this can cause e delayed evacuation, thus the real need of or the emergency escape windows. One of the opponent indica ted that not having emerge ncy escape windows in gro up homes may be a violation of fede ral law – that needs to be investigated. There needs to be more information on the entry rescue issues brought up by the fire service, including their use in non-fire emergencies.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This chan ge adds a re asonable exception based on an ap proved automatic sprinkler system in the d welling. This creates an incentive to provide a sprinkler system. Also, th is may get some retrofits for additions.

Assembly Action:

E151-09/10

This is a 4 Part Code Change. All 4 Parts were heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Modify the proposal as follows (editorial correction):

3001.3 Accessibility. Passenger elevators required to be accessible or serve as part of an accessible means of egress shall comply with Section 1107 Sections 1007 and 1109.6.

E105.4 Mailboxes. Where mailboxes are provided in an interior location, at least 5 percent, but not less than one, of each type shall be accessible. In residential and institutional facilities, where mailboxes are provided for

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

each dwelling unit or sleeping unit, accessible mailboxes be accessible shall be provided for each unit required to be an Accessible unit.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The selective deletions of the reference to ICC A117.1 remove redundant text. Revisions in terminology for tactile signage coordinate with revisions in the 2009 edition of ICC A117.1.

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted Committee Rea son: The revisions clarify the applicable te chnical requirements in ICC A117. 1 for visible

alarms in dwelling units.

Assembly Action:

Assembly Action:

PART II- IFC

PART III- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The revisions clarify the applicable technical requirements in ICC A117.1 f or signage at toilet rooms.

Assembly Action:

PART IV- IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The selective deletions of the reference to ICC A117.1 remove redundant text.

Assembly Action:

E152-09/10

This is a 2 part code change. Both parts were by the IBC Means of Egress Code **Development Committee.**

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The technical provisions in the 2009 edition of ICC A117.1 n eed to be published befor e these scoping provisions are included in the IBC. Some of the items in these provisions are outside the scope of the code official's ty pical purview and should be lo cated in Appendix E (i.e., golf courses, boating piers, amusement rides).

Assembly Action:

PART II- IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Part II was disapproved based on the committee's actions to Part I of E152-09/10.

Assembly Action:

E153-09/10 **Committee Action:**

Modify the proposal as follows (editorial correction of missing underline):

1102.1 Definitions. The following words and terms shall, for the purposes of this chapter and as used elsewhere in the code, have the meanings shown herein:

COMMON USE: Interior or exterior circulation paths, rooms, spaces or elements that are not for public use and are made available for the shared use of either two or more people in a non-residential facility or the residents of two or more units of a residential facility.

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The term "non-residential facilities" is unclear as to meaning. For residential, this conflicts with the F air Ho using interpretation of common use area being immediately outside or assigned to the unit. This could be interpreted as also the inside of the unit if the apartment is for more than one person. The term is not used in the codes at this time in a manner that needs this definition.

Assembly Action:

E154-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal is too broad and could result in possible conflicts with the Fair Housing Act (FHA). HUD's interpretation limits the size of the unit to the same footprint as the garage. It is important that the code stay consistent with the FHA.

Assembly Action:

E155-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This definition w ould put the building official in place of enforcing st ate specific certifications, and would result in inconsistent enforcement. The code official can make a broader interpretation with the current language which would better address the concern expressed by the proponent. The definition actually narrows application.

Assembly Action:

E156-09/10

This is a 3 Part Code Change. Part I & II were heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee, Part III was heard by the IRC Building/Energy Code Development Committee.

PART I IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal is too far r eaching for just visit ability. It is easy to retrofit existing one and two step entries. There is a big concern about water infiltration and a stepped entry is needed to address that.

Justification was not provided for the 50% req uirement for number of units. It is unclear how this will effect construction of individual units – perhaps requiring every unit to meet Type C unit requirements. If there are Type A and Type B units on the site, there should be an a llowance for consideration of those units counting towards the percentage required to meet Type C units, similar to what is currently in Section 1107.2.

There needs to be exceptions for units that are a level above grade, in flood plains, on steep sites, etc. There are areas of the country where putting in a basement might hit rock and blasting down to get the zero level entry would be too costly – these types of issues should be considered when determining percentages. Adding anothe r t ype of unit is confusing. Pe rhaps these mi nimal accessibilit y r equirements should be incorporated into the International Residential Code.

Assembly Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

PART II- IEBC Committee Action: Disapp

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the committee action on E156-09/10 Part I.

PART III- IRC B/E

Committee R eason: The committee supports the need for visit ability but is concerned about the zoning, particularly the number of units in a development. The committee suggests that it would be better if the technical requirements were placed into the code in the appropriate sections then all homes would comply and

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

roved

None

Disapproved

there would not be a need for Type C. There are difficulties with the definitions and they contain technical requirements.

Assembly Action:

E157-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed text coordinates with the intent of the ADA and clarifies that the exempted work areas could be raised or lowered.

Assembly Action:

E158-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: While there should be allowances for some areas within a church, there needs to be some sort of size limitations. A possible interpretation could be that the entire church was used for religious ceremonies, which is not consistent with the intent of the proponent.

Assembly Action:

E159-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Day care centers are not always within Section 419 for Live/Work units as indicated in the proponent's reason. This would also result in a conflict with the American's with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Assembly Action:

E160-09/10

Committee Reason: The current allowances for platform lifts covers providing access to an individual dwelling unit in Section 1109.7 Item 4, therefore this text is redundant.

Assembly Action:

E161-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This would be a conflict with the requirements in ICC A117.1. The proposal is too far reaching and could be interpreted too broadly.

Assembly Action:

E162-09/10 **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The increased area would be consistent with the American's with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG).

Assembly Action:

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Committee Action:
E163-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The n ew term "public areas" is unclear and ver y open for interpretation. The 30 occupants limit would result in very different area limitations depending on use; and uses in a space can change over time. Item 1.4 w ould be a conflict w ith the Amer ican's with Disabilities Act Acce ssibility G uidelines (ADAAG).

Assembly Action:

E164-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed language does not clarify the intent of the route provisions and more than the current text.

Assembly Action:

E165-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: In some cases this requirement could be too broad and restrictive for individual tenants. This could have substantial impact on multi-story building with ten ants on multiple floors that also include exi t stairways, but where everyone has access to a common elevator.

Assembly Action:

E166-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The F air Housing Accessibility G uidelines (FHAG) does not add ress van space w ith additional headr oom, so the exception is not a conflict w ith F HAG. T echnology is such that the height requirement for private converted vans may not be needed. No technical justification was submitted indicated that the lower height is a problem for private vans.

Assembly Action:

E167-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This concern is an educational issue for designers - this is already covered by "serving units". "Elements" and "but not limited too" can be in terpreted to o broadly. This should be in Section 1109, since mailboxes and garbage chutes can be in uses other than residential.

Assembly Action:

E168-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This concern is an educational issue for designers - this is already covered by "serving units". Rubbish chutes that s erve non-accessible dw elling units shoul d not be req uired to meet this requirement. This should be in Section 1109, since mail boxes and garage chutes can be in uses other t han residential. It is not clear ho w the door and disposal operation can be accomplished with only one hand as required in the last sentence.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

E169-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: It was not clear if the private residence elevator would have to comply with ICC A117.1, or this could be just an y type of elevator (i.e., non-accessible). While this proposal is consistent with Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) interpretation for individual dwelling units provided with private elevators, the committee felt that it was unnecessary for the elevator to go to every floor.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Committee Reason: No t echnical justification was provided for such a major re duction. This would conflict with current American's with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.

Assembly Action:

E170-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1107.6.1.1.1 Accessible unit facilities. All interior and exterior spaces and elements provided as part of or serving an Accessible dwelling unit or sleeping unit shall be accessible and be located on an accessible route.

Exceptions:

- 1. Where multiple bathrooms are provided within an Accessible unit, at least o ne full bathroom shall be accessible.
- 2. Where multiple family or assisted bathrooms serve an Accessible unit, at least 50% but not less than one room for each use at each cluster shall be accessible.
- 3. Five percent, but not less than one bed shall be accessible.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: For the modification, the term "and elements" is too broad to be uniformly applied. This term should be deleted for consistenc y with the committee actions on E167- 09/10. The proposal as a w hole was approved because it more clearly addresses sleeping units in hotels. Exception 1 in Section 11 07.6.1.1.1 is consistent with the 2009 edition of A117.1 for Accessible units with two or more bathrooms.

Assembly Action:

E171-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: While the code does use the same table for Accessible units in Group R-1 (i.e., hotels) as it does for Group R-2 (i.e., dormitories, fraternities, so rorities, boarding houses), removing this text would be confusing for the users by mixing transient and non-transient requirements.

Assembly Action:

E172-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The American's with Disabilities Act (ADA) does not include an exception for multi-story dwelling units like Fair Housing Act (FHA), therefore this exception should not be allowed for multi-story unit.

Assembly Action:

E173-09/10 **Committee Action:**

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

127

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

E174-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The reorg anization will clarify when assistive listening devi ces are re quired in loose seating areas. This would be consistent with the new American's with Disabilities Act/Architectural Barriers Act (ADA/ABA) Accessibility Guidelines.

Assembly Action:

E175-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1108.2.7.1.2 1108.2.7.2 Ticket Windows. Where ticket windows are provided in stadiums and arenas at least one of each type window at each location shall have an assistive listening system.

Committee Reason: The renumbering of the section w as an editorial fix. The mod ification clarifies that there only needs to be one w indow with an assistive listening system at each group of window s. If different types of services are provided at different window, such as sales vs. pick-up, this can be addressed by the facility as a modification to how services can be provided. Services at windows cannot be determined by the code official during construction.

This requirement for assistive-listening systems at ticket windows addresses the needs of persons with hearing impairments. M ost stadiums an d aren as will alread y have this capability b ecause of the requirements in Section 1108.2.7. While the p roponent stated that he did n ot intent to pick up smal ler facilities, such as high-schools, a public comment providing a minimum size consistent with the provisions in E176-09/10 w ould be helpful.

Assembly Action:

E176-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal puts a spec ific limit of 15, 000 occupants for the size of facilities where captioning will be required. These size fac ilities should have staff and equipment that will have a level of sophistication that is needed to effectively provide captioning. This would coordinate with the Fire Safet y committee's approval of F105-09/10.

Assembly Action:

E177-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The proposal clarifies these provisions app ly to both d rinking and dining areas. This clarifies that elevation changes within a single level are not permitted in dining and drinking areas. Items 1 and 4 will clarify where the 3,000 sq.f t. and employee only areas exceptions are permitted. This would coordinate with the American's with Disabilities Act/Architectural Barriers Act (ADA/ABA) Accessibility Guidelines.

Assembly Action:

None

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

E178-09/10

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: How to get into a Self-Service Storage facility is a technical requirement that should be in the ICC A117.1. The 15 lbs. upward force required to open an upward acting door is in conflict with ICC A117.1 and the American's with Disabilities Act (ADA). No technical information was provided to support that the 15 lbs force was useable by persons with disabilities and the text was not clear w hich direction the force could be applied.

Assembly Action:

E179-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.4, 3.6.3.1.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed reference standard had not yet completed its revision to put re quirements into mandatory language. The current standard is not in mandatory language.

Assembly Action:

E180-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The term "same type" is too broad and will lead to many interpretation issues.

Assembly Action:

E181-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal coordinates with the children provisions in ICC A117.1. It is appropriate to allow the unique provisions for children in such facilities as day cares and grade schools.

Assembly Action:

E182-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Many people with different types of disab ilities still need the 'access ible' restrooms, therefore, the exception would not serve the general population well. This would be a problem if the only restrooms were on the non-accessible level. This would also be in conflict with the American's with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

E183-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The prop osed revision is confusing and does not meet the intent expressed in the reason. If the re is both a kitchen and kitchenette in the same hotel suite, both must be accessible. The proposed language could be interpreted such that where multiple tenant space kitchenettes are provided on the same floor in a multi-tenant building, only one had to be accessible.

Assembly Action:

E184-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This is a practical application for facilities primarily designed for children. It is understood that the A117.1 standard currently only addresses children's heights for wheelchair drinking fountains and not drinking fountains for standing children. The current height in A117.1 for standing drinking fountains is too high for small children, so the 30 inches proposed sh ould work better. This should be moved to the A117.1 when there is the opportunity.

Assembly Action:

E185-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: In facilities where the IPC only require one drinking b oth a drinking f ountain for wheelchair users and a drinking fountain for standing persons is required by the American's with Disabilities Act (ADA). The code should not change here and conflict with ADA. If this is an issue for small spaces, it would be better to address this issue in the IPC fixture count table.

Assembly Action:

E186-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Adding scoping for sau na and steam rooms would coordinate with both ICC A117.1 and the American's with Disabilities Act (ADA). Any time public facilities are offered, they should be accessible, and therefore this requirement is appropriate for these types of spaces.

Assembly Action: None E187-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee R eason: Limited U se/Limited Acce ss (LULA) elev ators and Private Residence Elevators are considered passenger elevators by ASME A17.1, so this text is not needed. ASME A17.1 should contain t he limitations for use of these elevat ors. Repeating ASM E A17.1 requirements in the IBC could lead to possible conflicts in the future.

Assembly Action:

E188-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed language clarifies that all ameni ties provided must be usable by persons with disabilities, not just coat hooks and shelves.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

E189-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Proponents for E189-09/10 and E190-09/10 requested disapproval so that they have the opportunity to submit a public comment with a compromise solution for mailbox access.

Assembly Action:

E190-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Proponents for E189-09/10 and E190-09/10 requested disapproval so that they have the opportunity to submit a public comment with a compromise solution for mailbox access.

Assembly Action:

E191-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: If this is truly not within the scope of the code as indicated by the proponent than this text is not needed. This is also not a complete list of all the recreational facilities covered in the 200 9 edition of A117.1, therefore it could be interpreted that those recreational areas are covered. The committee hopes that this issue will be addressed in the public comments to E152-09/10.

Assembly Action:

E192-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: If this is truly not within the scope of the code as indicated by the proponent than this text is not needed.

Assembly Action:

E193-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Variable message sign requirements will make essential information available for person with low vision as well as the general public. This will coordinate with the new provisions in the 2009 edition of ICC A117.1.

Assembly Action:

E194-09/10

This is a 2 Part Code Change. Part I was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee, Part II was heard by the IRC Building/Energy Code **Development Committee.**

Note: This code change was contained in the e rrata po sted on t he I CC website. P lease go t o http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

PART I- IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The definition does not address landings at doors where a single step is provided. There

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

is a conflict with the definition of 'flight' which only deals with several risers. The definition is not clear for intermediate landings on stairways and ramps. There are other areas in the code that use this term, such as balconies, where this definition could be considered a conflict.

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

Committee Reason: The proposed definition does not address the landings at the exterior door. This should be reworked and brought to Final Action.

Assembly Action:

Assembly Action:

E195-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The new language could be interpreted differently if the stairs went "to" a floor rather than "through" the story or was not open to all floors as the stair tower moved up the building.

Assembly Action:

E196-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal will allow for security to be maintained when a stairway is within a tenant space.

Assembly Action:

E197-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal will allow for security to be maintained when a stairway is within a tenant space. This would also be consistent with E196-09/10.

Assembly Action:

E198-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The increased travel distance in open parking garages is reasonable due to the low fuel and occupant loads.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

132

E199-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: No technical justification was provided indicating that the current code requirements for corridors were deficient in Group I-4 occupancies.

Assembly Action:

E200-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed footnote did not allow for the corridor reduction for the higher levels of construction (i.e., IIA, IIIA and VA). No technical justification was provided for the increase in fire-resistance-rating or the increase from a NFPA13R sprinkler system to a NFPA 13 system for Group R.

Assembly Action:

E201-09/10

Note: This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website on 10/25/09. Please go to <u>http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx</u>.

Committee Action:

The posted erratum is the following:

E201-09/10 1008.1.4.3

Proponent: Gregory J. Cahanin, Cahanin Fire & Code Consulting Representing the Skyfold Company

Revise as follows:

1008.1.4.3 Horizontal sliding doors. In other than Group H occupancies, horizontal sliding doors permitted to be a component of a *means of egress* in accordance with Exception 6 to Section 1008.1.2 shall comply with all of the following criteria:

- 1. The doors shall be power operated and shall be capable of being operated manually in the event of power failure.
- 2. The doors shall be openable by a simple method from both sides without special knowledge or effort.
- The force required to operate the door shall not exceed 30 pounds (133 N) to set the door in motion and 15 pounds (67 N) to close the door or open it to the minimum required width.
- 4. The door shall be openable with a force not to exceed 15 pounds (67 N) when a force of 250 pounds (1100 N) is applied perpendicular to the door adjacent to the operating device.
- 5. The door assembly shall comply with the applicable *fire protection rating* and, where rated, shall be self closing or automatic closing by smoke detection in accordance with Section 715.4.8.3, shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 80 and shall comply with Section 715.
- 6. The door assembly shall have an integrated standby power supply.
- 7. The door assembly power supply shall be electrically supervised.
- 8. The door shall open to the minimum required width within 10 seconds after activation of the operating device.

Exception: Manual exit devices used to open doors shall be permitted in lieu of manual operation.

- Manual exit devices shall be located 40 inches to 48 inches vertically above the floor and within 5 feet of the egress door. Ready access shall be provided to the manual unlocking device and the device shall be clearly identified by a sign that reads "Push to Exit". When operated, the manual exit device shall result in the opening of the door.
- 2. <u>Standby power supplies for manual exit devices shall be capable of providing power for 10</u> opening and closing cycles.

Reason: First, this proposal deletes the Horizontal term from the sliding door requirement. The horizontal or vertical orientation of the sliding door is not relevant to how it is used in an emergency. The permitting of only Horizontal sliding doors for egress with the special stipulations of 1008.1.4.3 prevents vertically sliding doors from being used for egress.

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Second, the code has well established provisions for Access-controlled doors for people with mobility impairments. These provisions which provide for safe egress of slower occupants due to their being in a wheelchair, using a walker or cane or needing personal assistance should be available to the general public as well.

This new exception will allow the use of a horizontal or vertical sliding door with the redundant and accepted Access-controlled door features for both able bodied and mobility impaired individuals.

Cost Impact: The code change proposal will not increase the cost of construction.

Committee Reason: This was disapproved to be consistent with the committee action on E54-09/10. Technical justification needs to be provided for the 10 opening-closing cycle requirements. The proposal does not address when the door will provide adequate height for egress. Vertical sliding doors should be in a section separate from horizontal sliding doors.

Assembly Action:

None

E202-09/10

Note: This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website on 10/25/09. Please go to <u>http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx</u>.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

The posted erratum is the following:

E202-09/10 1008.1.4.3

Proponent: Gregory J. Cahanin, Cahanin Fire & Code Consulting Representing the Skyfold Company

Revise as follows:

1008.1.4.3 Horizontal sliding doors. In other than Group H occupancies, horizontal sliding doors permitted to be a component of a *means of egress* in accordance with Exception 6 to Section 1008.1.2 shall comply with all of the following criteria:

- 1. The doors shall be power operated and shall be capable of being operated manually in the event of power failure.
- 2. The doors shall be openable by a simple method from both sides without special knowledge or effort.
- 3. The force required to operate the door shall not exceed 30 pounds (133 N) to set the door in motion and 15 pounds (67 N) to close the door or open it to the minimum required width.
- 4. The door shall be openable with a force not to exceed 15 pounds (67 N) when a force of 250 pounds (1100 N) is applied perpendicular to the door adjacent to the operating device.
- 5. The door assembly shall comply with the applicable *fire protection rating* and, where rated, shall be self closing or automatic closing by smoke detection in accordance with Section 715.4.8.3, shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 80 and shall comply with Section 715.
- 6. The door assembly shall have an integrated standby power supply.
- 7. The door assembly power supply shall be electrically supervised.
- 8. The door shall open to the minimum required width within 10 seconds after activation of the operating device.
- 9. The door, if not contained in a fire or smoke rated assembly, but within the egress path, shall open upon activation of the building fire alarm system, building automatic fire sprinkler system, or fire detection system, if provided. The door shall be permitted to remain in the open position until the fire alarm system has been reset.

Reason: Not all sliding doors are fire or smoke rated, but they are used in the means of egress. Doors which are not part of a fire or smoke compartmentation wall need not close automatically. Side swinging doors which are in the means of egress are not required to have closers unless they are fire or smoke rated. This change will be consistent with non-rated side swinging doors. This change will allow sliding doors in folding non-rated partitions such as those found in convention centers, meeting rooms and churches to subdivide spaces to be more readily used for egress. Currently the side swinging doors used in folding partitions are not required to close automatically.

Cost Impact: The code change proposal will not increase the cost of construction.

Committee Reason: The proposal will increase the cost of construction because the door will be tied in the fire alarm system. There was no indication on why these doors would be required to open automatically.

Assembly Action:

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE Structural Code Development Committee

David P. Tyree, PE, CBO - Chair

Director, Codes and Standards Building Owners and Managers Association, International Washington, DC

Marcelino Iglesias – Vice Chair

Code Specialist State of New Jersey Dept. of Community Affairs; Division Trenton, NJ

Alexander Abel, PE

Plans Review Engineer City and County of Denver Denver, CO

Lindsey Carter, PE, CBO Inspection Services Supervisor Shelby County Department of Development Services Pelham, AL

David Chang, PE

Plan Check Supervisor Building & Safety Department, City of Los Angeles Los Angeles, CA

Wanda Edwards, PE

Director of Building Code Development Institute of Business & Home Safety Tampa, FL

Frank Golon

Rep: National Association of Home Builders The Kleiner Group LLC Eatontown, NJ

Cole Graveen, PE, SE Engineer Raths & Johnson Inc. Willowbrook, IL

Kirk Grundahl, PE

President Qualtim, Inc. Madison, WI

John Loscheider, PE, SE

Principal Loscheider Engineering Company Renton, WA

James Robinson, Jr., PE, SE

Rep: National Council of Structural Engineering Associations President Robinson Associates Consulting Engineers Inc. Atlanta, GA

Gary Searer, PE, SE

Associate Principal Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc. Burbank, CA

Constadino Sirakis, PE

Acting Director of Engineering Technical Affairs Division New York City Dept. of Buildings New York, NY

Gary Walker, PE

President Walker Engineering Inc. Birmingham, AL

Can Xiao, MS, PE

Camelback Infrastructure Development Manager, Water Services Department City of Phoenix Phoenix, AZ

Staff Secretariat: Alan Carr, SE

Code and Standards International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE STRUCTURAL COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS

S1-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The proposed revision to the definition of Roof Assembly is unnecessary because Chapter 16 already clarifies the design loads.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: The wind is a design load and is inherent in the definition. This revision would imply that a fire-resistant rating is required. This change would make the definition inconsistent with the definition in the IBC.

Assembly Action:

S2-09/10

Parts I and II of this code change were heard by the IPC code development committee.

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Rea son: Proponent's reason statement which stated that the requirements for secondary roof drains needs to be clarified so as to alert roofers to their responsibility to size drains and scuppers.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IBC STRUCTURAL **Committee Action:**

Committee Rea son: Proponent's reason statement which stated that the requirements for secondary roof drains needs to be clarified so as to alert roofers to their responsibility to size drains and scuppers.

Assembly Action:

PART III- IRC PLUMBING **Committee Action:**

Committee Re ason: Residential roofers are probably not real familiar with roofs having parapets but the application does present itself from time to time. The added text is a good thing to have in the code to alert storm gutter and drain installers that they may need to add secondary drains in these rare applications.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

As Submitted

None

As Submitted

None

As Submitted

None

S3-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL **Committee Action:**

Committee Rea son: The proposed exception to Section 1503.6 would apply to all skylights as written. Specifying "unit" skylights may not be enough of a clarification to tie the exception to applicable Chapter 24 requirements. If not completely clear, an exception to allow the use of the manufacturers' instructions could open the door to misapplication.

Assembly Action:

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

Modify the proposal as follows:

R903.2.2 Crickets and saddles. A cricket or saddle shall be installed on the ridge side of any chimney or penetration more than 30 inches (762 mm) wide as measured perpendicular to the slope. Cricket or saddle coverings shall be sheet metal or of the same material as the roof covering.

Exception: Unit skylights installed in accordance with Section R308.6 and flashed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions shall be permitted to be installed without a cricket or saddle.

Committee Reason: The exception is needed to address roof penetration that is engineered to prevent water infiltration without a cricket. The modification clarifies that the exception only applies to unit skylights.

Assembly Action:

S4-09/10

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 SPRI WD-1 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There was some question on the scope of reference to a "design" standard, SPRI WD-1, for the "installation" requirement as was proposed. Additional clarification should be provided on the derivation of the factor of safety that is employed in the standard. The proposed requirements would be more suitably located in Section 1504.3.1 rather than the charging section. The committee suggests that the proponent address these questions in the public comment phase in addition to including his proposed floor modification.

Assembly Action:

S5-09/10 S6-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There are concerns with the ten percent fines that would be permitted in the ballast, since testing indicates these fines are a problem in glass breakage. The proposed restrictions (exceptions) that are based on a building's Occupancy Category do not properly address the debris hazard posed to (or by) adjacent buildings, since the Occupancy Category is not relevant to the ballast blowing off the roof. There were concerns raised on correlating the parapet height to the area of the roof.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Modified

None

None

None

Disapproved

137

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

S7-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: This proposal clarifies the code by listing the specific roof membrane types to which Section 1504.5 applies.

Assembly Action:

S8-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change clarifies the scope of reference to ANSI/SPRI ES-1 in Section 1504.5. By indicating the specific test methods, RE-1, RE-2 and RE-3, the applicable portions of the reference standard are more obvious to the reader.

Assembly Action:

S9-09/10

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 ANSI/SPRI RP 14 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3(1) Readily available.

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee's disapproval was based on the status of the proposed reference standard. As a draft, it is not readily available.

Assembly Action:

S10-09/10

This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety code development committee.

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 1505.1^{a,b, d} MINIMUM ROOF COVERING CLASSIFICATION FOR TYPES OF CONSTRUCTION (No change to table)

(No change to Notes a. through c.)

Any exposed portions of roof coverings on roofs containing roof gardens or landscaped roofs shall have their roof covering fire classification increased one level above the level indicated in the table.

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: Roof gardens and landscaped roofs are terms currently used in the I-codes and providing these requirements would be appropriate and consistent with the new language in the IFC recommended for approval. The modification removes a language that is no longer needed base on the related language recommended for approval in the IFC.

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

138

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

S11-09/10

This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety code development committee.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Large amounts of requirements should not be placed in a footnote as they may not easily be recognized. Further the proposed requirements related to roof classifications, building construction types and maximum building areas are confusing and could be misinterpreted. Lastly, it is unclear how these requirements would, or could, apply to reroofing projects.

Assembly Action:

S12-09/10

This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety code development committee.

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

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ANSI/SPRI VF 1 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3(1) Readily available.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the proponents request for disapproval. Further, the proposed standard SPRI VF-1-08 has not been submitted.

Assembly Action:

S13-09/10

This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety code development committee.

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1505.8 Photovoltaic systems. Rooftop installed photovoltaic systems that are adhered or attached to the roof covering or photovoltaic modules/shingles installed as roof coverings shall be labeled to identify their fire classification in accordance with the testing required in Section 1505.1.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that photovoltaic systems should be required to comply with the same roof classification requirements as the assembly they are installed upon. The modification appropriately includes other photovoltaic system components.

Assembly Action:

S14-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There are concerns with the test wind speed versus the code required basic wind speed and no data was provided that would indicate that shingles installed in accordance with the current requirements of Table 1507.2.7(2) are not performing adequately. There should be some correlation between the code wind speed and the test wind speed. The proposed change to the required asphalt shingle classification was deemed overly restrictive, as written.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This change would make the classification requirements inconsistent with the IBC classification. The two hour test duration in ASTM D 3161 is sufficient.

Assembly Action:

S15-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: As worded, the requirements could be applied to currently used products that do not have problems, excluding self-adhered underlayment unless it is nailed down. This would be an extensive change and the committee was not provided with the data to support these specific requirements. The need for this underlayment requirement is unclear since it is under a covering that is already held down. There is no credit given for the nails through the shingles, for instance. Typically the roof covering manufacturer provides direction on how to install the underlayment and the underlayment varies with the type of roof covering. While the phrase "underlayment ... shall be applied with corrosion-resistant fasteners in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions" is currently used in Section 1507.2.8.1, there are questions on its intent and the wording should be clear on whether this refers to the fastener or underlayment manufacturer before adding it in several new sections.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

inches (914mm) on center.

Modify the proposal as follows:

R905.2.7.2 Underlayment and high wind. Underlayment applied in areas subject to high winds [above 110 mph (49 m/s) per Figure R301.2(4)] shall be applied with corrosion-resistant fasteners in accordance with manufacturer's installation instructions. Fasteners are to be applied along the overlap not farther apart than 36

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 120 mph (54 m/s) shall comply with ASTM D 226 Type II, ASTM D 4869 Type IV, or ASTM D 6757. The underlayment shall be attached in a grid pattern of 12 inches (305 mm) between side laps with a 6 inch (152 mm) spacing at the side laps. Underlayment shall be applied in accordance with Section R905.2.7 except all Head laps shall be a minimum of 4 inches (102 mm) and end laps shall be a minimum of 6 inches (152 mm). Underlayment shall be attached using metal or plastic cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (44 25.4 mm) with a shank thickness of at least 32 gauge sheet metal. The cap-nail shank shall be a minimum of 3/4 inch into the roof sheathing.

Exception: As an alternative, adhered underlayment complying with ASTM D 1970 shall be permitted.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 140 mph (63 m/s) shall be attached using metal cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (41 mm) with a shank of at least 32 gauge sheet metal with a length to penetrate through the roof sheathing.

R905.3.3.3 Underlayment and high wind. Underlayment applied in areas subject to high wind [over 110 miles per hour (49 m/s) per R301.2(4)] shall be applied with corrosion-resistant fasteners in accordance with manufacturer's installation instructions. Fasteners are to be applied along the overlap not farther apart than 36 inches (914 mm) on center.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 120 mph (54 m/s) shall be attached in a grid pattern of 12 inches (305 mm) between side laps with a 6 inch (152 mm) spacing at the side laps. Underlayment shall be applied in accordance with Section R905.2.7 except all Head laps shall be a minimum of 4 inches (102 mm) and end laps shall be a minimum of 6 inches (152 mm). Underlayment shall be attached using metal or plastic cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (41 25.4 mm) with a shank thickness of at least 32 gauge sheet metal. The cap-nail shank shall be a minimum of 3/4 inch into the roof sheathing.

Exception: As an alternative, adhered underlayment complying with ASTM D 1970 shall be permitted.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 140 mph (63 m/s) shall be attached using metal cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (41 mm) with a shank of at least 32 gauge sheet metal with a length to penetrate through the roof sheathing.

R905.4.3.2 Underlayment and high wind. Underlayment applied in areas subject to high winds [above 110

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Modified

mph (49 m/s) per Figure R301.2(4)] shall be applied with corrosion-resistant fasteners in accordance with manufacturer's installation instructions. Fasteners are to be applied along the overlap not farther apart than 36 inches (914 mm) on center.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 120 mph (54 m/s) shall comply with ASTM D 226 Type II, ASTM D 4869 Type IV, or ASTM D 1970. The underlayment shall be attached in a grid pattern of 12 inches (305 mm) between side laps with a 6 inch (152 mm) spacing at the side laps. Underlayment shall be applied in accordance with Section R905.2.7 except all Head laps shall be a minimum of 4 inches (102 mm) and end laps shall be a minimum of 6 inches (152 mm). Underlayment shall be attached using metal or plastic cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (41 25.4 mm) with a shank thickness of at least 32 gauge sheet metal. The cap-nail shank shall be a minimum of 3/4 inch into the roof sheathing.

Exception: As an alternative, adhered underlayment complying with ASTM D 1970 shall be permitted.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 140 mph (63 m/s) shall be attached using metal cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (41 mm) with a shank of at least 32 gauge sheet metal with a length to penetrate through the roof sheathing.

R905.5.3.2 Underlayment and high wind. Underlayment applied in areas subject to high winds [above 110 mph (49 m/s) per Figure R301.2(4)] shall be applied with corrosion-resistant fasteners in accordance with manufacturer's installation instructions. Fasteners are to be applied along the overlap not farther apart than 36 inches (914 mm) on center.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 120 mph (54 m/s) shall comply with ASTM D 226 Type II or ASTM D 4869 Type IV. The underlayment shall be attached in a grid pattern of 12 inches (305 mm) between side laps with a 6 inch (152 mm) spacing at the side laps. <u>Underlayment shall be applied in accordance with Section R905.2.7 except all</u> Head laps shall be <u>a minimum of 4</u> inches (102 mm) and end laps shall be a minimum of 6 inches (152 mm). Underlayment shall be attached using metal or plastic cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (44 <u>25.4</u> mm) with a shank thickness of at least 32 gauge sheet metal. <u>The cap-nail shank shall be a minimum of 3/4 inch into the roof sheathing</u>.

Exception: As an alternative, adhered underlayment complying with ASTM D 1970 shall be permitted.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 140 mph (63 m/s) shall be attached using metal cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (41 mm) with a shank of at least 32 gauge sheet metal with a length to penetrate through the roof sheathing.

R905.6.3.2 Underlayment and high wind. Underlayment applied in areas subject to high winds [above 110 mph (49 m/s) per Figure R301.2(4)] shall be applied with corrosion-resistant fasteners in accordance with manufacturer's installation instructions. Fasteners are to be applied along the overlap not farther apart than 36 inches (914 mm) on center.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 120 mph (54 m/s) shall comply with ASTM D 226 Type II or ASTM D 4869 Type IV. The underlayment shall be attached in a grid pattern of 12 inches (305 mm) between side laps with a 6 inch (152 mm) spacing at the side laps. <u>Underlayment shall be applied in accordance with Section R905.2.7 except all</u> Head laps shall be <u>a minimum of</u> 4 inches (102 mm) and end laps shall be a minimum of 6 inches (152 mm). Underlayment shall be attached using metal or plastic cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (41 25.4 mm) with a shank thickness of at least 32 gauge sheet metal. <u>The cap-nail shank shall be a minimum of 3/4 inch into the roof sheathing</u>.

Exception: As an alternative, adhered underlayment complying with ASTM D 1970 shall be permitted.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 140 mph (63 m/s) shall be attached using metal cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (41 mm) with a shank of at least 32 gauge sheet metal with a length to penetrate through the roof sheathing.

R905.7.3.2 Underlayment and high wind. Underlayment applied in areas subject to high winds [above 110 mph (49 m/s) per Figure R301.2(4)] shall be applied with corrosion-resistant fasteners in accordance with manufacturer's installation instructions. Fasteners are to be applied along the overlap not farther apart than 36 inches (914mm) on center.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 120 mph (54 m/s) shall comply with ASTM D 226 Type II or ASTM D 4869 Type IV. The underlayment shall be attached in a grid pattern of 12 inches (305 mm) between side laps with a 6 inch (152 mm) spacing at the side laps. <u>Underlayment shall be applied in accordance with Section R905.2.7 except all</u> Head laps shall be <u>a minimum of</u> 4 inches (102 mm) and end laps shall be a minimum of 6 inches (152 mm). Underlayment shall be attached using metal or plastic cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (44 25.4 mm) with a shank thickness of at least 32 gauge sheet metal. <u>The cap-nail shank shall be a minimum of 3/4 inch into the roof sheathing</u>.

Exception: As an alternative, adhered underlayment complying with ASTM D 1970 shall be permitted.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 140 mph (63 m/s) shall be attached

using metal cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (41 mm) with a shank of at least 32 gauge sheet metal with a length to penetrate through the roof sheathing.

R905.8.3.2 Underlayment and high wind. Underlayment applied in areas subject to high winds [above 110 mph (49 m/s) per Figure R301.2(4)] shall be applied with corrosion-resistant fasteners in accordance with manufacturer's installation instructions. Fasteners are to be applied along the overlap not farther apart than 36 inches (914 mm) on center.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 120 mph (54 m/s) shall comply with ASTM D 226 Type II or ASTM D 4869 Type IV. The underlayment shall be attached in a grid pattern of 12 inches (305 mm) between side laps with a 6 inch (152 mm) spacing at the side laps. <u>Underlayment shall be applied in accordance with Section R905.2.7 except all</u> Head laps shall be <u>a minimum of 4</u> inches (102 mm) and end laps shall be a minimum of 6 inches (152 mm). Underlayment shall be attached using metal or plastic cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (44 <u>25.4</u> mm) with a shank thickness of at least 32 gauge sheet metal. <u>The cap-nail shank shall be a minimum of 3/4 inch into the roof sheathing</u>.

Exception: As an alternative, adhered underlayment complying with ASTM D 1970 shall be permitted.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 140 mph (63 m/s) shall be attached using metal cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (41 mm) with a shank of at least 32 gauge sheet metal with a length to penetrate through the roof sheathing.

R905.10.5.1 Underlayment and high wind. Underlayment applied in areas subject to high winds [above 110 mph (49 m/s) per Figure R301.2(4)] shall be applied with corrosion-resistant fasteners in accordance with manufacturer's installation instructions. Fasteners are to be applied along the overlap not farther apart than 36 inches (914 mm) on center.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 120 mph (54 m/s) shall comply with ASTM D 226 Type II. The underlayment shall be attached in a grid pattern of 12 inches (305 mm) between side laps with a 6 inch (152 mm) spacing at the side laps. <u>Underlayment shall be applied in accordance with Section R905.2.7 except all</u> Head laps shall be <u>a minimum of</u> 4 inches (102 mm) and end laps shall be a minimum of 6 inches (152 mm). Underlayment shall be attached using metal or plastic cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (41 <u>25.4</u> mm) with a shank <u>thickness</u> of at least 32 gauge sheet metal. The cap-nail shank shall be a minimum of 12 gauge (0.105 inches) with a length to penetrate through the roof sheathing <u>or a minimum of 3/4 inch into the roof sheathing</u>.

Exception: As an alternative, adhered underlayment complying with ASTM D 1970 shall be permitted.

Underlayment installed where the basic wind speed equals or exceeds 140 mph (63 m/s) shall be attached using metal cap nails with a head diameter of not less than 1 5/8 inches (41 mm) with a shank of at least 32 gauge sheet metal with a length to penetrate through the roof sheathing.

Committee Reason: This change will add underlayment requirements that will improve the performance of the roof covering in high wind situations. The modification corrects an error with respect to the nailing and adds self-adhering underlayment as an alternate. The committee has concern that eight sections are being added that prescribe the same requirement. The proponent should consolidate these and bring this back later.

Assembly Action:

S16-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: Consideration should be given to the thickness of the drip edge versus the fastener spacing as they can both be effective in improving the performance in high winds. The proposed 4 inch fastener spacing seems too conservative and some clarification of the staggered fastener pattern would be suggested. It is unclear that the proposed limit on the extension of a shingle beyond the drip edge is appropriate.

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: Based upon the proponent's request for disapproval. The proposal contains requirements that are beyond the scope of the IRC.

Assembly Action:

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

. .

Disapproved

S17-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL **Committee Action:**

Committee Rea son: There are concerns with the appropriateness of adapting a referenced standard for asphalt shingles to apply to metal roof shingles. No specifics were provided that would justify this change.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: The reference standard is not approved for metal roof shingles. The proponent should bring this back with appropriate test method for metal roof shingles.

Assembly Action:

S18-09/10

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 UL 55A indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal adds a referenced standard that is appropriate for built-up roof covering materials.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: The reference standard is being used for built-up roof coverings. This change brings the standard into the code and will permit an additional alternate for built-up roof coverings.

Assembly Action:

S19-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal adds a referenced standard for asphalt coatings, coordinating the IBC with the corresponding requirements in the IRC.

Assembly Action:

S20-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Agreement with the proponent's reason which indicates that this proposal clarifies the requirements for protective coating materials by adding a table listing the material standards that are applicable to sprayed polyurethane foam roof systems.

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

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

Committee Reason: This change provides clarity for the appropriate material to use for the protective coating for sprayed polyurethane foam roofing.

Assembly Action:

S21-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal corrects terminology relating to liquid applied products that serve as a roof coverina.

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Assembly Action:

S22-09/10

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 :

Committee Reason: This change clarifies the materials that can serve as liquid-applied roofing.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard UL 1703 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.

PART I & II- IBC STRUCTURAL **Committee Action:**

Modify the proposal as follows:

PHOTOVOLTAIC MODULES/SHINGLES. A roof covering composed of flat-plate photovoltaic modules fabricated in sheets that resemble three-tab composite shingles.

1507.17.3 Wind resistance. Photovoltaic modules/shingles shall be tested in accordance with procedures adapted from ASTM D 3161. Photovoltaic modules/shingles shall comply with the classification requirements of Table 1507.2.7.1(2) for the appropriate maximum basic wind speed. Photovoltaic modules/shingle packaging shall bear a label to indicate compliance with the procedures adapted from ASTM D 3161 and the required classification from Table 1507.2.7.1(2).

(Portions not proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Reason: This proposal adds requirements for photovoltaic shingles. This is important due to the increase in solar applications on roofs. The modification clarifies the definition and removes language that is problematic in order to clarify acceptance criteria. This helps clarify the provision since ASTM D 3161 covers other material.

Assembly Action:

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

Modify the proposal as follows:

Approved as Modified

PHOTOVOLTAIC MO DULES/SHINGLES. A roof covering composed of flat-plate photovoltaic modules fabricated into sheets that resemble three-tab composite shingles.

R905.16.3 Win d resistance. Photovoltaic modules/shingles shall be tested in accordance with procedures adapted from and acceptance criteria in ASTM D 3161. Photovoltaic modules/shingles shall comply with the

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

None

None

144

classification requirements of Table R905.2.4.1(2) for the appropriate maximum basic wind speed. Photovoltaic modules/shingle packaging shall bear a label to indicate compliance with the procedures adapted from in ASTM D 3161 and the required classification from Table R905.2.4.1(2).

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: This change introduces a new product into the code that provides not only a roof covering but also a source of electrical power. A new reference standard is added for listing and labeling the new product. This is a needed addition to the code to regulate the installation of these photovoltaic modules/shinales.

The modification clarifies that the procedures and acceptance criteria from ASTM D 3161 are to be used to classify the modules/shingles for the approved wind speeds.

Assembly Action:

S23-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There are concerns with the proposal to adapt an asphalt shingle standard to formed plastic shingles.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: There is no definition of the term "formed plastic shingles". Other requirements need to be addressed, such as deck, underlayment and flashing.

Assembly Action:

S24-09/10 S25-09/10

This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety code development committee.

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

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASTM C 726 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that ASTM C 726 was an appropriate material standard to include mineral fiber insulation board as a prescribed roof insulation material.

Assembly Action:

S26-09/10

This code change was heard by the IBC General code development committee.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Although the proposal would provide more specific standards and options based on different types of equipment, the committee felt the proposal lacked technical justification. It was not clear what the hazards were regarding mechanical equipment screens that would necessitate that they be more strictly regulated than the roof surface on which they sit.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Withdrawn by Proponent

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

S27-09/10

This code change was heard by the IBC General code development committee.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee recognized the need to improve this section and acknowledged the efforts of the proponents. Based on the testimony provided and the number of attempted modifications, the proposal needs additional refinement before it can be approved. The committee also expressed concerns that some of the wall and screening requirements for the penthouses would be more stringent that the walls of the building below. There was an uncomfortable mixture of materials and fire resistance ratings. The various fire separation distances appeared inconsistent as did the variety of height limits.

Assembly Action:

S28-09/10

This code change was heard by the IBC General code development committee.

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1509.6.1 Wind resistance. Rooftop mounted photovoltaic systems shall be designed for wind loads for component and cladding in accordance with Chapter 16 using an effective wind area based on the dimensions of a single unit frame.

1509.6.2 Fire Classification. Rooftop mounted photovoltaic systems shall be shall have the same fire classification as the roof assembly as defined required by Section 1505.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Rea son: With the modifications included, it is important to have the rooftop installation of photovoltaic equipment and systems addressed in the code. The fire classifications provided in the code proposal are good additions to the code.

Assembly Action:

S29-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The proposed exception is not necessary because the existing recovering versus replacement requirement already allows this. Furthermore, it would be a loophole to conditions 2 and 3.

Assembly Action:

S30-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreement with the proponent's reason which indicates that the removal of an adhered ice barrier membrane causes damage that is not in line with the intent of the code. The no exception will permit this to be recovered.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change provides a solution to the situation where an adhered ice barrier membrane is present and the difficulty of removing it. During removal the adhered membrane will leave an irregular surface. This provides a solution by applying an additional smooth adhered membrane. This change will be consistent with the IBC.

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

None

None

None

146

S31-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal makes an editorial change to the definition of "vehicle barrier system" that makes it clear that it includes walls as well as open sides of garage floors. It also provides correlation with the 2010 edition of ASCE 7.

Assembly Action:

S32-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

LIVE LOAD, ROOF. A load on a roof produced (1) during maintenance by workers, equipment and materials; and (2) during the life of the structure by movable objects such as planters or other similar small decorative appurtenances that are not occupancy related; or (2 3) by the use and occupancy of the roof such as for roof gardens or assembly areas.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Rea son: This code change addresses the issue of occupied roofs by revising definitions of and notation for live loads and roof live load. This improvement will better distinguish between the typical roof live load of 20 psf or less versus those for an occupied roof. The modification retains the current numbering of items in the definition of roof live load.

Assembly Action:

S33-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1603.1.4 Wind design data. The following information related to wind loads shall be shown, regardless of whether wind loads govern the design of the lateral-force-resisting system of the building structure:

- 1. Basic wind speed (3-second gust), miles per hour (km/hr).
- 2. Occupancy category.
- 3. Wind exposure; applicable wind direction if more than one wind exposure is utilized.
- 4. Applicable internal pressure coefficient.
- Design wind pressures to be used for exterior component and cladding materials not specifically designed by the registered design professional responsible for the design of the structure, psf (kN/m²).

1603.1.5 Earthquake design data. The following information related to seismic loads shall be shown, regardless of whether seismic loads govern the design of the lateral-force-resisting system of the <u>building structure</u>:

- 1. Occupancy category.
- 2. Seismic importance factor, Ie.
- 3. Mapped spectral response accelerations parameters, S_S and S₁.
- 4. Site class.
- 5. <u>Design spectral response coefficients acceleration parameters</u>, S_{DS} and S_{D1}.
- 6. Seismic design category.
- 7. Basic seismic-force-resisting system(s).
- 8. Design base shear(s).
- 9. Seismic response coefficient(s), C_S.
- 10. Response modification factor(s) coefficient(s), R.
- 11. Location of base(s) as defined in Section 11.2 of ASCE 7.
- 12 11. Analysis procedure used.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

None

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: This proposal makes editorial revisions to the required design data on construction documents that provide correlation with the ASCE 7 standard. The modification changes "building" to "structure" to more accurately reflect the scope of chapter 16 as well as the ASCE 7 load standard. It also removes the location of the base (item 11) from the list of required seismic data to address concerns with the increasing length of this list as well as recognizing this information needs to be in the design calculations.

Assembly Action:

S34-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal to include horizontal and vertical irregularities in the seismic data required for construction documents was judged to be too burdensome. This information is not as imperative as the other data that is currently required. Architectural design changes would affect this, requiring the information to be revised. It is recognized that the existence of certain irregularities matter more than others. Therefore, it would be preferable to focus on specific irregularities and this could be achieved in the public comment phase.

Assembly Action:

S35-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This code change adds appropriate deflection limits to Table 1604.3 for structural members supporting plaster or stucco finishes. This also corresponds to IRC Table R301.7 as well as ASTM C 926

Assembly Action:

S36-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The proposed footnote to Table 1604.3 referring to the "design" of metal composite material panels does not agree with the reason which indicates structural adequacy is determined by testing. Nothing in the proposal provides the design guidance for these panels and there is a concern that a nonlinear analysis would be required to address their behavior. Introducing a requirement for what could be considered sheathing may indicate that similar criterion is needed for all other types of sheathing. Should a public comment or subsequent proposal be submitted to address these concerns it is preferred that the requirement be in a subsection of 1604.3 rather than placed in a footnote to the table.

Assembly Action:

S37-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1604.3.6 Limits. The deflection limits of Section 1604.3.1 shall be used unless more restrictive deflection limits are required in order to ensure adequate serviceability of the structural members by a referenced standard for the element or and finish material.

Committee Reason: This revision to Section 1604.3.6 puts the designer on notice of possible deflection criteria contained in standards. The modification makes it clearer by changing vague wording to "...referenced standard for the element....'

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

None

Approved as Modified

None

148

S38-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed change is not needed since the concept of load path is already adequately addressed. Using the current code language, a systems engineering approach can be used to achieve what the proponent wishes to address. If it were added, the wording would need to be carefully considered due to a concern over chances of misapplication.

Assembly Action:

S39-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The intent to clarify adult education facilities in Occupancy Category III of Table 1604.5 is valid, but the proposal does not recognize the nature of occupancy. The phrase "formal educational system" is not defined which could lead to non uniform application. As worded, it suggests the building has to have classrooms and the classroom occupant load must be greater than 500. This differs from the current provision. If a public comment is submitted wording such as "aggregate classroom occupant load" may be more appropriate.

Assembly Action:

S40-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This code change provides clarification on the Table 1604.5 Occupancy Category determination where hazardous materials are a factor. Referring to the maximum allowable quantities per control area for the hazardous material tables is an improvement.

Assembly Action:

S41-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1602.1 Definitions. The following words and terms shall, for the purposes of this chapter, have the meanings shown herein.

RISK CATEGORY. A category used to determine structural requirements categorization of buildings and other structures for determination of flood, wind, snow, ice and earthquake loads based on eccupancy the risk associated with unacceptable performance.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: Changing "Occupancy Category" to "Risk Category" will align the IBC structural provision with the next edition of the ASCE 7 load standard. The modification reflects further updates made in ASCE 7 development process.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change coordinates the IEBC with the IBC and is consistent with the committee's action on Part I.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

Approved as Submitted

S42-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee believes the code is clear that designated emergency shelters are considered Occupancy Category IV. Furthermore, the existing language in Section 1604.5.1 covers multiple occupancy categories. Moving all schools to Occupancy Category IV is problematic. There is a concern with the effect this change could have on existing school buildings.

Assembly Action:

S43-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change simplifies the IBC making maintenance easier. It is not necessary to repeatedly refer to Chapter 35 for referenced Standards. This is covered in Section 102.4.

Assembly Action:

S44-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1604.8.2 Structural walls. Walls that provide vertical load bearing resistance or lateral shear resistance for a portion of the structure shall be anchored to the roof and to all floors and members that provide lateral support for the wall or that are supported by the wall. The connections shall be capable of resisting the horizontal forces specified in Section 1.4.4 of ASCE 7 for walls of structures assigned to Seismic Design Category A and to Section 12.11 of ASCE 7 for walls of structures assigned to all other structures seismic design categories. Concrete and masonry walls shall be designed to resist bending between anchors where the anchor spacing exceeds 4 feet (1219 mm). Required anchors in masonry walls of hollow units or cavity walls shall be embedded in a reinforced grouted structural element of the wall. See Section 1609 for wind design requirements and see Section 1613 for earthquake design requirements.

Committee Reason: The proposal removes an ASCE 7 modification in Section 1613.7 that will not be needed, since it will be addressed in the next edition of the standard. It also revises the requirements for anchoring walls to diaphragms for clarity and makes reference to appropriate requirements in ASCE 7. The modification reflects further updates made in the ASCE 7 development process.

Assembly Action:

S45-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed requirement for consideration of dead load is currently covered for wind under the load combinations. Because the earthquake load is tied to the dead load it would place an additional burden on the computation. The wording of the second sentence is vague, which could lead to enforcement problems.

Assembly Action:

S46-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed loading on patio covers conflicts with typical roof live loads in the IBC and ASCE 7. Before incorporation into the building code, this issue should be taken up with the ASCE 7 committee.

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

150

None

Approved as Submitted

S48-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1810.3.6.1 Seismic Design Categories C through F. For structures assigned to Seismic Design Category C, D, E, or F, splices of deep foundation elements shall develop the lesser of the following:

- 1. The nominal strength of the deep foundation element; and
- The axial and shear forces and moments from the seismic load effects including overstrength factor in accordance with Section 12.4.3.2 12.4.3 or 12.14.3.2 of ASCE 7.

1810.3.11.2 Seismic Design Categories D through F. For structures assigned to Seismic Design Category D, E, or F in accordance with Section 1613, deep foundation element resistance to uplift forces or rotational restraint shall be provided by anchorage into the pile cap, designed considering the combined effect of axial forces due to uplift and bending moments due to fixity to the pile cap. Anchorage shall develop a minimum of 25 percent of the strength of the element in tension. Anchorage into the pile cap shall comply with the following:

- 1. In the case of uplift, the anchorage shall be capable of developing the least of the following:
 - 1.1. The nominal tensile strength of the longitudinal reinforcement in a concrete element;
 - 1.2. The nominal tensile strength of a steel element; and
 - 1.3. The frictional force developed between the element and the soil multiplied by 1.3.

Exception: The anchorage is permitted to be designed to resist the axial tension force resulting from the seismic load effects including overstrength factor in accordance with Section $\frac{12.4.3.2}{12.4.3}$ or 12.14.3.2 of ASCE 7.

2. In the case of rotational restraint, the anchorage shall be designed to resist the axial and shear forces, and moments resulting from the seismic load effects including overstrength factor in accordance with Section 12.4.3.2 12.4.3 or 12.14.3.2 of ASCE 7; or shall be capable of developing the full axial, bending and shear nominal strength of the element.

Where the vertical lateral-force-resisting elements are columns, the pile cap flexural strengths shall exceed the column flexural strength. The connection between batter piles and pile caps shall be designed to resist the nominal strength of the pile acting as a short column. Batter piles and their connection shall be designed to resist the forces and moments that result from the application of seismic load effects including overstrength factor in accordance with Section <u>12.4.3.2</u> <u>12.4.3</u> or 12.14.3.2 of ASCE 7.

1810.3.12 Grade beams. For structures assigned to Seismic Design Category D, E, or F in accordance with Section 1613, grade beams shall comply with the provisions in Section 21.12.3 of ACI 318 for grade beams, except where they are designed to resist the seismic load effects including overstrength factor in accordance with Section <u>12.4.3.2</u> <u>12.4.3</u> or 12.14.3.2 of ASCE 7.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: This code change clarifies application of the seismic load effect including overstrength and provides better coordination with ASCE 7. The modification corrects section references to match the original intent and retains portions of the current IBC wording in Section 1810.3.11.2

Assembly Action:

S49-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1605.2.1 Basic load combinations. Where strength design or load and resistance factor design is used, structures and portions thereof shall resist the most critical effects from the following combinations of factored loads:

1.4 (D + F)1.2 $(D + F + T) + 1.6 (L + H) + 0.5 (L_r \text{ or } S \text{ or } R)$ 1.2 $(D + F) + 1.6 (L_r \text{ or } S \text{ or } R) + 1.6 H + (f_1 L \text{ or } 0.8 W)$ 1.2 $(D + F) + 1.6 W + f_1 L + 1.6 H + 0.5 (L_r \text{ or } S \text{ or } R)$ 1.2 $(D + F) + 1.0 E + f_1 L + 1.6 H + f_2 S$ 0.9 D + 1.6 W + 1.6 H0.9 (D + F) + 1.0 E + 1.6 H (Equation 16-1) (Equation 16-2) (Equation 16-3) (Equation 16-4) (Equation 16-5) (Equation 16-6) (Equation 16-7)

where:

- = 1 for floors in places of public assembly, for live loads in excess of 100 pounds per square foot (4.79 f1 kN/m²), and for parking garage live load, and
 - = 0.5 for other live loads.
- = 0.7 for roof configurations (such as saw tooth) that do not shed snow off the structure, and f2 = 0.2 for other roof configurations.

Exceptions:

- Where other factored load combinations are specifically required by other provisions of this 1. code, such combinations shall take precedence.
- 2. Where the effect of H resists the primary variable load effect, a load factor of 0.9 shall be included with H where H is permanent and H shall be set to zero for all other conditions.

1605.3.1 Basic load combinations. Where allowable stress design (working stress design), as permitted by this code, is used, structures and portions thereof shall resist the most critical effects resulting from the following combinations of loads:

D + F	(Equation 16-8)
D+H+F+L+T	(Equation 16-9)
$D + H + F + (L_r \text{ or } S \text{ or } R)$	(Equation 16-10)
$D + H + F + 0.75 (L + T) + 0.75 (L_r \text{ or } S \text{ or } R)$	(Equation 16-11)
D + H + F + (W or 0.7 E)	(Equation 16-12)
$D + H + F + 0.75 W + 0.75 L + 0.75 (L_r \text{ or } S \text{ or } R)$	(Equation 16-13)
D + H + F + 0.75 (0.7 E) + 0.75 L + 0.75 S	(Equation 16-14)
0.6 D + W + H	(Equation 16-15)
0.6 <u>(</u> D <u>+ F)</u> + 0.7 E + H	(Equation 16-16)

Exceptions:

- Crane hook loads need not be combined with roof live load or with more than three-fourths of the 1. snow load or one-half of the wind load.
- Flat roof snow loads of 30 psf (1.44 kN/m²) or less and roof live loads of 30 psf or less need not be combined with seismic loads. Where flat roof snow loads exceed 30 psf (1.44 kN/m²), 20 percent shall be combined with seismic loads.
- Where the effect of H resists the primary variable load effect, a load factor of 0.6 shall be 3. included with H where H is permanent and H shall be set to zero for all other conditions.

Committee Rea son: This code change correlates the strength load combinations and the basic allowable stress load combinations with the comparable provisions in the next edition of ASCE 7. The modification reflects further updates made in the ASCE 7 development process.

Assembly Action:

S50-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The removal of the exception for flat roof snow loads of 30 psf or less in the allowable stress load combinations is not justified. This is a long-standing difference between ASCE 7 and the IBC that dates back to legacy codes. It would be too drastic a change to make without some evidence that there is a need for this change. The proponent is urged to raise this issue with the ASCE 7 committee.

Assembly Action:

S51-09/10

S52-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal updates the IBC load combinations based on similar changes to appear in the next edition of ASCE 7. The self-straining force, T, is removed from load combinations in favor of a reference to the section of ASCE 7 that provides guidance on this subject. This refects the problems associated with a single load factor on self-straining force, T.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

None

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

S53-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1605.3.1 Basic load combinations. Where allowable stress design (working stress design), as permitted by this code, is used, structures and portions thereof shall resist the most critical effects resulting from the following combinations of loads:

D+F	(Equation 16-8)
D + H + F + L + T	(Equation 16-9)
$D + H + F + (L_r \text{ or } S \text{ or } R)$	(Equation 16-10)
$D + H + F + 0.75 (L + T) + 0.75 (L_r \text{ or } S \text{ or } R)$	(Equation 16-11)
D + H + F + (W or 0.7 E)	(Equation 16-12)
D + H + F + 0.75 (W or 0.7 E) +0.75 L + 0.75 (L _r or S or R)	(Equation 16-13)
0.6 D + W + H	(Equation 16-14)
0.6 D + 0.7 E + H	(Equation 16-15)

Exceptions:

- 1. Crane hook loads need not be combined with roof live load or with more than three-fourths of the snow load or one-half of the wind load.
- Flat roof snow loads of 30 psf (1.44 kN/m²) or less and roof live loads of 30 psf or less need not 2. be combined with seismic loads. Where flat roof snow loads exceed 30 psf (1.44 kN/m²), 20 percent shall be combined with seismic loads.
- In Equation 16-14, the wind load, W, is permitted to be reduced 10 percent for design of the 3. foundation other than anchorage of the structure to the foundation in accordance with Exception 2 of Section 2.4.1 of ASCE 7.
- 4. In Equation 16-15, 0.6 D is permitted to be increased to 0.9 D for the design of special reinforced masonry shear walls complying with Chapter 21.

Committee Reason: This code change correlates the basic allowable stress load combinations with those of ASCE 7. In particular, new Exception 4 addresses the dead load factor for design of special reinforced masonry shear walls. The modification reflects further updates made in the ASCE 7 development process.

Assembly Action:

S54-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed elimination of the alternative allowable stress load combinations would remove an important tool for designers. This set of load combinations is much needed for foundation designs because the one-third stress increase remains a common practice in the geo-technical reports. This is only permitted with these alternative load combinations.

Assembly Action:

S55-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Chapter 16 is for structural loads and design. The requirements for posting live loads were moved out of Chapter 16 to Chapter 1 previously. A posting requirement is an administrative issue that belongs in Chapter 1.

Assembly Action:

*Note: Subsequent to committee action, the proponent withdrew this code change proposal.

S56-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved*

S57-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL **Committee Action:**

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 1607.1

MINIMUM UNIFORMLY DISTRIBUTED LIVE LOADS, Lo, AND MINIMUM CONCENTRATED LIVE LOADS⁹

(No change to footnotes a through h)

- Uninhabitable attics without storage are those where the maximum clear height between the joists and L. rafters is less than 42 inches, or where there are not two or more adjacent trusses with web configurations capable of accommodating an assumed rectangle 42 inches in height by 24 inches in width, or greater, within the plane of the trusses. This live load need not be assumed to act concurrently with any other live load requirements.
- Uninhabitable attics with storage are those where the maximum clear height between the joists and rafters is 42 inches or greater, or where there are two or more adjacent trusses with web configurations capable of accommodating an assumed rectangle 42 inches in height by 24 inches in width, or greater, within the plane of the trusses.

At the trusses, The live load need only be applied to those portions of the joists or bottom chords where all both of the following conditions are met:

The attic area is accessible from an opening not less than 20 inches in width by 30 inches in length that is located where the clear height in the attic is a minimum of 30 inches; and

ii. The slopes of the joists or truss bottom chords are no greater than 2 units vertical to 12 units horizontal.

The remaining portions of the joists or bottom chords shall be designed for a uniformly distributed concurrent live load of not less than 10 lb/ft².

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Reason: This proposal makes editorial clarifications to Table 1607.1 footnotes that relate to attic live loads. These changes correspond to updates in the next edition of the ASCE 7 load standard. The modification clarifies the applicability of the uninhabitable attic with storage live load.

Assembly Action:

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

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE R301.5 MINIMUM UNIFORMLY DISTRIBUTED LIVE LOADS (in pounds per square foot)

USE LIVE	LOAD
Uninhabitable attics without storage ^b	10
Uninhabitable attics with limited storage ^{b, g}	20
Habitable attics and attics served with fixed stairs	30

(No changes to the remaining Table not shown)

(No change to footnote a)

Uninhabitable attics without storage are those where the maximum clear height between the joists and b. rafters is less than 42 inches, or where there are not two or more adjacent trusses with web configurations capable of accommodating an assumed rectangle 42 inches in height by 24 inches in width, or greater, within the plane of the trusses. This live load need not be assumed to act concurrently with any other live load requirements.

(No change to footnotes c through f)

Uninhabitable attics with limited storage are those where the maximum clear height between the joists and g. rafters is 42 inches or greater, or where there are two or more adjacent trusses with web configurations capable of accommodating an assumed rectangle 42 inches in height by 24 inches in width, or greater, within the plane of the trusses.

At the trusses, The live load need only be applied to those portions of the joists or bottom chords where all of the following conditions are met:

The attic area is accessible from an opening not less than 20 inches in width by 30 inches in length 1. that is located where the clear height in the attic is a minimum of 30 inches.

None

Approved as Modified

Approved as Modified

- 2. The slopes of the joists or truss bottom chords are no greater than 2 units vertical to 12 units horizontal.
- Required insulation depth is less than the joist or bottom chord member depth. 3.

The remaining portions of the joists or bottom chords shall be designed for a uniformly distributed concurrent live load of not less than 10 lb/ft².

(No change to footnote h)

Committee Reason: This change adds clarity to the code and correlates with ASCE 7-10. The modification clarifies that Note g applies to joists as well as truss bottom chords. Also, the modification retains the term "limited storage".

Assembly Action:

S58-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 1607.1

MIN	IIMUM UNIFORMLY DISTRIBUTED LIVE LOADS, L _o , AND MINI		RATED LIVE LOADS ⁹
	OCCUPANCY OR USE	UNIFORM	CONCENTRATED
		(psf)	(lbs.)
4.	Assembly areas and theaters		
	Fixed seats (fastened to floor)	60	
	Follow spot, projections and control rooms	50	
	Lobbies	100	-
	Movable seats	100	
	Stages floors	150	
	Platforms (assembly)	100	
	Other assembly areas	100	

(Portions of Table not shown, remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: This code change aligns live loads in Table 1607.1 for stages and platforms in assembly areas with the corresponding provisions in ASCE 7. The modification reflects further updates made in the ASCE 7 development process. It also retains the requirement for follow spot, projections and control rooms.

Assembly Action:

S59-09/10

S60-09/10

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:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1605.2.1 Basic load combinations. Where strength design or load and resistance factor design is used, structures and portions thereof shall resist the most critical effects from the following combinations of factored loads:

1.4(D+F) $1.2(D + F + T) + 1.6(L + H) + 0.5(L_r \text{ or } S \text{ or } R)$ $1.2 D + 1.6 (L_r \text{ or } S \text{ or } R) + (f_1 L \text{ or } 0.8 W)$ $1.2 D + 1.6 W + f_1 L + 0.5 (L_r \text{ or } S \text{ or } R)$ $1.2 D + 1.0 E + f_1 L + f_2 S$ 0.9 D + 1.6 W + 1.6 H 0.9 D + 1.0 E + 1.6 H

where

f1 = 1 for floors in places of public assembly, areas and recreational uses (see Table 1607.1), for live loads, L, in excess of 100 pounds per square foot (4.79 kN/m²), and for floors in passenger vehicle parking garages; and = 0.5 for other live loads, L.

Approved as Modified

Withdrawn by Proponent

(Equation 16-3) (Equation 16-4) (Equation 16-5) (Equation 16-6)

(Equation 16-1)

(Equation 16-2)

(Equation 16-7)

None

fa = 0.7 for roof configurations (such as saw tooth) that do not shed snow off the structure; and = 0.2 for other roof configurations.

Exception: Where other factored load combinations are specifically required by the provisions of this code, such combinations shall take precedence.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Re ason: This proposal correlates the reduction of live loads at floors and occupied roofs with comparable provisions in the next edition of ASCE 7 load standard. The modification rolls back portions of the proposed revisions to the basic allowable load combination notes that were deemed unnecessary.

Assembly Action:

S61-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproval was because the committee's action of S57-09/10 was preferred.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee R eason: Based on the committee's previous action on S57-09/10, Part II and the proponent's request for disapproval.

Assembly Action:

S62-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: There is no evidence suggesting the current live load requirements for decks and balconies are a problem. The issue raised in the proponent's reason has been associated more with the deck connections.

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

Committee Reason: There is no technical justification provided to substantiate the load increase. The support of hot tubs must be addressed separately.

Assembly Action:

Assembly Action:

S63-09/10

S64-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed definitions should not contain requirements. The committee encourages a public comment modifying the definitions of cornice.

Assembly Action:

Withdrawn by Proponent

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

S65-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change was disapproved because the committee's action on S57-09/10 was preferred.

Assembly Action:

S66-09/10

Assembly Action:

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The 10 psf attic load in footnote j is considered a live load, but this proposal would replace this live load with an inappropriate reference to the dead load requirements.

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This change would remove the 10 psf required minimum load. The committee feels it is appropriate to maintain a minimum load requirement and require a larger load if applicable.

Assembly Action:

S67-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 1607.1

MI	NIMUM UNIFORMLY DISTRIBUTED LIVE LOADS, L _o , AND MINIM	UM CONCENTR	ATED LIVE LOADS ⁹
	OCCUPANCY OR USE	UNIFORM	CONCENTRATED
		(psi)	(ibs.)
7.	Catwalks for maintenance access	40	300

(Portions of table not shown are unchanged)

1607.7.3 Vehicle barrier systems. Vehicle barrier systems for passenger vehicles shall be designed to resist a single load of 6,000 pounds (26.70 kN) applied horizontally in any direction to the barrier system and shall have anchorage or attachment capable of transmitting this load to the structure. For design of the system, two loading conditions shall be analyzed. The first condition shall apply the load at a height of 1 foot, 6 inches (457 mm) above the floor or ramp surface. The second loading condition shall apply the load at 2 feet, 3 inches (686 mm) above the floor or ramp surface. The more severe load condition shall govern the design of the barrier restraint system. The load shall be assumed to act on an area not to exceed 12 inches by 12 inches (305 mm by 305 mm), and located so as to produce the maximum load effects. This load is not required to act concurrently with any handrail or guard loadings specified in Section 1607.7.1. Garages accommodating trucks and buses shall be designed in accordance with an approved method that contains provision for traffic railings.

1607.8 Impact loads. The live loads specified in Section <u>4607.2</u> <u>1607.3</u> shall be assumed to include adequate allowance for ordinary impact conditions. Provisions shall be made in the structural design for uses and loads that involve unusual vibration and impact forces.

1607.11.2.1 Flat, pitched and curved roofs. Ordinary flat, pitched and curved roofs, and awnings and canopies other than of fabric construction supported by a skeleton structures, are permitted to be designed for a reduced roof live load as specified in the following equations or other controlling combinations of loads as specified in Section 1605, whichever produces the greater load effect.

In structures such as greenhouses, where special scaffolding is used as a work surface for workers and materials during maintenance and repair operations, a lower roof load than specified in the following equations shall not be used unless approved by the building official. Such structures shall be designed for a minimum roof live load of 12 psf (0.58 kN/m²).

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

None

Disapproved

157

 $L_r = L_{ro} R_1 R_2$ where: $12 \le L_r \le 20$

For SI: $L_r = L_{ro} R_1 R_2$

where: $0.58 \le L_r \le 0.96$

 L_{ro} = Unreduced roof live load per square foot (m²) of horizontal projection supported by the member (see Table 1607.1).

 L_r = Reduced roof live load per square foot (m²) of horizontal projection supported by the member.

The reduction factors R_1 and R_2 shall be determined as follows:

R₁	=	1 for $A_t \leq 200$ square feet (18.58 m ²)	(Equation 16-26)
R₁	=	1.2 – 0.001 A_t for 200 square feet < A_t < 600 square feet	(Equation 16-27)
For	SI: 1.:	2 – 0.011 A_t for 18.58 square meters < A_t < 55.74 square meters	

 $R_1 = 0.6 \text{ for } A_t \ge 600 \text{ square feet } (55.74 \text{ m}^2)$ (Equation 16-28)

where:

 A_t = Tributary area (span length multiplied by effective width) in square feet (m²) supported by the member, and

R₂ :	= 1 for F	F≤ 4	(Equation 16-29)
R₂ :	= 1.2 - 0.	05 F for 4 < F < 12	(Equation 16-30)
R₂ :	= 0.6	for F≥ 12	(Equation 16-31)
			· · · /

where:

F = For a sloped roof, the number of inches of rise per foot (for SI: F = 0.12 x slope, with slope expressed as a percentage), and or for an arch or dome, rise-to-span ratio multiplied by 32.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Re ason: This code change makes various editorial revisions to live load requirements that correlate the IBC with the next edition of the ASCE 7 load standard. In addition to further coordinating with ASCE 7, the modification corrects some unintended changes in the original proposal. It also removes the change to catwalks in Table 1607.1, since the proposed wording, "for maintenance access" would restrict the applicability of this live load, leaving a hole in the code requirement.

Assembly Action:

S68-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee R eason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee believes the current live load provisions for partitions are clear.

Assembly Action:

S69-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1607.6 Helipads. Helipads shall be designed for the following live loads:

- 1. A uniform live load, *L*, as specified below. This load shall not be reduced.
 - 1.1. 40 psf (1.92 kN/m²) where the design basis helicopter has a maximum take-off weight of 3,000 pounds (13.35 kN) or less.
 - 1.2. 60 psf (2.87 kN/m²) where the design basis helicopter has a maximum take-off weight greater than 3,000 pounds (13.35 kN).
- A single concentrated live load, L, of 3,000 pounds (13.35 kN) applied over an area of 4.5 inches by 4.5 inches (114 mm by 114 mm) and located so as to produce the maximum load effects on the structural elements under consideration. The concentrated load need not be assumed is not required to act concurrently with other uniform or concentrated live loads.
- 3. Two single concentrated live loads, *L*, 8 feet (2438 mm) apart applied on the landing pad (representing the helicopter's two main landing gear, whether skid type or wheeled type), each having a magnitude of 0.75

158

None

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

times the maximum take-off weight of the helicopter, and located so as to produce the maximum load effects on the structural elements under consideration. The concentrated loads shall be applied over an area of 8 inches by 8 inches (203 mm by 203 mm) and need not be assumed are not required to act concurrently with other uniform or concentrated live loads.

Landing areas designed for a design basis helicopters with maximum take-off weight not exceeding of 3,000 pounds (13.35 kN) shall be identified with a 3,000 pound (13.34 kN) weight limitation. The landing area weight limitation shall be indicated by the numeral "3" (kips) located in the bottom right corner of the landing area as viewed from the primary approach path. The indication for the landing area weight limitation shall be a minimum 5 feet (1524 mm) in height.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Re ason: This code change clarifies the live loads specific to helipads and correlates these requirements with the next edition of the ASCE 7 load standard. The modification reflects further updates made in the ASCE 7 development process.

Assembly Action:

S70-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee R eason: The proposal would provide necessary clarifications of provisions for heavy vehicle loading. Proposed requirements for emergency vehicles need work and it is hoped this can be accomplished in the public comment phase.

Assembly Action:

S71-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed terminology, in trying to distinguish the structural requirements from means of egress requirements, is itself potentially confusing. The currently used term is guard and there's no reason to change it to guardrail.

Assembly Action:

S72-09/10

S73-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1607.7.3 Vehicle barrier systems. Vehicle barrier systems for passenger vehicles shall be designed to resist a single load of 6,000 pounds (26.70 kN) applied horizontally in any direction to the barrier system and shall have anchorage or attachment capable of transmitting this load to the structure. For design of the system, the load shall be assumed to act at heights of between 18 to inches (457 mm) and 27 inches (457 to 686 mm) above the floor or ramp surface, located so as to produce the maximum load effects. The load shall be applied on an area not to exceed 12 inches by 12 inches (305 mm by 305 mm). The load is not required to act concurrently with any handrail or guard loadings specified in Section 1607.7.1. Garages accommodating trucks and buses shall be designed in accordance with an approved method that contains provision for traffic railings.

Committee Reason: This code change makes editorial changes that clarify the load requirements for vehicle barrier systems. The modification provides further updates for correlation with the ASCE 7 load standard.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Withdrawn by Proponent

None

Approved as Modified

S74-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The proposed wording is problematic. The basis for the 2.5 factor on the load for attachment to the structure should be clarified. If possible, this should be addressed in the public comment phase.

Assembly Action:

S75-09/10

Committee A	ction:
-------------	--------

Committee Reason: This proposal correlates the provisions for impact loads with the ASCE 7 load standard. Elevator loading appropriately relies on a reference to ASME A17.1.

Assembly Action:

S76-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: In keeping with the committee's action on S54-09/10, the disapproval of this item retains the alternative approach to reducing live loads in Section 1607.9.2.

Assembly Action:

S77-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 1607.1

OCCUPANCY OR USE UNIFORM (psf) CONCENTRATED (lbs.) 29. Roofs: All roof surfaces subject to maintenance workers Awnings and canopies: Fabric construction supported by a lightweight rigid skeleton structure 300 All other construction supported by a lightweight rigid skeleton ordinary flat, pitched, and curved roofs (not serving an occupancy function) 20 Primery function) 20	MINIMUM UNIFORMLY DISTRIBUTED LIVE LOADS, L _o , AND MINIMUM CONCENTRATED LIVE LOADS ³			
(psf) (lbs.) 29. Roofs: All roof surfaces subject to maintenance workers 300 Awnings and canopies: Fabric construction supported by a lightweight rigid skeleton structure 5 All other construction 20 All other construction 20 Ordinary flat, pitched, and curved roofs (not serving an occupancy function) 20	OCCUPANCY OR USE	UNIFORM	CONCENTRATED	
29. Roofs: All roof surfaces subject to maintenance workers 300 All roof surfaces subject to maintenance workers 300 Awnings and canopies: 5 Fabric construction supported by a lightweight rigid skeleton structure 5 All other construction 20 All other construction 20 Ordinary flat, pitched, and curved roofs (not serving an occupancy function) 20 Primery function) 20		(psf)	(lbs.)	
All roof surfaces subject to maintenance workers 300 Awnings and canopies: 5 Fabric construction supported by a lightweight rigid skeleton structure 5 All other construction 20 All other construction 20 Primary flat, pitched, and curved roofs (not serving an occupancy function) 20 Primary function 20	29. Roofs <u>:</u>			
Awnings and canopies: Fabric construction supported by a lightweight rigid skeleton structure 5 All other construction 20 Ordinary flat, pitched, and curved roofs (not serving an occupancy function) 20 Primary function) 20	All roof surfaces subject to maintenance workers		300	
Fabric construction supported by a lightweight rigid skeleton structure 5 All other construction 20 Ordinary flat, pitched, and curved roofs (not serving an occupancy function) 20 Primary function) 20	Awnings and canopies <u>:</u>			
structure nonreduceable All other construction 20 Ordinary flat, pitched, and curved roofs (not serving an occupancy function) 20 Primary for fmombers, exposed to a work floor: 20	Fabric construction supported by a lightweight rigid skel	eton 5		
All other construction Ordinary flat, pitched, and curved roofs (not serving an 20 occupancy function) Primary roof members, exposed to a work floor:	structure	nonreduceable		
All other construction Ordinary flat, pitched, and curved roofs (not serving an 20 occupancy function) Primary roof members, exposed to a work floor:				
All other construction Ordinary flat, pitched, and curved roofs (not serving an 20 occupancy function) Primary roof members, exposed to a work floor:		20		
Ordinary flat, pitched, and curved roofs (not serving an 20 occupancy function) Primary roof members, exposed to a work floor:	All other construction			
occupancy function) Primary roof members, exposed to a work floor:	Ordinary flat, pitched, and curved roofs (not serving an	20		
Drimary root mombare, avanced to a work floor.	occupancy function)			
Finally root members, exposed to a work nool.	Primary roof members, exposed to a work floor:			
Single panel point of lower chord of roof trusses or any point	Single panel point of lower chord of roof trusses or any	point		
along primary structural members supporting roofs over 2,000	along primary structural members supporting roofs ov	/er	2,000	
manufacturing, storage warehouses, and repair garages 300	manufacturing, storage warehouses, and repair garage	ges	300	
All other occupancies	All other occupancies			
Roots serving an occupancy function:	Roots serving an occupancy function:			
Roof gardens 60 100	Roof gardens	60 <u>100</u>		
Assembly areas 100	Assembly areas	100		
All other similar areas Note I Note I Note I	All other similar areas	Note I	Note	

(Portions of Table not show, remain unchanged)

Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged

Committee Rea son: By deleting duplicate text and reorganizing the roof live load requirements, this code change clarifies this portion of the code. The modification reverses the reorganization of Table 1607.1 in item 2 and also restores roof live loads that were not intended to be included in this code change.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Modified

S78-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal would remove the live load reductions for members supporting two or more floors. The justification for this change is not sufficient. The requirement for a rational approach by a registered design professional could be included as an alternative.

Assembly Action:

S79-09/10

Committee Ac	tion:
--------------	-------

Committee Reason: The committee is not opposed in principle to the proposed clarifications for landscaped roofs, but some of the wording needs work. It should be reworked in the public comment phase.

Assembly Action:

S80-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: In lieu of code change S79-09/10, this code change provides some good clarifications of the provisions for landscaped roofs.

Assembly Action:

S81-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed wording creates confusion as to why the specified partition live load should be considered a wind load when used in Table 1604.3 for determining allowable deflections. It would be preferable to state the deflection limit prescriptively or fix the table. A public comment is encouraged.

Assembly Action:

S82-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Proponent's reason states that the proposed horizontal load on fire-resistance rated exterior walls is arbitrary. This requirement needs justification. There is also a concern with unenforceable language.

Assembly Action:

S83-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

SUSCEPTIBLE BAY. A roof or portion thereof with (1) a slope less than 1/4-inch per foot (0.0208 rad), or (2) where <u>on which</u> water <u>will be is</u> impounded upon it, in whole or in part, and the secondary drainage system is functional but the primary drainage system is <u>not functional</u> <u>blocked</u>. A roof surface with a slope of 1/4-inch per foot (0.0208 rad) or greater towards points of free drainage is not a susceptible bay.

1611.2 Ponding instability. Susceptible bays of roofs shall be investigated by structural analysis to ensure that they possess adequate stiffness to preclude progressive deflection evaluated for ponding instability in accordance with Section 8.4 of ASCE 7.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

161
Committee Reason: This code change enhances the safety of roofs by correlating the IBC with the ponding instability provisions of ASCE 7. In addition to covering portions of roofs with a slope up to ¼ inch per foot, it also addresses greater slopes that do not drain to a point of free drainage. The modification reflects further updates made in the ASCE 7 development process.

Assembly Action:

None

S84-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1609.6 Alternate all-heights method. The alternate wind design provisions in this section are simplifications of the ASCE 7 Directional Procedure.

1609.6.1 Scope. As an alternate to ASCE 7 Chapters 27 and 30, the following provisions are permitted to be used to determine the wind effects on regularly shaped buildings, or other structures that are regularly shaped, which meet all of the following conditions:

- The building or other structure is less than or equal to 75 feet (22 860 mm) in height with a height-toleast width ratio of 4 or less, or the building or other structure has a fundamental frequency greater than or equal to 1 hertz.
- 2. The building or other structure is not sensitive to dynamic effects.
- 3. The building or other structure is not located on a site for which channeling effects or buffeting in the wake of upwind obstructions warrant special consideration.
- 4. The building shall meet the requirements of a simple diaphragm building as defined in ASCE 7 Section 26.2, where wind loads are only transmitted to the main wind-force-resisting system (MWFRS) at the diaphragms.
- 5. For open buildings, multispan gable roofs, stepped roofs, sawtooth roofs, domed roofs, roofs with slopes greater than 45 degrees (0.79 rad), solid free-standing walls and solid signs, and rooftop equipment, apply ASCE 7 provisions

ASCE 7 provisions.

1609.6.1.1 Modifications. The following modifications shall be made to certain subsections in ASCE 7: in Section 1609.6.2, symbols and notations that are specific to this section are used in conjunction with the symbols and notations in ASCE 7 Section 26.3.

1609.6.2 Symbols and notations. Coefficients and variables used in the alternate all-heights method equations are as follows:

- Cnet = Net-pressure coefficient based on K_d [(G) (Cp) (GC_{pi})], in accordance with Table 1609.6.2.
- <u>*G*</u> = Gust effect factor for rigid structures in accordance with ASCE 7 Section 26.9.3.
- K_d = Wind directionality factor in accordance with ASCE 7 Table 26-6.
- $\underline{P_{net}}$ = Design wind pressure to be used in determination of wind loads on buildings or other structures or their components and cladding, in psf (kN/m²).

	NET PRESS	SURE COEFFICIEN	ITS, C _{NET} ^{a,D}			
STRUCTURE OR PART THEREOF	DESCRIPTION C _{net} FACTOR					
1. Main Wind Force			Encl	<u>osed</u>	Partially	Enclosed
Resisting Frames and Systems	WALLS:		<u>+</u> Internal	<u>- Internal</u> Pressure	+ Internal Pressure	<u>- Internal</u> Pressure
	Windward Wall Leeward Wall Side Wall		<u>0.43</u>	<u>0.73</u>	<u>0.11</u>	<u>1.05</u>
			<u>-0.51</u>	<u>-0.21</u>	<u>-0.83</u>	<u>0.11</u>
			<u>-0.66</u>	<u>-0.35</u>	<u>-0.97</u>	<u>-0.04</u>
	Deven et Mall	Windward	<u>1.28</u>		<u>1.28</u>	
	<u>Falapet Wall</u>	Leeward	<u>-0.85</u>		<u>-0.85</u>	
	ROOFS:		Enclosed		Partially	Enclosed
	Wind perpendicular to ridge		<u>+</u> Internal	 Internal Pressure 	+ Internal Pressure	<u>- Internal</u> Pressure
	Leeward roof or flat roof		<u>-0.66</u>	<u>-0.35</u>	<u>-0.97</u>	<u>-0.04</u>
	Windward roof slopes:					
Slope < 2:12 (10°)	$S_{1000} + 2:12 + 10^{\circ}$	Condition 1	-1.09	-0.79	<u>-1.41</u>	-0.47
	Condition 2	-0.28	0.02	-0.60	0.34	

TABLE 1609.6.2 ET PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS, C_{NET}^{a.b}

	01	Condition 1	<u>-0.73</u>	<u>-0.</u>	42	-1.04	<u>-0.11</u>	
	$Slope = 4:12(18^{\circ})$	Condition 2	<u>-0.05</u>	<u>0.</u> 2	25	<u>-0.37</u>	0.57	
	Slope = 5:12 (23°)	Condition 1	<u>-0.58</u>	-0.	28	<u>-0.90</u>	0.04	
		Condition 2	<u>0.03</u>	<u>0.</u>	34	-0.29	0.65	
	01270	Condition 1	-0.47	-0.	16	-0.78	0.15	
	$Slope = 6:12(27^{\circ})$	Condition 2	0.06	0.3	37	-0.25	0.68	
	01	Condition 1	-0.37	-0.	06	-0.68	0.25	
	$Slope = 7:12 (30^{\circ})$	Condition 2	0.07	0.3	37	-0.25	0.69	
		Condition 1	-0.27	0.0	04	-0.58	0.35	
	$Slope = 9:12(37^{\circ})$	Condition 2	0.14	0.4	44	-0.18	0.76	
	Slope = 12:12 (45°)	•	<u>0.14</u>	0.4	44	-0.18	0.76	
	Wind parallel to ridge and	l flat roofs	<u>-1.09</u>	<u>-0.</u>	<u>79</u>	-1.41	<u>-0.47</u>	
	Non Building Structures:	Chimneys, Tanks a	nd Similar S	Structu	res:			
					<u>h/</u>	<u>D</u>		
			<u>1</u>			<u>7</u>	<u>25</u>	
	Square (Wind normal to fa	ace)	<u>0.99</u>		<u>1</u>	.07	<u>1.53</u>	
	Square (Wind on diagona	<u>il)</u>	<u>0.77</u>		<u>0</u>	.84	<u>1.15</u>	
	Hexagonal or Octagonal		<u>0.81</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>.97</u>	<u>1.13</u>	
	Round		<u>0.65</u>		<u>0</u>	.81	<u>0.97</u>	
	Open Signs and Lattice F	rameworks	<u>R</u>	atio of	solid	to gross area		
			<u>< 0.1</u>		<u>0.1 t</u>	o 0.29	0.3 to 0.7	
	<u>Flat</u>		<u>1.45</u>		<u>1</u>	<u>.30</u>	<u>1.16</u>	
	Round		<u>0.87</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>.94</u>	<u>1.08</u>	
2.Components and cladding not in	Roof Elements and slop	<u>bes</u>	Enclo	osed		<u>Partia</u>	Ily Enclosed	
<u>areas of</u> discontinuity – Roofs and	Gable or hipped configurations (Zone 1)							
overhangs	Flat < Slope < 6:12 (2	7°) See ASCE 7 Fig	ure 6-11C Z	Cone 1	-			
	Positive	10 SF or less	<u>0.</u>	58			<u>0.89</u>	
		100 SF or more	<u>0.41</u>			0.72		
	Negative	10 SF or less	<u>-1.</u>	00			-1.32	
		100 SF or more	<u>-0.92</u>			<u>-1.23</u>		
	Overhang: Flat < Slope < 6:12 (27°) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-11B Zone 1							
	Negative	10 SF or less	less -1.45			<u>45</u>		
		100 SF or more			<u>-1.</u>	<u>36</u>		
		500 SF or more			<u>-0.</u>	<u>94</u>		
	<u>6:12 (27°) < Slope < 12</u>	12 (45°) See ASCI	E 7 Figure 6	-11D 2	Zone 1	<u>l</u>		
	Positive	10 SF or less	0.92			<u>1.23</u>		
		100 SF or more	<u>0.8</u>	<u>33</u>			<u>1.15</u>	
	Negative	10 SF or less	<u>-1.</u>	00			<u>-1.32</u>	

		100 SF or more	<u>-0.83</u>	<u>-1.15</u>	
	Monosloped Configurations (Zone 1)		Enclosed	Partially Enclosed	
	Flat < Slope < 7:12 (3	0°) See ASCE 7 Fig	ure 6-14B Zone 1		
	Positive	10 SF or less	<u>0.49</u>	<u>0.81</u>	
		100 SF or more	<u>0.41</u>	<u>0.72</u>	
	Negative	10 SF or less	<u>-1.26</u>	<u>-1.57</u>	
		100 SF or more	<u>-1.09</u>	<u>-1.40</u>	
	Tall flat topped roofs h>	<u>· 60'</u>	Enclosed	Partially Enclosed.	
	Flat <slope (10°)<="" 2:12="" <="" td=""><td>(Zone 1) See ASC</td><td>E 7 Figure 6-17 Zone 1</td><td></td></slope>	(Zone 1) See ASC	E 7 Figure 6-17 Zone 1		
	Negative	10 SF or less	<u>-1.34</u>	<u>-1.66</u>	
		500 SF or more	<u>-0.92</u>	<u>-1.23</u>	
3. Components and cladding in	Roof Elements and slopes		Enclosed	Partially Enclosed.	
<u>areas of</u> discontinuities –	Gable or Hipped Configurations at Ridges, Eaves and Rakes (Zone 2)				
overhangs	Flat < Slope < 6:12 (27	°) See ASCE 7 Figu	re 6-11C Zone 2		
	<u>Positive</u>	10 SF or less	<u>0.58</u>	<u>0.89</u>	
		100 SF or more	<u>0.41</u>	<u>0.72</u>	
		10 SF or less	<u>-1.68</u>	<u>-2.00</u>	
	Negative	100 SF or more	<u>-1.17</u>	<u>-1.49</u>	
	<u>Overhang for Slope Flat</u> < Slope < 6:12 (27°) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-11C Zone 2				
		10 SF or less	<u>-1.</u>	<u>87</u>	
	Negative	100 SF or more	<u>-1.</u>	<u>87</u>	
	<u>6:12 (27°) < Slope < 12:12 (45°) Figure</u> <u>6-11D</u>		Enclosed	Partially Enclosed	
	<u>Positive</u>	10 SF or less	<u>0.92</u>	<u>1.23</u>	
		100 SF or more	<u>0.83</u>	<u>1.15</u>	
		10 SF or less	<u>-1.17</u>	<u>-1.49</u>	
	<u>Negative</u>	100 SF or more	<u>-1.00</u>	<u>-1.32</u>	
	Overhang for 6:12 (27°	?) < Slope < 12:12 (45°) See ASCE 7 Figure	e 6-11D Zone 2	
	Negative	10 SF or less	-1.70		

	100 SF or more	<u>-1.53</u>		
Monosloped Configurations at Ridges, Eaves and Rakes (Zone 2)				
Flat < Slope < 7:12 (30°) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-14B Zone 2				
Positive 10 SF or less 0.49			<u>0.81</u>	
	100 SF or more	<u>0.41</u>	<u>0.72</u>	
	10 SF or less	<u>-1.51</u>	<u>-1.83</u>	
<u>Negative</u>	100 SF or more	<u>-1.43</u>	<u>-1.74</u>	
Tall flat topped roofs h>	<u>60'</u>	Enclosed	Partially Enclosed	
Flat <slope (10°)<="" 2:12="" <="" td=""><td>(Zone 2) See ASC</td><td>E 7 Figure 6-17 Zone 2</td><td></td></slope>	(Zone 2) See ASC	E 7 Figure 6-17 Zone 2		
Negative	10 SF or less	<u>-2.11</u>	<u>-2.42</u>	
	500 SF or more	<u>-1.51</u>	<u>-1.83</u>	
Gable or Hipped Config	urations at Corners	(Zone 3) See ASCE 7 F	igure 6-11C Zone 3	
Flat < Slope < 6:12 (2	<u>7°)</u>	Enclosed	Partially Enclosed	
Positive	10 SF or less	<u>0.58</u>	<u>0.89</u>	
	100 SF or more	<u>0.41</u>	<u>0.72</u>	
	10 SF or less	<u>-2.53</u>	<u>-2.85</u>	
Negative	100 SF or more	<u>-1.85</u>	<u>-2.17</u>	
Overhang for Slope Flat	t < Slope < 6:12 (27	7°) See ASCE 7 Figure 6	6-11C Zone 3	
	10 SF or less	<u>-3.15</u>		
Negative	100 SF or more	<u>-2.13</u>		
<u>6:12 (27°) < Slope < 12</u>	12 (45°) See ASCE	7 Figure 6-11D Zone 3		
Positive	10 SF or less	0.92	<u>1.23</u>	
	100 SF or more	<u>0.83</u>	<u>1.15</u>	
	10 SF or less	<u>-1.17</u>	<u>-1.49</u>	
Negative	100 SF or more	<u>-1.00</u>	<u>-1.32</u>	
Overhang for 6:12 (27°)	< Slope <	Enclosed	Partially Enclosed.	
<u>10 SF or less</u> -1.70			<u>70</u>	
Negative	100 SF or more	<u>-1.</u>	53	

	Monosloped Configurations at corners (Zone 3) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-14B Zone 3					
	<u>Flat < Slope < 7:12 (30°)</u>					
	<u>Positive</u>	10 SF or less	<u>0.49</u>	<u>0.81</u>		
		100 SF or more	<u>0.41</u>	<u>0.72</u>		
		10 SF or less	<u>-2.62</u>	<u>-2.93</u>		
	<u>Negative</u>	100 SF or more	<u>-1.85</u>	<u>-2.17</u>		
	Tall flat topped roofs h>	<u>· 60'</u>	Enclosed	Partially Enclosed		
	Flat < slope < 2:12 (10°) (Zone 3) See ASC	CE 7 Figure 6-17 Zone 3			
	Negative	10 SF or less	<u>-2.87</u>	<u>-3.19</u>		
		500 SF or more	<u>-2.11</u>	<u>-2.42</u>		
4. Components and Cladding not in	<u>Wall Elements: h ≤ 60' (</u> 11A	(Zone 4) Figure 6-	Enclosed	Partially Enclosed		
<u>areas of</u> <u>discontinuity -</u> <u>Walls and parapets</u>		10 SF or less	<u>1.00</u>	<u>1.32</u>		
	Positive	500 SF or more	<u>0.75</u>	<u>1.06</u>		
		10 SF or less	<u>-1.09</u>	<u>-1.40</u>		
	<u>Negative</u>	500 SF or more	<u>-0.83</u>	<u>-1.15</u>		
	Wall Elements: h > 60' (Zone 4) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-17 Zone 4					
		20 SF or less	<u>0.92</u>	<u>1.23</u>		
	<u>Positive</u>	500 SF or more	<u>0.66</u>	<u>0.98</u>		
		20 SF or less	<u>-0.92</u>	<u>-1.23</u>		
	<u>Negative</u>	500 SF or more	<u>-0.75</u>	<u>-1.06</u>		
	Parapet Walls					
	<u>Positive</u>		<u>2.87</u>	<u>3.19</u>		
	Negative		<u>-1.68</u>	<u>-2.00</u>		
5. Components and Cladding in areas of discontinuity - Walls and parapets	<u>Wall Elements: h ≤ 60' (</u> <u>11A</u>	(Zone 5) Figure 6-	Enclosed	Partially Enclosed		
	Positive	10 SF or less	<u>1.00</u>	<u>1.32</u>		
		500 SF or more	<u>0.75</u>	<u>1.06</u>		
		10 SF or less	<u>-1.34</u>	<u>-1.66</u>		
	Negative	500 SF or more	<u>-0.83</u>	<u>-1.15</u>		
	Wall Elements: h > 60'	(Zone 5) See ASCE	7 Figure 6-17 Zone 4			
	Positive	20 SF or less	<u>0.92</u>	<u>1.23</u>		

	500 SF or more	<u>0.66</u>	<u>0.98</u>
	20 SF or less	<u>-1.68</u>	<u>-2.00</u>
Negative	500 SF or more	<u>-1.00</u>	<u>-1.32</u>
Parapet Walls			
<u>Positive</u>		<u>3.64</u>	<u>3.95</u>
<u>Negative</u>		<u>-2.45</u>	<u>-2.76</u>

For SI: 1 foot = 304.8 mm, 1 square foot = 0.0929 m^2 , 1 degree = 0.0175 radians

a. Linear interpolation between values in the table is permitted.

b. Some C_{net} values have been grouped together. Less conservative results may be obtained by applying ASCE 7 provisions.

1609.6.3 Design equations. When using the alternate all-heights method, the MWFRS, and components and cladding of every structure shall be designed to resist the effects of wind pressures on the building envelope in accordance with Equation 16-34.

(Equation 16-34)

 $\underline{P_{net}} = 0.00256 \text{V}^2 K_z \underline{C_{net}} K_{zt}$

Design wind forces for the MWFRS shall not be less than 16 psf (0.77 kN/m²) multiplied by the area of the structure projected on a plane normal to the assumed wind direction (see ASCE 7 Section 27.4.7 for criteria). Design net wind pressure for components and cladding shall not be less than 16 psf (0.77 kN/m²) acting in either direction normal to the surface.

1609.6.4 Design procedure. The MWFRS and the components and cladding of every building or other structure shall be designed for the pressures calculated using Equation 16-34.

1609.6.4.1 Main wind-force-resisting systems. The MWFRS shall be investigated for the torsional effects identified in ASCE 7 Figure 27.4.6.

1609.6.4.2 Determination of K_z and K_{zt} . Velocity pressure exposure coefficient, K_{zt} shall be determined in accordance with ASCE 7 Section 27.3.1 and the topographic factor, K_{zt} shall be determined in accordance with ASCE 7 Section 26.8.

- 1. For the windward side of a structure, K_{zt} and K_z shall be based on height z.
- 2. For leeward and sidewalls, and for windward and leeward roofs, K_{zt} and K_z shall be based on mean roof height h.

1609.6.4.3 Determination of net pressure coefficients, C_{net} . For the design of the MWFRS and for components and cladding, the sum of the internal and external net pressure shall be based on the net pressure coefficient, C_{net} .

The pressure coefficient, C_{net} for walls and roofs shall be determined from Table 1609.6.2.
 Where C_{net} has more than one value, the more severe wind load condition shall be used for design.

1609.6.4.4 Application of wind pressures. When using the alternate all-heights method, wind pressures shall be applied simultaneously on, and in a direction normal to, all building envelope wall and roof surfaces.

1609.6.4.1 Components and cladding. Wind pressure for each component or cladding element is applied as follows using *C_{net}* values based on the effective wind area, *A*, contained within the zones in areas of discontinuity of width and/or length "a," "2a" or "4a" at: corners of roofs and walls; edge strips for ridges, rakes and eaves; or field areas on walls or roofs as indicated in figures in tables in ASCE 7 as referenced in Table 1609.6.2 in accordance with the following:

- 1. Calculated pressures at local discontinuities acting over specific edge strips or corner boundary areas.
- 2. Include "field" (Zone 1, 2 or 4, as applicable) pressures applied to areas beyond the boundaries of the areas of discontinuity.
- 3. Where applicable, the calculated pressures at discontinuities (Zones 2 or 3) shall be combined with design pressures that apply specifically on rakes or eave overhangs.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Reason: This code change updates the IBC wind load requirements for consistency with the next edition of the ASCE 7 load standard. The modification retains the current IBC alternative procedure with necessary corrections to the ASCE 7 references. A public comment is recommended to further coordinate the IBC with ASCE 7

Assembly Action:

S85-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: It is appropriate to put the correction to the referenced standard in the code at this time.

Assembly Action:

S86-09/10

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 ASCE/SEI 49 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3(1) Readily available.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed standard, ASCE/SEI 49 is not yet completed. In addition the proposal wording referring to minimum loading may take away any benefit to performing wind tunnel tests.

Assembly Action:

S87-09/10

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 TMS 404 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3(1) Readily available.

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed referenced standard, TMS 404, is not yet completed.

Assembly Action: PART II- IRC B/E

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request for disapproval. The standard is in draft form and is not ready at this time.

Assembly Action:

S88-09/10 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:

Committee Reason: The wording of this code change would limit the scope of impact-resistant test standards in Section 1609.1.2 to impact requirements only, circumventing the pressure testing that is currently a requirement. The referenced standard ICC 500, references the ASTM Standards that are already required by this section. Perhaps the ICC 500 Standard could be added at the end of the current provision as a permitted option.

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

None

Assembly Action:

S89-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproval was requested by the proponent. Extending the scope of Section 1609.1.2 from glazing to include any opening would include any penetration of the exterior wall which is not the intent of the impact resistance provision.

Assembly Action:

S90-09/10

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 ANSI A250.12 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: With the addition of ANSI A250.12 to regulate the parts of a side-hinged door, there will be at least a requirement for their testing. It can be better to have tests on each part of the assembly. This component approach is not a novel idea, but is something that is done all the time. There is a consensus standard and it's a good option to have in the code.

Assembly Action:

S91-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproval of this code change maintains consistency with the National Flood Insurance Program, thus providing a safe harbor by complying with the IBC. Building officials understand the use of market value in making the determination of substantial damage or substantial improvement.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: See reason for disapproval of S91-09/10, Part I.

Assembly Action:

S92-09/10

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

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

801.5 Applicability. For buildings in flood hazard areas as established in Section 1612.3, interior finishes, trim and decorative materials that extend below the elevation required by Section 1612.4 <u>1612</u> shall be flood-damage-resistant materials.

1403.5 Flood resistance. For buildings in flood hazard areas as established in Section 1612.3, exterior walls extending below the elevation required by Section 1612.4 <u>1612</u> shall be constructed with flood damage resistant materials. Wood shall be pressure-preservative treated in accordance with AWPA U1 for the species, product and end use using a preservative listed in Section 4 of APWA U1 or decay-resistant heartwood of redwood, black locust or cedar.

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

None

Committee Reason: This code change provides a definition as to what the flood elevation is that triggers flood requirements that are already in the IBC and it is just a clarification. The modification changes the section reference to merely refer to Section 1612.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IPC Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

[B] 309.2 Flood hazard. For structures located in flood hazard areas, the following systems and equipment shall be located and installed as required by Section <u>1612.4</u> <u>1612</u> of the *International Building Code*.

Exception: The following systems are permitted to be located below the elevation required by Section <u>1612.4</u> <u>1612</u> of the *International Building Code* for utilities and attendant equipment provided that the systems are designed and installed to prevent water from entering or accumulating within their components and the systems are constructed to resist hydrostatic and hydrodynamic loads and stresses, including the effects of buoyancy, during the occurrence of flooding to up to such elevation.

- 1. All water service pipes.
- 2. Pump seals in individual water supply systems where the pump is located below the design flood elevation.
- 3. Covers on potable water wells shall be sealed, except where the top of the casing well or pipe sleeve is elevated to at least 1 foot (305 mm) above the design flood elevation.
- 4. All sanitary drainage piping.
- 5. All storm drainage piping.
- 6. Manhole covers shall be sealed, except where elevated to or above the design flood elevation.
- 7. All other plumbing fixtures, faucets, fixture fittings, piping systems and equipment.
- 8. Water heaters.
- 9. Vents and vent systems.

Committee Reason: This code change provides a definition as to what the flood elevation is that triggers flood requirements that are already in the IPC and it is just a clarification. The modification changes the section reference to merely refer to Section 1612 of the IBC.

Assembly Action:

PART III- IFGC Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

[B] 301.11 Flood hazard. For structures located in flood hazard areas, the appliance, equipment and system installations regulated by this code shall be located at or above the elevation required by Section 1612.4 <u>1612</u> of the *International Building Code* for utilities and attendant equipment.

Exception: The appliance, equipment and system installations regulated by this code are permitted to be located below the elevation required by Section <u>1612.4</u> <u>1612</u> of the *International Building Code* for utilities and attendant equipment_provided that they are designed and installed to prevent water from entering or accumulating within the components and to resist hydrostatic and hydrodynamic loads and stresses, including the effects of buoyancy, during the occurrence of flooding to such elevation.

Committee Reason: This code change provides a definition as to what the flood elevation is that triggers flood requirements that are already in the IFGC and it is just a clarification. The modification changes the section reference to merely refer to Section 1612 of the IBC.

Assembly Action:

PART IV- IMC Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

[B] 301.13 Flood hazard. For structures located in flood hazard areas, mechanical systems, equipment and appliances shall be located at or above the elevation required by Section <u>1612.4</u> <u>1612</u> of the *International Building Code* for utilities and attendant equipment.

None

Approved as Modified

Approved as Modified

Approved as Modified

None

170

Exception: Mechanical systems, equipment and appliances are permitted to be located below the elevation required by Section 1612.4 1612 of the of the International Building Code for utilities and attendant equipment provided that they are designed and installed to prevent water from entering or accumulating within the components and to resist hydrostatic and hydrodynamic loads and stresses, including the effects of buoyancy, during the occurrence of flooding up to such elevation.

401.4 Intake opening location. Air intake openings shall comply with all of the following: 4. Intake openings on structures in flood hazard areas shall be at or above the elevation required by Section 1612.4 1612 of the International Building Code for utilities and attendant equipment.

501.2.1 Location of exhaust outlets. The termination point of exhaust outlets and ducts discharging to the outdoors shall be located with the following minimum distances:

For ducts conveying explosive or flammable vapors, fumes or dusts: 30 feet (9144 mm) from property lines; 10 feet (3048 mm) from operable openings into buildings; 6 feet (1829 mm) from exterior walls and roofs; 30 feet (9144 mm) from combustible walls and operable openings into buildings which are in the direction of the exhaust discharge; 10 feet (3048 mm) above adjoining grade.

For other product-conveying outlets: 10 feet (3048 mm) from the property lines; 3 feet (914 mm) from 2 exterior walls and roofs; 10 feet (3048 mm) from operable openings into buildings; 10 feet (3048 mm) above adjoining grade.

For all environmental air exhaust: 3 feet (914 mm) from property lines; 3 feet (914 mm) from operable 3. openings into buildings for all occupancies other than Group U, and 10 feet (3048 mm) from mechanical air intakes. Such exhaust shall not be considered hazardous or noxious.

Exhaust outlets serving structures in flood hazard areas shall be installed at or above the elevation 4. required by Section 1612.4 1612 of the International Building Code for utilities and attendant equipment. 5.

For specific systems see the following sections:

5.1. Clothes dryer exhaust, Section 504.4.

5.2. Kitchen hoods and other kitchen exhaust equipment, Sections 506.3.12, 506.4 and 506.5.

- 5.3. Dust stock and refuse conveying systems, Section 511.
- 5.4. Subslab soil exhaust systems, Section 512.4
- 5.5. Smoke control systems, Section 513.10.3
- 5.6. Refrigerant discharge, Section1105.7
- 5.7. Machinery room discharge, Section 1105.6.1

[B] 602.4 Flood hazard. For structures located in flood hazard areas, plenum spaces shall be located above the elevation required by Section 1612.4 1612 of the International Building Code for utilities and attendant equipment-or shall be designed and constructed to prevent water from entering or accumulating within the plenum spaces during floods up to such elevation. If the plenum spaces are located below the elevation required by Section 1612.4 1612 of the International Building Code for utilities and attendant equipment, they shall be capable of resisting hydrostatic and hydrodynamic loads and stresses, including the effects of buoyancy, during the occurrence of flooding up to such elevation.

[B] 603.13 Flood hazard areas. For structures in flood hazard areas, ducts shall be located above the elevation required by Section 1612.4 1612 of the International Building Code for utilities and attendant equipment-or shall be designed and constructed to prevent water from entering or accumulating within the ducts during floods up to such elevation. If the ducts are located below the elevation required by Section 1612.4 1612 of the International Building Code for utilities and attendant equipment, the ducts shall be capable of resisting hydrostatic and hydrodynamic loads and stresses, including the effects of buoyancy, during the occurrence of flooding up to such elevation.

1305.2.1 Flood hazard. All fuel oil pipe, equipment and appliances located in flood hazard areas shall be located above the elevation required by Section 1612.4 1612 of the International Building Code for utilities and attendant equipment-or shall be capable of resisting hydrostatic and hydrodynamic loads and stresses, including the effects of buoyancy, during the occurrence of flooding up to such elevation.

Committee Reason: This code change provides a definition as to what the flood elevation is that triggers flood requirements that are already in the IMC and it is just a clarification. The modification changes the section reference to merely refer to Section 1612 of the IBC.

Assembly Action:

S93-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1612.5 Flood hazard documentation. The following documentation shall be prepared and sealed by a registered design professional and shall be submitted to the building official:

- For construction in flood hazard areas not subject to high-velocity wave action: 1.
 - 1.1. The elevation of the lowest floor, including basement, as required by the lowest floor elevation inspection in Section 110.3.3.

None

Approved as Modified

- 1.2. For fully enclosed areas below the design flood elevation where provisions to allow for the automatic entry and exit of floodwaters do not meet the minimum requirements in Section 2.6.2.1, ASCE 24, construction documents shall include a statement that the design will provide for equalization of hydrostatic flood forces in accordance with Section 2.6.2.2 of ASCE 24.
- 1.3. For dry floodproofed nonresidential buildings, construction documents shall include a statement that the dry floodproofing is designed in accordance with ASCE 24.
- 2. For construction in flood hazard areas subject to high-velocity wave action:
- 2.1. The elevation of the bottom of the lowest horizontal structural member as required by the lowest floor elevation inspection in Section 110.3.3.
- 2.2. Construction documents shall include a statement that the building is designed in accordance with ASCE 24, including that the pile or column foundation and building or structure to be attached thereto is designed to be anchored to resist flotation, collapse and lateral movement due to the effects of wind and flood loads acting simultaneously on all building components, and other load requirements of Chapter 16.
- 2.3. For breakaway walls designed to resist a nominal load have a resistance of more than 20 psf (0.96 kN/m²) determined using allowable stress design, construction documents shall include a statement that the breakaway wall is designed in accordance with ASCE 24.

Committee Re ason: This proposal clarifies the requirement for the design of breakaway walls and the modification makes it clear that the loading threshold applies to allowable stress design loads.

Assembly Action:

None

S94-09/10

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, FEMA P646, indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.2(1) Mandatory language, 3.6.3(2) Consensus process.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1612.6 Tsunami-generated flood hazard. Construction within a Tsunami Hazard Inundation Zone shall be in accordance with this section.

APPENDIX L TSUNAMI-GENERATED FLOOD HAZARD

L101.1 General. The purpose of this appendix is to provide tsunami regulatory criteria for those communities that have a tsunami hazard and have elected to develop and adopt a map of their tsunami hazard inundation zone.

1612.6.1 L101.2 Definitions. The following words and terms shall, for the purposes of this section appendix, have the meanings shown herein.

TSUNAMI HAZARD INUNDATION MAP. A map that designates the extent of inundation by a design event tsunami which is developed and provided to a community by either the State or the National Atmospheric and Oceanic Administration (NOAA) under the National Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Program, using NOAA mapping criteria.

TSUNAMI HAZARD INUNDATION ZONE. The area anticipated to be flooded or inundated by a design event tsunami as identified on a community's Tsunami Hazard Inundation Map.

1612.6.2 <u>L101.3</u> **Establishment of Tsunami Hazard Inundation Zone**. Where a community has adopted a Tsunami Hazard Inundation Map, that map shall be used to establish a community's Tsunami Hazard Inundation Zone.

1612.6.3 <u>L101.4</u> Construction within the Tsunami Hazard Inundation Zone. Buildings and structures designated Occupancy Category III or IV in accordance with Section 1604.5 shall be prohibited within a Tsunami Hazard Inundation Zone.

Exception: A vertical evacuation tsunami refuge shall be permitted to be located in a Tsunami Hazard Inundation Zone provided it is constructed in accordance with FEMA P646.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Re ason: This code change provides a good start, giving guidance on tsunami hazards. The modification places the provisions In an appendix, making them available for jurisdictions to adopt them.

S95-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproval was requested by the proponent. This proposal would delete too much of the seismic criteria.

Assembly Action:

S96-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Code change S97 – 09/10 is preferred.

Assembly Action:

S97-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1613.2 Definitions. The following words and terms shall, for the purposes of this section, have the meanings shown herein.

MAXIMUM CONSIDERED EARTHQUAKE GROUND MOTION (MCE_B). The most severe earthquake effects considered by this code.

(No changes to definitions not shown)

1613.5.1 Mapped Acceleration Parameters. The parameters S_s and S_t shall be determined from the 0.2 and 1 s spectral response accelerations shown on Figures 1613.5(1) and 1613.5(2) through 1613.5(6). Where S_t is less than or equal to 0.04 and S_s is less than or equal to 0.15, the structure is permitted to be assigned to Seismic Design Category A.

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

173



FIGURE 1613.5(1) MAXIMUM CONSIDERED EARTHQUAKE GROUND MOTION (<u>MCE_R</u>) FOR THE CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES OF 0.2 SECOND SPECTRAL RESPONSE ACCELERATION (5% OF CRITICAL DAMPING), SITE CLASS B



FIGURE 1613.5(1)(CONTINUED) MAXIMUM CONSIDERED EARTHQUAKE GROUND MOTION (MCE_R) FOR THE CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES OF 0.2 SECOND SPECTRAL RESPONSE ACCELERATION (5% OF CRITICAL DAMPING), SITE CLASS B



FIGURE 1613.5(2) MAXIMUM CONSIDERED EARTHQUAKE GROUND MOTION ($\underline{MCE_R}$) FOR THE CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES OF 1 SECOND SPECTRAL RESPONSE ACCELERATION (5% OF CRITICAL DAMPING), SITE CLASS B



FIGURE 1613.5(2)(CONTINUED) MAXIMUM CONSIDERED EARTHQUAKE GROUND MOTION ($\underline{MCE_R}$) FOR THE CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES OF 1 SECOND SPECTRAL RESPONSE ACCELERATION (5% OF CRITICAL DAMPING), SITE CLASS







----- 10 ----------- 10 -----

Contours of spectral response acceleration expressed as a percent of gravity. Hickness point in direction of decreasing values





Areas with a constant spectral response acceleration of 60% g



Deterministic zone boundary. The ground motion inside the zone shall be taken as the number shown inside the zone.

----- 10 -----

Contours of spectral response acceleration expressed as a percent of gravity. Hacharcs point in direction of decreasing values

1.0 Second Spectral Response Acceleration (5% of Criitcal Damping)

DISCUSSION

REFERENCES

 DISCUSSION
 REFERENCES

 Maps prepared by United States Geological Survey (USOS) in collaboration with the Forderal Energency Management Agency, (FEMA), funded Building Steimic Safety Council (USSC) and explained in commentative prepared by BSSC and ASCE and the references given below.
 Building Steimic Safety Council (USSC) and motion values contoured on these maps incorporate is a rage risk of muturant of lapinge equal to 18 is 50 years based upon a generic tractural fragility which are there at 1.8 it me estimated motion response to the characteristic expression between to the characteristic expression between to the characteristic expression between to the softmat of the tempset in each state 1998 USGN National Seizmic Hazard Maps for Hewein to detailed versional Seizmic Hazard Maps for Hewein to the softmat Design Maps for the Conterminonse United States, Structural Engineer Astrocolism of California 2007 Convention Proceedings, pp. 165-175.

 Discussion of the commended of the temps are not provided because it is rearremended the corresponsing but and the providence maps are not provided because it is rearremined to determine the mapped rable for a specified location.
 RefERENCES

FIGURE 1613.5(3) MAXIMUM CONSIDERED EARTHQUAKE GROUND MOTION (MCER) FOR HAWAII OF 0.2 AND 1 SECOND SPECTRAL RESPONSE ACCELERATION (5% OF CRITICAL DAMPING), SITE CLASS B







FIGURE 1613.5(5) MAXIMUM CONSIDERED EARTHQUAKE GROUND MOTION (MCE_R) FOR ALASKA OF 1.0 SECOND SPECTRAL RESPONSE ACCELERATION (5% OF CRITICAL DAMPING). SITE CLASS B







sure 22-6 Maximum Considered Earth Ground Motion (MCE_e) for Puerto Rico. Culebra. Vieques. St. Thomas. St. John and St. Croix

FIGURE 1613.5(6) MAXIMUM CONSIDERED EARTHQUAKE GROUND MOTION (MCE_R) FOR PUERTO RICO, CULEBRA, VIEQUES, ST. THOMAS, ST. JOHN AND ST. CROIX OF 0.2 AND 1 SECOND SPECTRAL RESPONSE ACCELERATION (5% OF CRITICAL DAMPING), SITE CLASS B

Committee R eason: This proposal incorporates the latest USGS ground motion maps. The modification updates the map titles and provides reformatted versions of the maps with no technical changes. It also separates areas outside the conterminous United States, on individual maps.

Assembly Action:

Committee Rea son: This change brings the latest and improved Seismic Maps into the code. This will correlate the maps with the IBC and ASCE 7-10. One benefit of the new map is that some Seismic Design Category E regions will be smaller in area. This will result in some previous Seismic Design Category E structures to now be Seismic Design Category D structures.

Assembly Action:

S98-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change replaces site class requirements in the IBC with a reference to the ASCE 7 provisions, removing conflicts from the code.

Assembly Action:

S99-09/10

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 ASTM D 4428/D 4428M and ASTM D 7400 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standards did not comply with ICC standards criteria, 3.6.2(1) Mandatory language.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval of S98 - 09/10 replaced the site class requirements with an ASCE 7 reference. In addition the proposed referenced standards, ASTM D 4428 and ASTM D 7400 are not compliant with ICC criteria due to non-mandatory language.

Assembly Action:

S100-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change removes an earthquake load provision on flexible diaphragms from the IBC, because it will be covered by the next edition of ASCE 7.

Assembly Action:

S101-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change removes an earthquake load provision on automatic sprinkler systems from the IBC, because it will be covered by the next edition of ASCE 7.

Assembly Action:

S102-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This code change removes an earthquake load provision on design coefficients for autoclaved aerated concrete masonry shear walls from the IBC, because it will be covered by the next edition of ASCE 7.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

S103-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change removes an earthquake load provision on controls for elevators from the IBC, because it will be covered by the next edition of ASCE 7.

Assembly Action:

S104-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change removes an earthquake load provision on steel plate shear wall height limits from the IBC, because it will be covered by the next edition of ASCE 7.

Assembly Action:

S105-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change removes an earthquake load provision on seismic separations from the IBC, because it will be covered by the next edition of ASCE 7.

Assembly Action: S106-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change removes an earthquake load provision on ductwork with component importance factor of 1.5 from the IBC, because it will be covered by the next edition of ASCE 7.

Assembly Action:

S107-09/10

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 AISI S110 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The proposed earthquake load provision on cold-formed steel special bolted moment frames is not needed in the IBC, because it will be covered by the next edition of ASCE 7.

Assembly Action:

S108-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1613.8 Earthquake-Recording Instrumentations. For earthquake-recording instrumentations, see Appendix L

L101.1 General. Every structure building located where the 1-second spectral response acceleration, S1, in accordance with Section 1613.5 is greater than 0.40 that either 1) exceeds six stories in height above grade plane with an aggregate floor area of 60,000 square feet (5574 m²) or more, or 2) exceeds ten 10-stories in

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

Approved as Modified

height above grade plane regardless of floor area, shall be equipped provided with not less than three approved recording accelerographs. The accelerographs shall be interconnected for common start and common timing. The accelerographs shall be interconnected for common start and common timing.

L 101.2 Location. As a minimum, instruments shall be located at the lowest level, mid-height, and near the top of the structure building. Each instrument shall be located so that access is maintained at all times and is unobstructed by room contents. A sign stating "MAINTAIN CLEAR ACCESS TO THIS INSTRUMENT" in one inch block letters shall be posted in a conspicuous location.

L 101.3 Maintenance. Maintenance and service of the instrumentation shall be provided by the owner of the structure building, subject to the approval of the building official. Data produced by the instrument shall be made available to the building official on request.

Maintenance and service of the instruments shall be performed annually by an approved testing agency. The owner shall file with the building official a written report from an approved testing agency certifying that each instrument has been serviced and is in proper working condition. This report shall be submitted when the instruments are installed and annually thereafter. Each instrument shall have affixed to it an externally visible tag specifying the date of the last maintenance or service and the printed name and address of the testing agency.

Portions of the proposal not shown are unchanged.

Committee Reason: An appendix chapter on earthquake recording instrumentation is an important addition to the IBC for those jurisdictions that have typically adopted such provisions. The data collected is valuable in understanding how earthquakes affect structures. The modification removes an unnecessary reference to the appendix from Chapter 16. "Building" has been appropriately changed to the more general term, "structure". The reference to the building official's approval was removed from the section on maintenance since this would be difficult to enforce after a certificate of occupancy is issued. Other changes are consistent with similar requirements in the LA City Building Code.

Assembly Action:

S109-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This proposal makes design of ice-sensitive structures for atmospheric ice loads a requirement under the IBC by referencing those ASCE 7 provisions. The requisite definition of "ice-sensitive structure" is added to make the application clear.

Assembly Action:

S110-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change is disapproved because it is preferable to maintain the references to specific ACI 318 sections in the structural integrity requirements.

Assembly Action:

S111-09/10

Committee A	Action:
-------------	---------

Committee Reason: There was concern over striking "at the completion of the work" from the definition of periodic special inspection. The proposed revisions should be reconciled with S115 - 09/10

Assembly Action:

S112-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed definition of "statement of special inspection" is not needed, since the code adequately describes the requirements. It would include administrative issues that need to be addressed by each jurisdiction, making it needlessly wordy and potentially conflicting with other code requirements.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

184

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

S113-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The proposed definition is not needed since Section 1704.1 currently contains this information.

Assembly Action:

S114-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed revisions to the definitions of continuous and periodic special inspection are not appropriate code language. Though it was disapproved, S111–09/10 is preferable.

Assembly Action:

S115-09/10

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 ASHRAE 171 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3(1) Readily available.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change proposes deletion of needed definitions and portions of Chapter 17 without providing sufficient explanations. As written, these revisions are not correlated with the entire code. This proposal incorporates too much on accreditation and takes away the building officials ability to approve such agencies.

Assembly Action:

S116-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1704.1 General. This section provides minimum requirements for special inspections, <u>the statement of special inspections</u>, contractor responsibility and structural observations.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Reason: This proposal is an editorial reorganization of currant sections 1704 through 1708 that provides better distinction between structural and other issues. The modification clarifies that the intent of Section 1704.1 includes the statement of special inspections.

Assembly Action:

S117-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change deletes current Exception 2 in Section 1704.1. The exception applies to "building components" which is an undefined term that leads to confusion. Furthermore the exemption should not be based on whether or not the design is by a registered design professional.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

S118-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee R eason: The wording of the proposed exception in Section 1704.1 is potentially confusing, specifically the reference to "portions of structures". Furthermore, the reference solely to section 2308 would be too narrow since it would not include other types of light-frame construction.

Assembly Action:

S119-09/10

Committee	Action:
-----------	---------

Committee Reason: This code change will require access for special inspections, similar to that required in Section 110.1 for other inspections.

Assembly Action:

S120-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: Agreement with proponent's reason which indicates this code change improves the scoping provisions applicable to the statement of special inspections, by moving the exception from Section 1704.1.1 to Section 1705.1.

Assembly Action:

S121-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This proposal makes use of the more comprehensive inspection requirements for structural steel by referencing AISC 360 quality assurance inspections. Replacing the IBC provisions with this reference is similar to the reference to AISC 341 for steel seismic systems.

Assembly Action:

S122-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

REQUIRED VERIFICATION AND INSPECTION OF CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION					
VERIFICATION AND INSPECTION	CONTIN- UOUS PE	RIODI C	REFERENCED STANDARD [®]	IBC REFERENCE	
 Inspection of anchors post-installed in hardened concrete members and designed in accordance with Section 1912.^b 	<u></u> +×	<u>-×</u>	ACI 318; 3.8.6, 8.1.3, 21.2.8	1912.1	
5. Inspection of anchors post-installed in hardened concrete members and qualified for installation through Section 104.11	Note b	Note b			

TABLE 1704.4

b. Special inspection of anchors qualified for installation through Section 104.11 shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements specified in the report of qualification, such as an Evaluation Report issued by ICC ES. Specific requirements for special inspection shall be included in the research report for the anchor issued by an approved source in accordance with ACI 355.2 or other qualification procedures. Where specific requirements are not provided, special inspection requirements shall be specified by the registered design professional and shall be approved by the building official prior to the commencement of the work.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: Agreement with the proponent's reason which indicates the proposal adjusts the special inspection of concrete anchors for consistency with the access provided to perform the required verifications. The modification adjusts the wording in item 4 to more closely match the current wording and revises footnote b to more appropriately refer to research reports.

Assembly Action:

S123-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Replacement of the IBC special inspection provisions with a direct reference to the MSJC code and specification is consistent with the use of other referenced material standards.

Assembly Action:

S124-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based on the historical performance of light-frame construction of wood and cold-formed steel, the proposed changes in special inspections were too substantial to make without better substantiation by the proponent. There was nothing in the way of case studies, calculation or rational analysis offered to the committee. Additionally the proponent's rather extensive floor modification would indicate that this proposal needs work before it can be approved. Clarification of inspection for prefabricated structural assemblies and components may be necessary but these need to be clearer so that it can be implemented both with building inspectors and third party inspectors. Since the proposal is getting into new territory, it would be preferable to treat wood and cold-formed steel separately so they can be discussed and voted on individually.

Assembly Action:

S125-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal would reduce the required inspection and testing of compacted fill. The proponent's reason does not provide adequate justification to support this change.

Assembly Action:

S126-09/10

This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety code development committee.

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

Analysis: Review of proposed new standards ASTM E 2174 and ASTM E 2393 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standards comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this change to be consistent with actions they took on S127 and S128-09/10.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

S127-09/10

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

This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety code development committee.

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

Analysis: Review of proposed new standards ASTM E 2174 and ASTM E 2393 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standards comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1704.15 Fire-resistant penetrations and joints. In buildings assigned an Occupancy Category of III or IV in accordance with Section 1604.5, special inspections for through penetrations, membrane penetration firestops, fire resistant joint systems, and perimeter fire barrier systems of the types specified in tested and listed in accordance with Sections 713.3.1.2, 713.4.1.2, 714.3 and 714.4 shall be in accordance with Sections 1704.15.2.

1704.15.1 Penetration firestops. Inspections of penetration firestop systems of the types specified in tested and listed in accordance with Sections 713.3.1.2 and 713.4.1.2 shall be conducted by an approved inspection agency in accordance with ASTM E 2174.

1704.15.2 Fire-resistant joint systems. Inspection of fire resistant joint systems of the types specified in tested and listed in accordance with Sections 714.3 and 714.4 shall be conducted by an approved inspection agency in accordance with ASTM E 2393.

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that these installations were critical and that special inspections should be required for these installations in buildings assigned an Occupancy Category of III or IV. The modification more appropriately identifies the systems as those that are tested and listed.

Assembly Action:

None

S128-09/10

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

This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety code development committee.

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

Analysis: Review of proposed new standards ASTM E 2174 and ASTM E 2393 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standards comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1704.15 Fire-resistant penetrations and joints. In buildings having occupied floors located more than 75 feet (22860 mm) above the lowest level of fire department vehicle access, special inspections for through penetrations, membrane penetration firestops, fire resistant joint systems, and perimeter fire barrier systems of the types specified in tested and listed in accordance with Sections 713.3.1.2, 713.4.1.2, 714.3 and 714.4 shall be in accordance with Sections 1704.15.1 or 1704.15.2.

1704.15.1 Penetration firestops. Inspections of penetration firestop systems of the types specified in tested and listed in accordance with Sections 713.3.1.2 and 713.4.1.2 shall be conducted by an approved inspection agency in accordance with ASTM E 2174.

1704.15.2 Fire-resistant joint systems. Inspection of fire resistant joint systems of the types specified in tested and listed in accordance with Sections 714.3 and 714.4 shall be conducted by an approved inspection agency in accordance with ASTM E 2393.

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that these installations were critical and that special inspections should be required for these installations in buildings having occupied floors located more than 75 feet above the lowest level of fire department vehicle access. The modification more appropriately identifies the systems as those that are tested and listed.

Assembly Action:

S129-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This code change cleans up the statement of special inspection requirements by removing redundant text and correlating with the section requiring the special inspections.

Assembly Action:

S130-09/10

S131-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal removes suspended ceiling systems from the list on items requiring special inspections, since these inspections do not require the skill and knowledge that warrant the special inspections.

Assembly Action:

S132-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: This code change removes redundant text and clarifies the seismic and wind requirements in the statement of special inspections. Consistent with committee action on S129-09/10.

Assembly Action:

S133-09/10 Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This proposal corrects the terminology relating to special inspections for seismic resistance in order to clarify these requirements and correlate with the ASCE 7 standard.

Assembly Action:

S134-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change relocates the exception to special inspections for seismic resistance from the statement of special inspection section to a more appropriate location under Section 1707.1. It is consistent with the actions taken on S129 - 09/10 and S132 - 09/10.

Assembly Action:

S135-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

S136-09/10

Committee Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Modify the proposal as follows:

1707.2 Structural steel. Special inspection for structural steel shall be in accordance with the quality assurance plan requirements of AISC 341.

Exception: Special inspections of structural steel in structures assigned to Seismic Design Category C that are not specifically detailed for seismic resistance, with a response modification coefficient, R, of 3 or less, excluding cantilever column systems.

Committee Reason: This proposal removes an exception to special inspection of structural steel systems since the latest edition of AISC 341 now addresses the issue. The modification makes the reference to AISC 341 qualify assurance more general.

Assembly Action:

S137-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change removes conflicting and extraneous requirements related to testing for seismic resistance. This provides better alignment with the ASCE 7 seismic provisions.

Assembly Action:

S138-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1708.3 Structural steel. Testing for structural steel shall be in accordance with the quality assurance plan requirements of AISC 341.

Exception: Testing for structural steel in structures assigned to Seismic Design Category C that are not specifically detailed for seismic resistance, with a response modification coefficient, R, of 3 or less, excluding cantilever column systems.

Committee Reason: This proposal removes an exception to testing of structural steel systems since the latest edition of AISC 341, now addressed the issue. The modification makes the reference to AISC 341 quality assurance more general.

Assembly Action:

S139-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee prefers retaining the provisions allowing the registered design professional (RDP) or the building official to require structural observation.

Assembly Action:

S140-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There is not enough evidence to indicate that the current provision for testing and labeling exterior windows and doors is incorrect. There was no evidence presented to justify treating Group R occupancies differently.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

None

None

Approved as Modified

S141-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproved for same reasoning as S140 - 09/10.

Assembly Action:

S142-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change provides a needed reference to rolling doors in order to establish acceptance criteria.

Assembly Action:

S143-09/10

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 ANSI A250.13 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: There are concerns on the applicability of the proposed referenced standard to this portion of the IBC. There is also a question of who takes responsibility for the entire door assembly, when only the individual parts are tested by the standard.

Assembly Action:

S144-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There was concern with the proposed Section 1715.6 being located in the section on testing.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: This change clarifies that a tubular daylighting devices (TDDs) is a unit skylight. The TDD was added to the energy conservation part of the code.

Assembly Action:

S145-09/10

S146-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed exception in Chapter 18 would provide a loop hole for temporary structures, since manufacturers instructions would supercede Chapter 18. It is not tied to specific criteria and does not indicate that the building official should approve. There may be a need to address foundations for temporary

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Withdrawn by Proponent

Disapproved

None

None

Assembly Action:

PART II- IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The proposed exceptions for temporary structures in the IEBC are not appropriate in Chapter 12 which covers relocated buildings.

Assembly Action:

S147-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The current exception to geo-technical investigations is adequate, making the proposed exception redundant. It is not an appropriate location for addressing additions. It appears to address a problem occurring where jurisdictions are not adopting the IRC.

Assembly Action:

S148-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1803.5.12 Seismic Design Categories D through F. For structures assigned to Seismic Design Category D, E or F in accordance with Section 1613, the geotechnical investigation required by Section 1803.5.11 shall also include all of the following, as applicable:

- 1. The determination of dynamic seismic lateral earth pressures on foundation walls and retaining walls due to design earthquake ground motions.
- The potential for liquefaction and soil strength loss evaluated for site peak ground accelerations, earthquake magnitudes, and source characteristics consistent with the maximum considered earthquake ground motions. Peak ground acceleration shall be determined based on:
 - 2.1 A site-specific study-in accordance with Section 11.4.7 21.5 of ASCE 7; or
 - 2.2 The maximum considered earthquake geometric mean peak ground acceleration adjusted for site class in accordance with Section 11.8.3 of ASCE 7.
- 3. An assessment of potential consequences of liquefaction and soil strength loss, including, but not limited to:
 - 3.1 Estimation of total and differential settlement;
 - 3.2 Lateral soil movement;
 - 3.3 Lateral soil loads on foundations:
 - 3.4 Reduction in foundation soil-bearing capacity and lateral soil reaction;
 - 3.5 Soil downdrag and reduction in axial and lateral soil reaction for pile foundations;
 - 3.6 Increases in soil lateral pressures on retaining walls; and
 - 3.7 Flotation of buried structures.
- 4. Discussion of mitigation measures such as, but not limited to:
 - 4.1 Selection of appropriate foundation type and depths;
 - 4.2 Selection of appropriate structural systems to accommodate anticipated displacements and forces:
 - 4.3 Ground stabilization; or
 - 4.4 Any combination of these measures and how they shall be considered in the design of the structure.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Reason: These changes in the geo-technical investigation requirements that are based on seismic design category provide wording that is better correlated with ASCE 7 earthquake load provisions. The modification reflects further correlation based on changes made in process of updating ASCE 7

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

S149-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change relieves the geo-technical requirement for determination of lateral earth pressure on small structures as well as retaining walls that support backfill no more than 12 feet in height. It is the height of the backfill that imposes the inertial force. This is based on a California Building Code requirement that recognizes earthquake is not controlling loading on these structures.

Assembly Action:

S150-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproved because code change S148 - 09/10 was preferred.

Assembly Action:

S151-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The proposed revision to the embedment depth limit on pole foundations was not adequately substantiated by the proponent.

Assembly Action:

S152-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The proposed explanation of units is not needed as is the case for all dimensionally consistent equations throughout the code.

Assembly Action:

S153-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed limit on embedment depth is not consistent with the original basis of the pole foundation formula.

Assembly Action:

S154-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the committee's action on S162-09/10.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

S155-09/10

Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

S156-09/10

capacity. Load tests and analysis are not equivalent.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change allows a reasonable approach for determining uplift capacity of pile groups, by accounting for the shear resistance of the soil block. The current limit is overly conservative.

Committee Rea son: No evidence was provided to validate the proposed Factor of Safety on pile uplift

Assembly Action:

S157-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed method of verifying pile integrity is currently permitted if it is needed, but there is a concern with the proprietary nature a product that would become mandatory for all piles if it were approved.

Assembly Action:

S158-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: It is not necessary to require automated monitoring of all cast-in-place deep foundation elements. Other acceptable methods could be permitted and this is a contractor's means and methods decision.

Assembly Action:

S159-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: see S158 - 09/10.

Assembly Action:

S160-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal removes provisions in Chapter 19 that are merely a list of references to the ACI 318 standard and are not useful in their current form.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

S161-09/10

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 ASTM E 2634 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change adds a material reference standard for flat wall insulating concrete form systems. These forms are part of the completed construction.

Assembly Action:

S162-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL **Committee Action:**

Committee Rea son: Removing specific ACI 318 section references in favor of nebulous references would present problems. The lack of specific references in Table 1704.4 would confuse inspectors.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: This change would remove reference to specific areas of the referenced standard. The updated reference ACI-318 is not ready at this time. This is consistent with the IBC.

Assembly Action:

S163-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee prefers retaining specific section references to ACI 318, consistent with actions on S162 - 09/10 and S110 - 09/10.

Assembly Action:

S164-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The current requirements on intermediate precast structural wall systems are clear, making this proposal unnecessary.

Assembly Action:

S165-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change adds requirements for wall pier detailing that are warranted as an ACI 318 modification.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

S166-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There are concerns with revising the exemption to now apply to Group U. In addition these proposed changes would be inconsistent with the NEHRP Provisions.

Assembly Action:

S167-09/10

None

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1908.1.9 ACI 318, Section D.3.3. Modify ACI 318, Sections D.3.3.1, D3.3.4 and D3.3.5, and add Section D.3.3.7 to read as follows:

D.3.3.1 — The provisions of Appendix D do not apply to the design of anchors in plastic hinge zones of concrete structures under earthquake forces or to anchors that meet the requirements of Section D.3.3.7.

D.3.3.4 – Anchors shall be designed to be governed by the steel strength of a ductile steel element as determined in accordance with D.5.1 and D.6.1, unless either D.3.3.5 or D.3.3.6 is satisfied.

Exceptions:

1. Anchors in concrete designed to support nonstructural components in accordance with ASCE 7 Section 13.4.2 need not satisfy Section D.3.3.4.

2 1. Anchors designed to resist wall out-of-plane forces with design strengths equal to or greater than the force determined in accordance with ASCE 7 Equation 12.11-1 or 12.14-10 need not satisfy Section D.3.3.4.

2. In light-frame wood structure bearing or non-bearing walls, for the design of anchors used to attach wood sill plates to foundations or foundation stem walls, it shall be permitted to take the allowable in-plane shear strength of the anchors in accordance with Section 2305.1.2 of the International Building Code.

D.3.3.5 – Instead of D.3.3.4, the attachment that the anchor is connecting to the structure shall be designed so that the attachment will undergo ductile yielding at a force level corresponding to anchor forces no greater than the design strength of anchors specified in D.3.3.3.

Exceptions:

1. Anchors in concrete designed to support nonstructural components in accordance with ASCE 7 Section 13.4.2 need not satisfy Section D.3.3.5.

2. Anchors designed to resist wall out-of-plane forces with design strengths equal to or greater than the force determined in accordance with ASCE 7 Equation 12.11-1 or 12.14-10 need not satisfy Section D.3.3.5.

D.3.3.7 – For anchors installed in wood sill plates a maximum of 2 ½ inches (38 mm) in net thickness, the allowable lateral design values for shear in the cast-in-place anchor, parallel to the grain of the wood sill plate, are permitted to be determined in accordance with Section 2305 of the *International Building Code*, provided the anchor installation complies with all of the following:

2305.1.2 Sill plate anchor bolts. For sill plates of 2x or 3x nominal thickness, the allowable lateral design for shear parallel to the grain of sill plate anchor bolts is permitted to be determined using the lateral design value for a bolt attaching a wood sill plate to concrete, as specified in AF&PA NDS Table 11E, provide the anchor bolts comply with all of the following:

- 1. <u>The maximum anchor nominal diameter is 5/8 inches (16 mm);</u>
 - Anchors are embedded into concrete a minimum of 7 inches (178 mm);

3. Anchors are located a minimum of <u>2 ¼ anchor diameters</u> <u>1-3/4 inches (45 mm)</u> from the edge of the concrete parallel to the length of the wood sill plate; and

4. Anchors are located a minimum of 15 anchor diameters from the edge of the concrete perpendicular to the length of the wood sill plate.

Committee Reason: This proposal revises the determination of anchor bolt capacity under Appendix D of ACI 318, in recognition that both lab tests and field experience show that failure of the wood sill plate controls the capacity. In these instances there is no need for laborious concrete strength calculations. The modification removes an exception that is no longer needed with the updates in the next edition of the ASCE 7 Standard. It also reformats the proposal as new Exception 3 and places the sill plate anchor details in new Section 2305.1.2. This also combines and addresses issues raised by code changes S170- 09/10 and S209 – 09/10.

Assembly Action:

2.

S168-09/10

Committee Action:

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard TMS 403 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3(1) Readily available.

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL **Committee Action:**

will provide a prescriptive alternative to the empirical design method for masonry.

Assembly Action:

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

inch and considering typical construction tolerances, some anchor bolts could be installed awfully close to the edge of the concrete. Approval could possibly conflict with some portions of S167-09/10. The proponent is encouraged to provide better justification in the public comment phase. Assembly Action: None

Committee Reason: With the liberalization of concrete anchorage approved in S167-09/10 a significant portion of problems posed in light-frame construction has been addressed. There is concern about the proposed extrapolation of data from testing that is ongoing. When dealing with an edge distance of only a little over an

S169-09/10 **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposed requirement for patio cover slab/foundations does not address supporting soil conditions.

Assembly Action:

S170-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with committee's action on S167 - 09/10.

Assembly Action:

S171-09/10

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 :

Committee Reason: The addition of TMS 403 as a referenced standard is valuable to the masonry industry. It

Committee Rea son: This is a much needed change. The proposed new standard provides a simplified method for the design of masonry construction. The new reference standard is not yet complete but is a consensus draft and must be ready by Final Action.

Assembly Action: S172-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal clarifies the required information on construction documents in order to provide flexibility for designers since the exact location of conduits, pipes and sleeves isn't always known.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None
S173-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change removes Chapter 21 definitions that are no longer used in the code.

Assembly Action:

S174-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal updates the definitions in Chapter 21 for consistency with the referenced material standard for masonry.

Assembly Action:

S175-09/10

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 ASTM C 1364 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change adds a material standard for architectural cast stone, a product that is currently in use.

Assembly Action:

S176-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The proposed clarification regarding load combinations and masonry allowable stress increases is not needed.

Assembly Action:

S177-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change adds flexibility to the determination of lap splice length, allowing the MSJC requirement in addition to the IBC approach.

Assembly Action:

S178-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with action on S162 - 09/10.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

198

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

S179-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed correlation of wind speed triggers with the updated provisions approved in code change S84-09/10 need to be consistent with the wind terminology.

Assembly Action:

S180-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change in terminology for masonry chimneys brings consistency with the remainder of Chapter 21 as well as the IRC.

Assembly Action:

S181-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal removes an unnecessary restriction on chimney fireblocking.

Assembly Action:

S182-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: This code change provides needed requirements for chimney caps and rain caps.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: This change adds new language to address chimney caps and rain caps. The added language is consistent with the reference standards for flue liners.

Assembly Action:

S183-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal requires non water soluble refractor mortar for clay flue liners in order to reduce the possibility of washout from rain.

Assembly Action:

S184-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

Modify the proposal as follows:

2204.2.1 Anchor rods. Anchor rods shall be set in accordance with the construction documents. The protrusion of the threaded ends through the connected material shall fully engage the threads of the nuts, but shall not be greater than the length of the threads on the bolts.

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

199

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This code change removes extraneous text for the provision for anchor rods. The modification retains the word "fully" so that the required thread protrusion will be clear.

Assembly Action:

S185-09/10

S186-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

2208.1 Storage racks. The design, testing and utilization of industrial steel storage racks made of cold-formed or hot-rolled steel structural members, shall be in accordance with the RMI/ANSI MH 16.1. Where required by ASCE 7, the seismic design of storage racks shall be in accordance with the additional provisions of Section 15.5.3 of ASCE 7.

Committee Reason: This proposal will correlate the reference to the RMI rack standard with the earthquake load requirements of ASCE 7. The modification removes a word that would cause confusion.

Assembly Action:

S187-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved at the request of the proponent while work continues on the next edition of the RMI Steel Rack Standard.

Assembly Action:

S188-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code removes the ASCE 3 standard for composite slab construction. The standard is out of print and availability is a problem. There are also some concerns such as not addressing serviceability.

Assembly Action:

S189-09/10

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 AISI S110 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

2209.3.1 AISI S110, Section D1. Modify Section D1 by revising to read as follows. D1 Cold-Formed Steel Special Bolted Moment Frames (CFS-SBMF)

Cold-formed steel-special bolted moment frames (CFS-SBMF) systems shall withstand significant inelastic deformations through friction and bearing at their bolted connections. Beams, columns, and connections shall satisfy the requirements in this section. CFS-SBMF systems shall be limited to one-story structures, no greater than 35 feet in height, without column splices and satisfying the requirements in this section. The CFS-SBMF shall engage all columns supporting the roof or floor above. The single size beam and single size column with the same bolted moment connection detail shall be used for each frame. The frame is to shall be supported on a level floor or foundation.

2209.3.3 AISI S110, Section D1.2.1. Modify Section D1.2.1 by revising to read as follows. **D1.2.1 Beam Limitations**

Approved as Modified

Withdrawn by Proponent

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

In addition to the requirements of Section D1.2.3, beams in CFS-SBMF systems shall be ASTM A653 galvanized 55 ksi (374 MPa) yield stress cold-formed steel C-sections members with lips, and designed in accordance with Chapter C of AISI S100. The beams shall have a minimum design thickness of 0.105 inches (2.67 mm). The beam depth shall be not less than 12 in (305 mm) or greater than 20 in (508 mm). The flat depth-to-thickness ratio of the web shall

not exceed 6.18 $\sqrt{E/F_v}$.

D1.2.1.1 Single C-Section Beam Limitations

In addition to the requirements of Section D1.2.1, when single C-section beams are used, torsional effects shall be accounted for in the design.

2209.3.6 AISI S110, Section D1.5. Add a new Section D1.5 as follows.

D1.5 Period Determination

The fundamental period of the structure, T, in the direction under consideration shall be established in accordance with the applicable building code using the structural properties and deformational characteristics of the resisting elements in a properly substantiated analysis. Use of the approximate building period, $T_{\rm e}$, as an alternative fundamental period shall not be permitted.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Reason: This proposal adds requirements for cold-formed steel special bolted moment frames by reference to AISI S110. The modification coordinates the AISI S110 modifications for consistency with the updated earthquake load provisions in ASCE 7.

Assembly Action:

S190-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Adding the ACI 318 reference under the composite slab provision is inappropriate and would create a conflict with ACI 318.

Assembly Action:

S191-09/10

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 SDI-C1.0 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed reference standard, SDI-C1.0 is still in need of work. Questions have been raised on its treatment of serviceability and wheel loads. The need to exclude fiber reinforcement should be clarified.

Assembly Action:

S192-09/10

S193-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Consistent with the committee's action on S188 - 09/10.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

S194-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change removes a modification of SDI -NC1.0 that is unnecessary.

Assembly Action:

S195-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal relocates the definition of naturally durable wood to a more appropriate location in Chapter 2.

Assembly Action: S196-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The added definitions of structural composite lumber types will clear up some confusion with their use. The definitions include some requirements and this should be corrected in the public comment phase.

Assembly Action:

S197-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee R eason: The proposed definition of "post-frame building system" does not relate to any requirements in the code. It contains vague language and is more of a description than a definition.

Assembly Action:

S198-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

2303.1.1.2 End-jointed lumber. Approved end-jointed lumber is permitted to be used interchangeably with solid-sawn members of the same species and grade. End-jointed lumber used in an assembly required elsewhere in this code to have a fire resistance rating shall have the designation "Heat Resistant Adhesive" or "HRA" included in its grade mark.

(Portions of the proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Reason: This code change clarifies requirements for sawn lumber by separating the requirements for a certificate of inspection and end-jointed lumber. It also provides an important clarification relating to grade marks. The modification removes extraneous wording from the proposal that is of no value.

Assembly Action:

S199-09/10

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 APA PRP 210 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

None

202

Approved as Modified

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: It is important to update the code to include a new industry standard for performancerated wood siding.

PART II- IRC B/E **Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change provides a new standard for wood structural panel siding. The change is consistent with the IBC.

Assembly Action:

Assembly Action:

S200-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: This proposal adds terminology that coordinates the IBC with the wood structure panel product standards. A public comment is in order to include a definition of the new term "Performance Class".

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: This change updates the code for identification requirements for wood structural panels to be consistent with the latest versions of DOC PS1 and DOC PS2. This change is consistent with the IBC.

Assembly Action:

S201-09/10

Assembly Action:

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal is not editorial as the reason suggests. If accepted, it would no longer allow fire-retardant treated wood products that currently comply with the code. If there are problems, they would appear to accent the need for education. Acceptability should be defined by the products performance not the means or method of manufacture.

PART II- IRC B/E **Committee Action:** Committee Reason: The proposal would have the effect of being exclusionary. It would provide language that

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

S202-09/10

Committee Reason: Stating that other nailing patterns are permitted is not necessary, since one can always provide an analysis and gain approval of an alternative. Also pre-drilling holes is a standard practice in wood, but permitting pre-drilling without limits opens the door for potential abuse.

appears to eliminate some products in the market. This proposal would hinder development of new products.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

None

S203-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal adds clarity to the requirements for fasteners in fire-retardant treated wood by stating that the nuts and washers are treated in the same manner as the fastener.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change provides clarity that the nuts and washers are to be included. Also, the change adds a needed exception to allow plain carbon steel fasteners when borates are used in dry locations. This is consistent with the IBC.

Assembly Action: None

S204-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee R eason: No test data was presented that would support the proposal to allow mechanical galvanizing for wood screws and lag screws.

Assembly Action:

S205-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The need for this requirement for termite protection is unclear, since Section 2304.11.2.1 already covers wood within 18 inches of exposed earth.

Assembly Action:

S206-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Chapter 23 is not the appropriate place for a requirement to placard buildings. Generally labeling is not a good idea and this may not solve the purported problem. A fire department should generally be aware of hazards that are present. There is no explanation why this should apply to "pre-fabricated" trusses only.

Assembly Action:

S207-09/10

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 ASTM D 7032 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: Wood plastic composite materials are currently qualified by evaluation reports and including them in the code is not appropriate at this time. It is important to be able to verify design capacities. The proposed term, structural capacities, may not correlate with the proposed reference standard.

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Rea son: The labeling requirements are unclear and present a problem for inspectors after installation. There are no directions for how to label and the location of the label. The labeling should be similar to sheathing that allows the inspector to visibly, easily and readily verify that the proper material is installed.

Assembly Action:

S208-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

2306.3 Wood-frame shear walls. Wood-frame shear walls shall be designed and constructed in accordance with AF&PA SDPWS. Where panels are fastened to framing members with staples, requirements and limitations of AF&PA SDPWS shall be met and the allowable shear values set forth in Table 2306.3(1), 2306.3(2) or 2306.3(3) shall be permitted. The allowable shear values in Tables 2306.3(1) and 2306.3(2) are permitted to be increased 40 percent for wind design. Panels complying with ANSI/APA PRP-210 shall be permitted to use design values for Plywood Siding in the AF&PA SDPWS.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Re ason: The primary design document for lateral load design of wood systems is the AF&PA SDPWS and the removal of duplicate IBC requirements will assure its use. This makes the remaining code requirements more apparent and easier to understand. The modification provides additional correlation based on the approval of S199 - 09/10.

Assembly Action:

S209-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproved at the proponent's request because the modified version of S167 - 09/10 that was accepted has addressed sill plate anchorage.

Assembly Action:

S210-09/10

Committee Action:

CASE 1

ASE

Framina Blocking

Replace Table 2306.2.1(1) illustration with the following:

if used

Continuous panel joints

Blocking typical

Committee Reason: This proposal provides clarification to the figures for diaphragm cases referred to in the allowable load table. The modification corrects an error in the original submittal.

CASE 2

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

CASE 6 Framing typical Diaphragm boundar Continuous panel joints

None

None

None

S211-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

2308.3.2.2 Top plate connection. Where joists and/or rafters are used, braced wall line top plates shall be fastened to joists, rafters, rimboards or full-depth blocking above in accordance with Table 2304.9.1, Items 11, 12, 15 or 19 as applicable based on the orientation of the joists or rafters to the braced wall line. Blocking at joists with walls above shall be a minimum of 2 inches (51 mm) nominal in thickness and shall be equal to the depth of the joist or rafter at the braced wall line and shall be fastened to the braced wall line top plate as specified in Table 2304.9.1, Item 11. Exception: Blocking at rafters need not be full depth when there are no braced wall lines above but shall extend to within 2 inches (51 mm) from the roof sheathing above. Blocking shall be a minimum of 2 inches (51 mm) nominal in thickness and shall be fastened to the braced wall line top plate as specified in Table 2304.9.1, Item 11.

At exterior gable end walls braced wall panel sheathing in the top story shall be extended and fastened to roof framing where the spacing between parallel exterior braced wall lines is greater than 50 feet (15240 mm).

Where roof trusses are used and are installed perpendicular to an exterior braced wall line, lateral forces shall be transferred from the roof diaphragm to the braced wall by blocking of the ends of the trusses or by other approved methods providing equivalent lateral force transfer. Blocking shall be minimum 2 inch (51 mm) nominal thickness and equal to the depth of the truss at the wall line and shall be fastened to the braced wall line top plate as specified in Table 2304.9.1, Item 11

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Reason: This code change clarifies what's required for braced wall line connections by breaking out the requirements for top plate and bottom plate. This is often difficult to accommodate while addressing energy code and ventilation issues. There are unresolved issues with the 2 inch gap allowed at rafters, but it is considered acceptable. The modification cleans up the proposed wording and provides an acceptable starting point for getting these clarifications into the code.

Assembly Action:

S212-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed prescriptive requirements for braced wall panel top plate connections are not exactly like those in the IRC and there are different triggers. There were concerns expressed with the stability of the remote blocking option.

Assembly Action: S213-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal did not adequately justify reducing stud spacing from 28 to 24 inches. There may be some 28 inch applications currently that would be affected. The remainder of the proposal is acceptable but the proponent should consider an adjustment in a public comment.

Assembly Action:

S214-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed revisions to cripple wall are poorly worded and would not make the code any clearer.

Assembly Action:

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

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Committee Rea son: This proposal needs additional information to define "method to prevent studs from splitting". The added reference sections may create potential problems with other sections of the code in the previously approved RB105-09/10 and RB106-09/10.

Assembly Action:

S215-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change makes the required amount of wall bracing clearer and more rational by showing the requirement as a percentage of the wall length.

Assembly Action:

S216-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This proposal provides needed instructions on how to allow alternate wall bracing in buildings classified as Seismic Design Category D or E. It is consistent with the intent of the wall bracing provisions.

Assembly Action:

S217-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The code has a test standard and labeling requirement for safety glazing. If the glazing meets these code criteria, it should be permitted.

Assembly Action:

S218-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL **Committee Action:**

Modify the proposal as follows:

2406.4.2 Glazing adjacent doors. Glazing in an individual fixed or operable panel adjacent to a door where the nearest vertical edge of the glazing is within a 24-inch (610 mm) arc of either vertical edge of the door in a closed position and where the bottom exposed edge of the glazing is less than 60 inches (1524 mm) above the walking surface shall be considered a hazardous location.

Exceptions:

- Decorative glazing. 1.
- 2. When there is an intervening wall or other permanent barrier between the door and glazing.
- 3. Where access through the door is to a closet or storage area 3 feet (914 mm) or less in depth. Glazing in this application shall comply with Section 2406.4.3.
- Glazing in walls on the latch side of and perpendicular to the plane of the door in a closed 4. position in one- and two-family dwellings or within dwelling units in Group R-2.
- Glazing that is adjacent to the fixed panel of patio doors.

(Portions of the proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Rea son: This proposal provides a good reorganization of the hazardous locations for safety glazing. The modification removes an exception previously added to the IRC, but it is not appropriate for buildings that are constructed under the IBC.

Assembly Action:

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

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Committee Reason: This change provides clarity and re-organization. It improves the ease of use of the code by grouping the glazing adjacent to water requirement. The impact test tables may need to be revised to accommodate the renumber of sections.

Assembly Action:

S219-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change clarifies the code requirements for safety glazing by making the higher performance category the default.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: This is an appropriate change. This change makes the default to the higher standard and permits a lower one for specific applications.

Assembly Action:

S220-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: No technical justification was provided for the fastener and adhesive requirements that were proposed for installing mirrors.

Assembly Action:

S221-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There may be problems in Section 2407.1.1 with the safety factor and which load applies, but this proposal needs better substantiation. Removing the phrase "panels and their support system" is not justified.

Assembly Action:

S222-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change completes the update of the IBC to the consolidated material standard for gypsum wallboard.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Re ason: This change adds the proper reference standard for gypsum lath. Also, reference standards that are no longer available are removed from this section as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action:

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

S223-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The documentation provided in the proponent's reason indicated these gypsum backers are not appropriate in the IBC for shower areas.

Assembly Action:

S224-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change correlates the IBC reference to ASTM C 1325 with revisions made in the title of that standard.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: The change corrects the terminology to be consistent with the referenced ASTM C 1325.

Assembly Action:

S225-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

2510.6 Water-resistive barriers. Water-resistive barriers shall be installed as required in Section 1404.2 and, where applied over wood-based sheathing, shall include a water-resistive vapor-permeable barrier with a performance at least equivalent to two layers of Grade D paper. The individual layers shall be installed independently such that each layer is installed ship lapped fashion provides a separate continuous plane and any flashing (installed in accordance with Section 1405.4) intended to drain to the water-resistive barrier is directed between the layers.

Exception: Where the water-resistive barrier that is applied over wood-based sheathing has a water resistance equal to or greater than that of 60-minute Grade D paper and is separated from the stucco by an intervening, substantially nonwater-absorbing layer or drainage space.

Committee Reason: This proposal provides needed instruction for installation of water-resistive barriers. The modification further clarifies the installation of a two layer system.

Assembly Action:

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

Modify the proposal as follows:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

R703.6.3 Water-resistive barriers. Water-resistive barriers shall be installed as required in Section R703.2 and, where applied over wood-based sheathing, shall include a water-resistive vapor-permeable barrier with a performance at least equivalent to two layers of Grade D paper. The individual layers shall be installed independently such that each layer is installed ship lapped fashion provides a separate continuous plane and any flashing (installed in accordance with Section R703.8) intended to drain to the water-resistive barrier is directed between the layers.

Exception: Where the water-resistive barrier that is applied over wood-based sheathing has a water resistance equal to or greater than that of 60 minute Grade D paper and is separated from the stucco by an intervening, substantially nonwater-absorbing layer or designed drainage space.

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: This change clarifies and improves the directions for installation of the 2 layer system for the water-resistive barrier. This improvement will be a benefit to the building official and the builder. The modification clarifies that each layer is independent and removes the term "ship lapped fashion".

Assembly Action:

S226-09/10

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

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1505.2 Class A roof assemblies. Class A roof assemblies are those that are effective against severe fire test exposure. Class A roof assemblies and roof coverings shall be listed and identified as Class A by any approved testing agency. Class A roof assemblies shall be permitted for use in buildings or structures of all types of

Excepti ons:

construction.

- 1. Class A roof assemblies include those with coverings of brick, masonry and exposed concrete roof deck.
- 2. Class A roof assemblies also include ferrous or copper shingles or sheets, metal sheets and shingles, clay or concrete roof tile, or slate installed on non-combustible decks or ferrous, copper or metal sheets installed without a roof deck on noncombustible framing.
- Class A roof assemblies include <u>minimum 16 oz/ft²</u> copper sheets installed over combustible decks.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that copper sheets over combustible decking was appropriate for a prescribed class A roof assembly based on the testing submitted with the proposal. The modification includes the necessary minimum copper sheet specifications that are tied to the testing performed.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC B/E Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Copper sheets installed on a combustible deck are Class A and was inadvertently omitted last code change cycle as stated in the proponent's published reason. This change brings this roof covering back into the code as Class A and exempt from testing.

Assembly Action:

S227-09/10

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

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 AMCA 540 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change adds a needed impact standard for testing louvers.

Assembly Action:

S228-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

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

Approved as Modified

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

S229-09/10

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

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 SMA MH28.3 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3(1) Readily available.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The code change includes a definition of the term "industrial steel work platform" which is unclear and is more of a description. It also is included within a provision rather than being listed separately in a definitions section. The proposed reference standard does not appear to allow anything that's not already in the code.

Assembly Action:

S230-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

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

S231-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal updates the code requirements for composite steel and concrete structures and correlates their seismic design coefficients with the earthquake load requirements in the latest edition of the ASCE 7 standard.

Assembly Action:

S232-09/10

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

S233-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change provides correlation with the seismic design requirements for structural steel in the latest edition of ASCE 7.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Withdrawn by Proponent

None

None

Disapproved

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL EXISTING BUILDING CODE COMMITTEE

EXISTING BUILDING CODE COMMITTEE

Jonathan Siu, PE, SE - Chair

Principal Engineer/Building Official City of Seattle, Department of Planning & Development Seattle, WA

Hal Key, PE - Vice Chair

Fire Protection Engineer Mesa Fire Department Mesa, AZ

Raymond Andrews, RA

Assistant Director for Code Development New York State-Department of State Albany, NY

James Bartl

Director of Code Enforcement Mecklenburg County Government Charlotte, NC

Ronald Brendel, PE

Senior Plan Review Engineer/Code Dev. Specialist City of Saint Louis Saint Louis, MO

John Catlett, CPCA, CBO, MCP

Director, Office of Building and Fire Code Administration City of Alexandria Fire Department Buildling & Fire Adminstration Alexandria, VA

William Clayton, CBCO

Building Codes Administrator City of Lakewood Lakewood, CO

Michael DeVore

Fire Protection Specialist State Farm Insurance Bloomington, IL

Matt Dobson

Rep: National Association of Home Builders Director Vinyl Siding Institute Burlington, NC

Joseph Fleming

Assistant Fire Chief Broadview Heights Fire Dept. Brecksville, OH

Jeff Hugo

Manager of Codes National Fire Sprinkler Association Essexville, MI

Steven McDaniel, CPCA

Building Official City of Corning Corning, NY

Jeri L. S. Morey, AIA

Owner - Architect Jeri L. S. Morey Corpus Christi, TX

Marc Sampson

Fire Protection Engineer Longmont Fire Department Longmont, CO

Howard Zee, SE

Structural Engineer City & County of San Francisco Department of Building Inspection San Francisco, CA

Staff Secretariat:

Beth Tubbs, PE Senior Staff Engineer Codes and Standards Development

INTERNATIONAL EXISTING BUILDING CODE COMMITTEE **HEARING RESULTS**

EB1-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee felt that the issues being removed from Chapter one were not administrative in nature and were often lost when jurisdictions remove Chapter 1 during the adoption process. The issues dealt with in these sections were felt to be critical and need to be addressed in their own chapter. This approach was preferred over that proposed in EB2-09/10. There was some concern that the compliance method addressed currently in Section 101.5 through 101.5.3 should remain in chapter 1 as those requirements are more administrative in nature in terms of describing how the code works.

Assembly Action:

EB2-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved in favor of the approach provided in EB1-09/10. More specifically there were some concerns with the mixing of the different methods of compliance within the same chapter. There was also a concern expressed that the reason statement did not provide enough detail describing the revision proposed and how the chapter would be applied.

Assembly Action:

EB3-09/10

Both parts of this code change proposal were heard by the IBC Structural Code **Development Committee**

PART I- IEBC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: This proposal provides an editorial change to the definition of dangerous in the IEBC that corrects poor grammar.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IBC GENERAL **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: This proposal provides an editorial change to the definition of dangerous in the IBC that corrects poor grammar.

Assembly Action:

EB4-09/10

Both parts of this code change proposal were heard by the IBC Structural Code **Development Committee**

PART I- IEBC **Committee Action:**

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the current 20 percent threshold on lateral load capacity is too low a level to be considered a highly damaged building and thus trigger an upgrade. This code change increases the trigger for substantial structural damage to 33 percent of the lateral load capacity which is

213

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

None

considered a more reasonable threshold to require an upgrade in accordance with the IBC or IEBC Appendix.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the current 20 percent threshold on lateral load capacity is low and not as great a distinction. This code change increases the trigger for substantial structural damage to 33 percent of the lateral load capacity which is considered a more reasonable threshold to require an upgrade of a damaged building.

Assembly Action:

EB5-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it provides a clarification to repairs of historic buildings by removing circular logic.

Assembly Action:

EB6-09/10

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

PART I- IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This code change provides a better rationale in the IEBC under which to evaluate buildings that have sustained substantial structural damage.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change provides a better rationale in the IBC under which to evaluate buildings that have sustained substantial structural damage.

Assembly Action:

EB7-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The disapproval is consistent with the committee's action on G195-09/10, because it would introduce uneven requirements for repairs of earthquake damaged buildings. The Instrument Intensity VII measure may be an appropriate trigger for higher seismic areas. How the Instrument Intensity trigger would work with older buildings is not clear. It could create problems for an owner of a damaged building in making a determination on the correct Instrument Intensity after an earthquake.

Assembly Action:

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

EB8-09/10

Both parts of this code change proposal were heard by the IBC Structural Code **Development Committee**

PART I- IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The action taken is consistent with EB6-09/10. An exception in the IEBC for one- and twofamily dwellings that have substantial structural damage is reasonable due to their overall good performance and the fact the many are built prescriptively.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IBC GENERAL **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The action taken is consistent with EB6-09/10. An exception in the IBC for one- and twofamily dwellings that have substantial structural damage is reasonable due to their overall good performance and the fact the many are built prescriptively.

Assembly Action:

EB9-09/10

Both parts of this code change proposal were heard by the IBC Structural Code **Development Committee**

PART I- IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Adding an exception in the IEBC for buildings assigned to Seismic Design Category A, B or C is consistent with the committee's approval of EB6-09/10, Part I.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IBC GENERAL **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Adding an exception in the IBC for buildings assigned to Seismic Design Category A, B or C is consistent with the committee's approval of EB6-09/10, Part II.

Assembly Action:

EB10-09/10

All three parts of this code change proposal were heard by the IEBC Code **Development Committee**

PART I - IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that exception 8 to Section 912.4.1 was confusing in its reference back to 805.4 where it discussed changes of occupancy in a chapter about alterations. Further, Section 805.4 does not contain the current 20 percent cost limitation. Without this limit the costs will get unreasonable.

Assembly Action:

PART II – IBC GENERAL **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that as with EB10-09/10 Part I this proposal does not adequately address costs involved with providing accessibility to existing buildings

None

215

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

PART III – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based on the action the committee took on EB10-09/10 Part II, this would be an improper reference. Therefore, the committee recommended disapproval.

Assembly Action:

EB11-09/10

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

PART I - IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this proposal brings in retroactive requirements that may be very difficult for many jurisdictions to comply with. Further, providing accessibility provisions for new construction is unreasonable. Also, going beyond the requirements for Federal Housing is not justified for previously compliant buildings. Lastly, obtaining Safe Harbor with HUD should not be the only factor in providing technical requirements for this code.

Assembly Action:

PART II – IBC General Committee Action:

Committee Reason: As with EB11-09/10 Part I, the committee felt that this proposal brings in retroactive requirements that may be very difficult for many jurisdictions to comply with. Further, providing accessibility provisions for new construction is unreasonable. Also, going beyond the requirements for Federal Housing is not justified for previously compliant buildings. Lastly, obtaining Safe Harbor with HUD should not be the only factor in providing technical requirements for this code.

Assembly Action:

FR12_09/10

PART I- IEBC	
Committee Action:	Editorial
PART II-IBC GENERAL	
Committee Action:	Editorial
EB13-09/10	
PART I- IEBC Committee Action:	Editorial

PART II-IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Editorial

216

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

ved

EB14-09/10

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

PART I- IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it was felt that making the changes for Type B units were not that difficult. In addition this requirement would only apply for more substantial level III alterations and change of occupancy that involves level III alterations. There were some concerns expressed that approval of this proposal would exceed the fair housing requirements.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved Part II to be consistent with the action taken on Part I of the proposal.

Assembly Action:

EB15-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it appropriately relocates the triggered installation of wall anchors to level 3 alterations. Since roof anchors are typically installed from below, the current location under re-roofing does not make the anchor installation more convenient. In addition, the improved wording will facilitate the enforcement of this provision.

Assembly Action:

EB16-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it is a simple editorial change that clarifies the intended scope of the evaluation of diaphragms and connections in high wind regions. It corrects the inadvertent triggering of all connections that resist wind loads throughout the building.

Analysis: Should S84-09/10 ultimately be approved, wind speed triggers will be updated accordingly.

Assembly Action:

EB17-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change reduces the threshold for diaphragm and connections to 75 percent of the IBC wind load, before requiring an upgrade of these items to meet full code wind loads. There is a need to grandfather in existing buildings and this change allows the use of judgment for buildings that have been designed under previous codes.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

EB18-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change was disapproved for several reasons. First, it was felt that the IEBC already addressed the issue of energy efficiency through reference to the IECC in Section 607.1. Second, there was a concern that this requirement even as possibly modified would be more restrictive than the IECC for new construction. Finally, this proposal could have the affect of starting a laundry list of specific items which was felt to be inappropriate.

Assembly Action:

EB19-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it was felt to be a reasonable alternative in multi-tenant buildings that do not have sufficient water supply to support a sprinkler system. The requirement for smoke detection system within the corridors that activates the occupant notification system was felt to provide additional time for egress in non-sprinklered buildings.

Assembly Action:

EB20-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the proponents request since as currently written it would make Level II alterations more restrictive than Level III. In addition there was concern from the committee that these requirements would extend beyond the work area and be a disincentive to rehabilitating existing buildings.

Assembly Action:

EB21-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change was approved as it provides clarification of the wind and seismic load requirements that apply to level 2 and level 3 alterations.

Assembly Action:

EB22-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved based upon agreement with the proponent's reason which indicates it is appropriate to prohibit alterations that would create a structural irregularity, unless the entire structure complies with reduced IBC level seismic forces in Section 101.5.4.2.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

EB23-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee R eason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the proponents request and also due to questions committee members had related to water consumption and energy requirements.

Assembly Action:

EB24-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Extending the time-frame for structural alterations to five years was felt to be appropriate by the committee as it will encourage a long-term perspective and eliminate a concern that the current 12 month time-frame can allow manipulation of the system.

Assembly Action:

EB25-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This proposal was approved as it takes a logical step to require the bracing of unreinforced masonry parapets under level 3 alterations.

Assembly Action:

EB26-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon a request from the proponent and based upon the action taken on EB18-09/10.

Assembly Action:

EB27-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal provides clarity and consistency with the Group B ambulatory healthcare requirements in Chapter 4 of the IBC and was felt by the committee to be an appropriate revision. These types of facilities often get constructed within existing buildings.

Assembly Action:

EB28-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved since it was felt that this minor change in ventilation rate between business and retail store could be dealt with locally as a modification. In addition there was concern that people would build buildings with this exception in mind from the start and provide inferior ventilation.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

219

EB29-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The main reason this proposal was disapproved was concern that by inserting the concept of 'fire area' in this section that in many cases the entire building may require sprinklers. This would be contrary to the incremental approach to sprinklering buildings in the IEBC that was intended only to sprinkler the area where the change of occupancy actually occurs.

Assembly Action:

EB30-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal as it was felt that an approach similar to Section 1004.1.1 of the IBC would be a more appropriate. In addition there was concern that individual spaces within the buildings were not in all cases be addressed by the proposed language. There is a need to look at both the building and all individual "spaces" to ensure egress fits the occupant load in all portions of the building.

Assembly Action:

EB31-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There was an agreement that horizontal assemblies should be acknowledged as a valid alternative for decreasing building area but it was felt that an increase for sprinklers should be allowed.

Assembly Action:

EB32-09/10

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

PART I- IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal which would have only required accessible features when an alteration was required was disapproved as it was felt that a modification addressing an upper limit on cost at 20% instead of fully exempting changes of occupancy without alterations was more appropriate.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The code change was disapproved to be consistent with the action on Part I of the proposal.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

EB33-09/10

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

PART I- IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this requirement for an accessible toilet room was onerous and the intent of this section is to deal with the accessible path not accessible building features. In addition there was some concern that this requirement may actually result in more restrictive requirements than the International Plumbing Code for plumbing fixture counts in new buildings.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IBC GENERAL **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved Part II to be consistent with the action taken on Part I of the proposal.

Assembly Action:

EB34-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved to be consistent with the action taken on EB14. There was also some concern that where the exception is proposed is awkward as it has no relationship to the list related to the accessible path features. Some members of the committee were concerned that without this proposed exception the FHA would be exceeded.

Assembly Action:

EB35-09/10

Comm	ittoo	Action:
COMMIN	illee	ACTION.

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal as they felt the specific pointer for the IECC would make it clear to the code user, including the jurisdiction, that compliance with the IECC is required. It should be noted that there was some concern by committee members that Section 1001.1 already requires compliance with the IECC for additions.

Assembly Action:

B36-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change was approved as it provides a more precise definition of the lateral force-resisting system description that is required for the written report on a historic building.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

EB37-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal is a simple cleanup of Chapter 11 for consistency with defined terms. In order to clarify required repairs and structural requirements is important to properly differentiate between dangerous conditions and unsafe conditions.

Assembly Action:

EB38-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change provides consistency with wind and seismic upgrade triggers elsewhere in the code. The 10 percent threshold is more meaningful than the current 5 percent, particularly in light of the accuracy of the computed earthquake loads.

Assembly Action:

EB39-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as it has no exception for historic buildings that are moved or relocated into a different climate zone.

Assembly Action:

EB40-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved due to the desire to provide enhanced performance as it is not appropriate to strengthen Occupancy Category III and IV buildings using the seismic risk reduction procedure of Appendix Chapter A1.

Assembly Action:

EB41-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The proposal was approved as it eliminates two unnecessary definitions from the Appendix. It adds a needed definition of "flexible diaphragm" that is specific to this appendix.

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

222

Approved as Submitted

EB42-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

A110.2 Lateral forces on elements of structures. Parts and portions of a structure not covered in Sections A110.3 shall be analyzed and designed per the current building code, using force levels defined in Section A110.1.

Exceptions:

- Unreinforced masonry walls for which height-to-thickness ratios do not exceed ratios set forth in 1. Table A1-B need not be analyzed for out-of-plane loading. Unreinforced masonry walls that exceed the allowable h/t ratios of Table A1-B shall be braced according to Section A113.5.
- 2. Parapets complying with Section A113.6 need not be analyzed for out-ofplane loading.
- 3. Walls in buildings with flexible diaphragms shall Where walls are to be anchored to flexible floor and roof diaphragms, the anchorage shall be in accordance with Section A113.1.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it clarifies that wall anchorage in Exception 3 applies to flexible diaphragms. The modification differentiates between the treatment of flexible and rigid diaphragms, recognizing that both can occur in the same building.

Assembly Action:

EB43-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This proposal was approved as it deletes the reference to seismic design category, making the requirement for this retrofit appendix applicable to any building regardless of the seismic design category.

Assembly Action:

EB44-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it removes an unnecessary reference to historic buildings in the Appendix in order to avoid conflicts with Chapter 11.

Assembly Action:

EB45-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change was approved as it primarily makes editorial changes by relocating requirements for alternative design methods to the section of Appendix A3 where they belong.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

223

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Modified

EB46-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it replaces the phrase "approved foundation system" with more appropriate language that will be more enforceable.

Assembly Action:

EB47-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change was approved as it replaces the Appendix A3 figures with updated figures that reflect current design and construction practices in retrofits in addition to providing more alternatives.

Assembly Action:

EB48-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it provides an editorial clarification of the requirements for evaluating existing foundations. It will require the Registered Design Professional to confirm the diaphragm as part of the load path.

Assembly Action:

None

None

EB49-09/10

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

Analysis: ASTM A153/A153M-05 is currently referenced in the IBC. Also note that ASTM A 653/A 653M-08 is also currently referenced in the IBC.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

A304.2.6 New sill plates. Where new sill plates are used in conjunction with new foundations, they shall be minimum 2x nominal thickness and shall be preservative-treated wood or foundation grade redwood naturally durable wood permitted by the building code for similar applications, and shall be marked or branded by an approved agency. Nails in contact with preservative-treated wood shall be hot-dip galvanized <u>or other material permitted by the building code for similar applications</u>. Metal framing anchors in contact with preservative-treated wood shall be galvanized in accordance with ASTM A153 A 653 with a G185 coating.

ASTM A 153/A 153M-05

5 Standard Specification for Zinc Coating (Hot-Dip) on Iron and Steel Hardware

<u>A 653/A 653M-08</u> <u>Standard Specification for Steel Sheet, Zinc-Coated (Galvanized) or Zinc-Iron Alloy-</u> Coated (Galvannealed) by the Hot-Dip Process

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Reason: This code change was approved as it simplifies the section on foundations by replacing references to the building code in multiple subsections with a single cross reference in Section A304.2.3. The modification correlates the sill plate wording with the corresponding requirement in Chapter 23 of the IBC and for the same reason corrects the reference standard to ASTM A 653.

Assembly Action:

None

EB50-09/10

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

Unpublished Errata: Replace portions of proposal as follows:

A304.3.2 Placement of chemical anchors and expansion bolts. Chemical anchors or expansion bolts Anchors shall be placed within 12 inches (305 mm), but not less than 9 inches (229mm), from the ends of sill plates and shall be placed in the center of the stud space closest to the required spacing. New sill plates may be installed in pieces when where necessary because of existing conditions. For lengths of sill plate greater than 12 feet (3658mm), anchors or bolts shall be spaced along the sill plate as specified noted in Table A3-A. For other lengths of sill plate, see anchor placement shall be in accordance with Table A3-B. For lengths of sill plate less than 30 inches (762mm), a minimum of one anchor or bolt shall be installed.

Exception: Where physical obstructions such as fireplaces, plumbing or heating ducts interfere with the placement of an anchor or bolt, the anchor or bolt shall be placed as close to the obstruction as possible, but not less than 9 inches (229 mm) from the end of the plate. Center-to-center spacing of the anchors or bolts shall be reduced as necessary to provide the minimum total number of anchors required based on the full length of the wall. Center-to-center spacing shall not be less than 12 inches (305mm).

ADHESIVE CHEMICAL ANCHOR. An assembly consisting of a threaded rod, washer, nut, and chemical adhesive approved by the code building official for installation in existing concrete or masonry.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it updates and modernizes these foundation provisions. Changing the term "chemical anchors" to "adhesive anchors" is consistent with the concrete material standard, ACI 318 (Appendix D).

Assembly Action:

EB51-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change was approved as it clarifies that exterior cripple walls greater than 4 feet in height require an analysis by a registered design professional while others are permitted to use the prescriptive bracing method. It further clarifies the requirement to block horizontal joints in the sheathing.

Assembly Action:

EB52-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

A304.5.1 Nails. All nails specified in this chapter shall be common wire nails of the following diameters and lengths: 8d nails shall be 0.131" x 2 1/2". 10d nails shall be 0.148" x 3". 12d nails shall be 0.148" x 3 1/4". 16d nails shall be 0.162" x 3 1/2". Nails used to attach metal framing connectors directly to wood members need only be 1

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

1/2" long shall be as specified by the connector manufacturer in an approved report.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it provides clarity to Appendix A3 by adding specifics on nail style and dimensions. The modification will require nails used with metal framing connectors to be in accordance with an approved report. It was also suggested that the phrase "approved report" should be consistent with Section 104.11 wording.

Assembly Action:

EB53-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change was approved as it removes an unnecessary code provision on the phasing of construction. Construction can always be phased.

Assembly Action:

EB54-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as the updated figures make this Appendix chapter clearer. The updated Figures A3-1 thru A3-7 are improvements to the current figures.

Assembly Action:

EB55-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it cleans up the scope of Appendix A4 by removing extraneous language.

Assembly Action:

EB56-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This proposal was approved as it revises the definition of "Expansion anchor" in Appendix A4 to be consistent with ACI 318, Appendix D. This is also consistent with the committee's action on EB 50-09/10.

Assembly Action:

226

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

EB57-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: This code change was approved as it makes it clear that a modification required by Appendix A4 must be designed in accordance with the IBC.

Assembly Action:

EB58-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it more clearly explains the extent of the load path analysis of wood-framed structures.

Assembly Action:

EB59-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change was approved as it is an editorial reorganization that clarifies the scope of analysis of Appendix A4 by moving the analysis requirement for slopes steeper than one vertical to 3 horizontal from the general section.

Assembly Action:

EB60-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

A403.3 Design base shear and design parameters. The design base shear in a given direction shall be permitted to be 75 percent of the value required for similar new construction in accordance with the building code. The value of R used in the design of the strengthening of any story shall not exceed the lowest value of R used in the same direction at any story above. The system overstrength factor, Ω_0 , and the deflection amplification factor, C_d, shall not be less than the largest respective value corresponding to the R factor being used in the direction under consideration.

Exceptions:

- 1. For structures assigned to Seismic Design Category A or B, values of R, Ω_0 , and C_d shall be permitted to be based on the seismic force-resisting system being used to achieve the required strengthening.
- For structures assigned to Seismic Design Category C or D, values of R, Ω_0 , and C_d shall be 2. permitted to be based on the seismic force-resisting system being used to achieve the required strengthening, provided that when the strengthening is complete, the strengthened structure will not have an extreme weak story irregularity defined as Type 5b in ASCE 7 Table 12.3-2.
- For structures assigned to Seismic Design Category E, values of R, Ω_0 , and C_d shall be 3. permitted to be based on the seismic force-resisting system being used to achieve the required strengthening, provided that when the strengthening is complete, the strengthened structure will not have an extreme soft story, a weak story, or an extreme weak story irregularity defined,

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

respectively, as Types 1b, 5a, and 5b in ASCE 7 Table 12.3-2.

Committee Rea son: This proposal was approved as it provides direction on the selection of design coefficients for seismic force-resisting systems when using Appendix A4. The modification removes Seismic Design Category (SDC) A from Exception 1, since SDC A does not require these seismic force-resisting system coefficients.

Assembly Action:

EB61-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal as it provides clarity by dividing Section A403.6.1 into two parts, locating requirements for pole structures into a separate section. There is clearer wording provided that refers to geotechnical investigations for these structures.

Assembly Action:

EB62-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This code change was approved as it deletes Section A403.8.1 on cripple walls, removing unnecessary wording from the code.

Assembly Action:

EB63-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it deletes conflicting and unnecessary language from Section A403.11.2.1 provisions on drift limits.

Assembly Action:

EB64-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change was approved as it removes unnecessary requirements on shear walls that duplicate provisions in the IBC.

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

EB65-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it eliminates language that is contained in the concrete material standard and is redundant. The revision to the definition of "Expansion Anchor" made by code change EB56-09/10 is preferred and it should be retained.

Assembly Action:

EB66-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change makes editorial improvements to various provisions of Appendix A4 which were felt to by the committee to be appropriate. For new materials an appropriate reference to the IBC is introduced.

Assembly Action:

EB67-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This proposal was approved as it removes the provision for preloading hold down connectors, because it is not consistent with standard practice. There is no reason to require this in existing buildings when it is not a requirement for new buildings.

Assembly Action: EB68-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The approval of this proposal is consistent with the committee's action on EB53-09/10. Phasing of construction is always an option and there is no need to state it in the code text.

Assembly Action:

EB69-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

A406.3 Existing materials. The physical condition, strengths, and stiffnesses of existing building materials shall be taken into account in any analysis required by this chapter. The verification of existing materials conditions and their conformance to these requirements shall be made by physical observation, material testing

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

229

None

Approved as Modified

or record drawings as determined by the <u>registered</u> design professional subject to the approval of the code official.

(Portions of proposal not shown do not change)

Committee Re ason: This code change was approved as it removes information on horizontal wood diaphragms that conflicts with national standards in order to be more consistent with current design practice. The modification in Section A406.3 makes the reference to design professionals consistent with similar references in the building code.

Assembly Action:

None

EB70-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it updates the code requirements related to existing nails and plywood, removing inappropriate and archaic language while eliminating conflicts with other code sections.

Assembly Action:

None

EB71-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

C101.2 Scope. The provisions of this chapter are a prescriptive alternative for one- and two-family dwellings located where the wind speed according to Section 1609 of the IBC exceeds 100 mph to achieve compliance with Section 606.3 of the International Existing Building Code.

TABLE C102.1.2

Existing fasteners	Existing fastener spacing (edge or intermediate supports)	Wind speed <u>greater</u> <u>than 100 mph and</u> <u>less than or equal to</u> 110 mph or less supplemental fastening shall be no greater than	Wind speed greater than 110 mph supplemental fastening for interior zone ^c locations and edge zones not covered by column to right shall be no greater than	Edge zone ^a for wind speed greater than 120 mph and Exposure C, or Wind speed greater than 140 mph and Exposure B
Staples or 6d	Any	6" o.c. ^b	6" o.c. ^b	4" o.c ^b at panel edges and 4" o.c. ^b at intermediate supports.
8d clipped head or round head smooth shank	6" o.c. or less	None necessary	None necessary along edges of panels but 6" o.c. ^b at intermediate supports of panel	4" o.c ^a at panel edges and 4" o.c. ^a at intermediate supports.
8d clipped head or round head ring shank	6" o.c. or less	None necessary	None necessary	4" o.c ^a at panel edges and 4" o.c. ^a at intermediate supports.
8d clipped head or round head smooth shank	Greater than 6" o.c.	6" o.c. ^ª	6" o.c. ^a along panel edges and 6" o.c. ^b at intermediate supports of panel	4" o.c ^a at panel edges and 4" o.c. ^a at intermediate supports.
8d clipped head or round head ring shank	Greater than 6" o.c.	6" o.c. ^a	6" o.c. ^a	4" o.c ^a at panel edges and 4" o.c. ^a at intermediate supports.

a. Maximum spacing determined based on existing fasteners and supplemental fasteners.

- b. Maximum spacing determined based on supplemental fasteners only.
- Interior zone = sheathing that is not located within 4 feet of the perimeter edge of the roof or within 4 feet of c. each side of a ridge
- d. Edge zone = sheathing that is located within 4 feet of the perimeter edge of the roof and within 4 feet of each side of a ridge

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged.)

Committee Reason: This code change was approved as it provides good guidance for roof decks in high wind areas. The prescriptive solutions can eliminate the need for engineering in some cases. The modification clarifies the applicability based on wind speeds. The committee urges a public comment to coordinate these provisions with the updated wind requirements approved in S84-09/10.

Analysis: Should S84-09/10 ultimately be approved, wind speed triggers will be updated accordingly.

Assembly Action:

EB72-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted Committee Reason: This proposal introduces guidelines for gable retrofits as an appendix. While no IEBC provision will send you to this appendix, jurisdictions will have it available to make that decision. This chapter addresses a recognized hazard and it has been utilized for a number of years in Florida's hurricane regions.

Assembly Action:

EB73-09/10

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:

Committee Re ason: The proposal was felt to be too restrictive and would be a disincentive to upgrading existing buildings. In particular it was felt that the IEBC needs to provide an incremental approach to installing sprinklers in high rise buildings. Without the incremental approach the framework of the IEBC will be undermined. Concern was raised that existing tenants located in the building where other tenants are making alterations would then be required to install a sprinkler system.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL FIRE/WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE CODE COMMITTEE

John Mueller, Chair

Rep: National Assoc. of State Fire Marshals Deputy State Fire Administrator NY State Office of Fire Prevention & Control Albany, NY

Robert Geislinger, Vice Chair

Fire Marshal South Metro Fire Rescue Authority Centennial, CO

Frank Castelvecchi, III, PE

Senior Plans Review Engineer County of Henrico, Building Inspections Henrico, VA

Larry Christy

Fire Marshal Butler Township Butler, PA

Rolland Crawford

Principal The Crawford Specialty Group Loma Linda, CA

Sean DeCrane

Battalion Chief Cleveland (OH) Fire Department Cleveland, OH

Tonya Hoover

Assistant State Fire Marshal CALFIRE - Office of the State Fire Marshal Sacramento, CA

Angie Leitner, EIT

Fire Protection Engineer City of Saint Paul Department of Safety and Inspections Saint Paul, MN

Michael Love

Rep: International Association of Fire Chiefs Division Chief Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service Rockville, MD

Joe McElvaney, Jr.

Fire Protection Engineer City of Phoenix Phoenix, AZ

Peter Merrill

Rep: National Association of Home Builders President & CEO, Construction Dispute Resolution Construction Dispute Resolution Services, LLC Santa Fe, NM

Richard Soltis, Jr.

Fire Sub Code Official Lawrence Township Lawrence, NJ 08648

Mark S. Wassom, PE

Rep: National Association of State Fire Marshals Fire Protection Engineer/Fire Prevention Section State of Colorado - Division of Fire Safety Centennial, CO

Gilbert Watt

Assistant Fire Marshal City of San Marcos, TX New Braunfels, TX

Staff Secretariat:

Bill Rehr Senior Technical Staff International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL FIRE CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS- FIRE PORTION

F1-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that t he revised format would provide a more logical r eorganization that will facilitate the use, application and teaching of the code and provide for expansion into new subject areas in the future.

Assembly Action:

F2-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal contains vague language, would limit who is deemed capable of recognizing a fire hazard and could result in inconsistent enforcement.

Assembly Action:

F3-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action:

F4-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal removes subjective language, making the provisions more enforceable.

Assembly Action:

F5-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

307.1.1 Prohibited open burning. *Open burning* that is offensive or objectionable because of smoke emissions or when atmospheric conditions or local circumstances make such fires hazardous shall be prohibited.

Exception: Prescribed burning for the purpose of reducing the impact of wildland fire when authorized by the *fire code official*.

307.3 Extinguishment authority. When open burning creates or adds to a hazardous or objectionable situation, or a required permit for open burning has not been obtained, the *fire code official* is authorized to order the extinguishment of the open burning operation.

Committee Reason: The proposal makes the provisions more enforceable by clarifying the conditions under which extinguishment may be ordered. The modification provides consistency with the action taken on code change F4-09/10.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Modified
F6-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal provides needed improvements to clarify the storage requirements.

Assembly Action:

F7-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that while the concept is good, it is proposed for the wrong place. It also felt that the proposal would conflict w ith the International Building Code which regulate s the initia installations since the p roposed provisions would be r etroactive. The committe e also felt that the phras e "...protected in a manner to p revent injury ..." in the exception was vague and s hould be portra yed as bein g subject to the approval of the fire code official.

Assembly Action:

F8-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

SECTION 316.0 ROOF GARDENS AND LANDSCAPED ROOFS

316.1 General. Rooftop gardens and landscaped roofs shall be installed and maintained in accordance with this code and Sections 1505.0 and 1507.16 of the International Building Code.

316.2 Rooftop garden or landscaped roof size. Rooftop garden or landscaped roof areas shall not exceed 15,625 ft² (1,450 m²) in size for any single area with a maximum dimension of 125 ft (39 m) in length or width. A minimum 3 ft (0.9 m) 6 ft (1.8 m) wide clearance consisting of a Class A-rated roof system complying with ASTM E108 or UL790 shall be provided between adjacent rooftop garden or landscaped roof areas.

316.3 Rooftop structure and equipment clearance. For all vegetated roofing systems abutting combustible vertical surfaces, a Class A-rated roof system complying with ASTM E108 or UL790 shall be achieved for a A minimum 3 ft (0.9 m) 6 ft (1.8 m) wide continuous border placed around rooftop structures and all rooftop equipment clearance shall be provided between the rooftop garden or landscaped roof and rooftop structures. including, but not limited to, mechanical and machine rooms, penthouses, skylights, roof vents, solar panels, antenna supports, and building service equipment.

316.4 Vegetation. Vegetation shall be maintained as described in Sections 316.4.1 and 316.4.2

316.4.1 Irrigation. Supplemental irrigation shall be provided as necessary to maintain levels of hydration necessary to keep green roof plants alive and to keep dry foliage to a minimum.

316.4.2 Dead foliage. Dead foliage and Excess biomass, such as overgrown vegetation, leaves and other dead and decaying material, shall be removed at regular intervals not less than two times per year immediately.

905.3.8 (IBC [F] 905.3.8) Ro of gardens and landscaped roofs. Buildings or structures with roof gardens or landscaped roofs that a re equipped with a stand pipe shall extend the stan dpipe to the roof level on which the roof garden or landscaped roof is located.

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal provid es needed provisions for the regulation of the specified hazards. The modification provides better correlation with Section 1507.16 of the International Building Code.

Analysis: IBC code change S10-09/10 related to this topic was Approved as Modified. Code ch ange F238-09/10 proposing similar requirements to this proposal was Disapproved. See the Report of Hearing for these code changes.

Assembly Action:

None

234

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Assembly Action:

Assembly Action:

statement that the added wording will enhance emergency planning capabilities.

might need assistance and that some occupants w ho ne ed assistance might be overlooked by the limited application of the proposed text. It was also fel t that it is unclear as to who is responsible to identify the specified special needs occupants and could place an undu e burden on institutions to do so. Privacy issues in

Committee Action:

F12-09/10

Disapproved **Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposal is a good concept but that it needs revision to center the location on the facility entrance and not the building itself which would be especially important for mutual aid

will be correlated and consolidated into a single new code section.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

F10-09/10

companies. The proposal should also be specific as to how many decimal places the location description should be carried when recording it in records and what datum the location is taken to.

Assembly Action:

F11-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

identifying such individuals was also noted as a concern.

SECTION 318

VEGETATION ON ROOFS

318.1 Maintenance of vegetation. Vegetation placed upon buildings shall be maintained to prevent the accumulation of weeds, grass, vines, trees, or other growth that is capable of being ignited. All vegetation that poses a fire hazard to the building or exposure structures shall be removed from the building.

318.2 Maintenance plan. The fire code official is authorized to require a maintenance plan for vegetation placed on roofs due to the size of a roof garden, materials used, or when a fire hazard may exist to the building or exposures due to the lack of maintenance.

318.3 Maintenance equipment. Fueled equipment stored on roofs and used for the care and maintenance of vegetation on roofs shall be stored in accordance with Section 313.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that a vegetation maintenance plan a nd maintenance equipment regulation is needed for vegetative roofs. The modification eliminates vague and subjective language that could lead to inconsistent enforcement and also provides correlation with the action taken on code change F8-09/10.

Analysis: If code changes F8-09/10 and F9-09/10 are both Approved as Modified in Final Action, their content

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

F9-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

Approved as Modified

None

None

None

Committee Reason: The committee generally felt that the current text adequately addresses occupants who

F13-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal should be more specific as to the "ke y emergency components" mentioned and should be more specific as to where the plans should be posted. The proposed text would also conflict w ith Section 404.2 w hich al ready includes Group R- 2 college and university buildings and also provides a much higher threshold for Group A and B occupancies.

Assembly Action:

F14-09/10

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 EPA 40 CFR, Part 68, Subparts F and G - 2000 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee felt that the proposal w ould put the fire cod e official in the position of approving a fed erally-mandated document which the committee f elt was inappropriate. It was also noted a s unclear as to w hat, if any, action the fire code offici al might need to take upon notification required b y Section 408.4.4 and who would be r esponsible for identif ying any deficiencies. The classificat ion of some materials listed in the tables were also noted as not being compatible with the material definitions in the IFC.

Assembly Action:

F15-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that the proposal makes no distinction between new and existing buildings, that the fire code official could unilaterally reclassify occupancies and that em ployee access widths could be substantially reduced.

Assembly Action:

F16-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: While the committee recognizes the issues surrounding the proposal, it felt that having the width reduction highlighted in a specific section as proposed could be used against the fire code official in reviewing site pl an documents for adequate fire apparatus access. It was suggested that it might be more effective to revise current Section 503.2.2 to give the fire code official the authorit y to modify the width of fire apparatus access roads without specifying whether it is to increase or to decrease the width. It was also noted that the proposal includes a "laun dry list" of things to consider when modifying the width, albeit an incomplete one. Such a list should be better located in the commentary and expanded to to include, but not be limited to, consideration of building construction type, wildland-urban interface areas, ter rain characteristics and the specific characteristics of fire apparatus. The committee also expressed its prefere nce for code ch ange F17-09/10 to establish needed dialogue regarding fire apparatus road design issues versus traffic safety issues.

Assembly Action:

F17-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that approval of this proposal would be an important first step in establishing needed critical dialogue with urban traffic planning officials so that both fire depart ments and traffic planners come to understand and respect one another's

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

236

viewpoints and needs regarding t he need for traffic calming devices. The committ ee recognized the need to provide better s peed control for increased safety but emphasized that features w hich impede or, possibly, prevent emergency vehicle response create a serious public safety hazard. The committee also noted that t he prohibitive language of this proposal ("Traffic calming devices are *prohibited...*") does not lend itself to the kind of co-ope ration between agencies that is essen tial to this discussion and sugg ested a p ublic comment be submitted to make the language more approval-oriented.

Assembly Action:

F18-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

None

Modify the proposal as follows:

IBC [F] 501.2 Address identification. New and existing buildings shall be provided with *approved* address numbers or letters. Each character shall be a minimum 4 inches (102 mm) high and a minimum of 0.5 inch (12.7 mm) wide. They shall be installed on a contrasting background and be plainly visible from the street or road fronting the property. When required by the <u>building fire code</u> official, address numbers shall be provided in additional *approved* locations to facilitate emergency response. Where access is by means of a private road and the building address cannot be viewed from the *public way*, a monument, pole or other *approved* sign or means shall be used to identify the structure. Address numbers shall be maintained.

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The proposal provides for additional addre ss i dentification for buildings when there ar e conditions that may require it such as when the building front is not facing the address side. The proposal also provides a needed requirement t hat address identification marking s be mainta ined in place and le gible. The modification recognizes that there should be only one official charged with address approvals and that the fire code official is the proper authority to establish additional marking requirements on a case-by-case basis.

Assembly Action:

None

F19-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book 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 UL 1037-99 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

506.1.2 Non-standardized fire service elevator keys. Key boxes provided for non-standardized fire service elevator keys shall comply with Section 506.1 and items 1 through 6 of this section.

- 1. The key box shall be compatible with an existing rapid entry key box system in use in the jurisdiction and approved by the fire code official.
- 2. The front cover shall be permanently labeled with the words "Fire Department Use Only Elevator keys."
- 3. The key box shall be mounted at each elevator bank at the lobby nearest to the lowest level of fire department access.
- 4. The key box shall be mounted 5'6" above the finished floor to the right side of the elevator bank.
- Contents of the key box are limited to fire service elevator keys. Additional elevator access tools, keys and information pertinent to emergency planning or elevator access shall be permitted when authorized by the fire code official.
- 6. In buildings with two or more elevator banks, a single key box shall be permitted to be used when such elevator banks are separated by not more than 30 feet. Additional key boxes shall be provided for each individual elevator or elevator bank separated by more than 30 feet.

Exception: A single key box shall be permitted to be located adjacent to a fire command center or the nonstandard fire service elevator key to be secured in a key box used for other purposes and located in accordance with Section 506.1 when approved by the Fire Chief.

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and approved the proposal for consistency with the action taken on code change F20-09/10. The modification will allow the single key box to be used and removes language that offers no guidance to the fire chief.

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

F20-09/10

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

PART I- IFC Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

506.3 Standardized fire service elevator keys. All buildings with elevators equipped with Phase I Emergency Recall, Phase II emergency in-car operation, or a Fire Service Access Elevator shall be equipped to operate

Exception: Where there is a practical difficulty to providing a standardized key t <u>The</u> owner shall <u>be</u> <u>permitted to</u> place the building's non-standardized fire service elevator keys in a key box installed in accordance with Section 506.1.

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

with a standardized fire service elevator key approved by the fire code official.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal would reduce the number of keys that need to be carried in fire apparatus. The modification removes subjective language which could lead to inconsistent enforcement.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

F21-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed requirement should apply to all fire department connections, not just those for standpipes.

Assembly Action:

F22-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the current text provides for an adequate fire-resistance rating for fire command centers. There has been no technical documentation provided to justify the proposed rating increase.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

F23-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the status indicators and controls continue to be a useful tool for incident commanders and should be retained and that fire service personnel are quite capable of understanding and using the equipment.

Assembly Action:

F24-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the information provided by the status indicators is critical to the fire command function and that they should be retained, especially since neither NFPA 72 or NFPA 20 require that such remote indicators be provided except as required by the code. It was also noted that these devices need not be a separate panel but that the signals can be manifested through the fire alarm control panel.

Assembly Action:

F25-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the building information card would be a useful tool that would enable the incident commander to quickly gather critical building information upon arrival at a scene and effectively plan tactics.

Assembly Action:

F26-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action:

F27-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

510.2 Emergency responder radio coverage in existing buildings. Existing buildings that do not have approved radio coverage for emergency responders within the building shall be equipped with such coverage according to one of the following:

- Whenever existing wired communication system cannot be repaired or is being replaced, or where 1. not approved in accordance with Section 510.1 Exception 1.
- 2. Within a time frame established by the adopting authority.

Exception: Where it is determined by the fire code official that the radio coverage system is not needed.

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason:. The committee felt that the specific requirements for emergency responder radio coverage are important enough to warrant relocation into the code text rather than being "hidden" in an appendix. The modification provides the same consideration for existing buildings as Section 510.1 does for new buildings.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Modified

None

Approved as Submitted

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

F28-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the cost impact of the proposal could be onerous and that one and two-family dwellings should not be unconditionally exempted in proposed Sections 510.1 and 510.3. The committee felt that building size should be made a part of any exception for one- and two-family dwellings.

Assembly Action:

F29-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that ex empting a specific type of facility could set up a futur e trend toward a "laundry list" of facilitie s that w ish to b e exempt from the requirem ent. It also felt that the ex isting exceptions, reasonably applied, could remed y any such concerns and that IFC Section 104.9 could also be applied. The committee also felt that providing an "on-off" switch for the radio coverage system could place first responders in danger.

Assembly Action:

F30-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee recognized the importance of t he issues raised by the propo sal but felt that it was not sufficiently developed to be included in the code at this time. It was indicated that the California State Fire Marshal's guidelines upon which the proposal was based are still in a draft form and not yet ready for adoption. An issue that the committee noted is that there is no correlation change to the IBC and that there is no IFC permit required for these installations which is important since the y are typically done on existing buildings and show up unexpectedly. The proposal is also unclear in Section 511.4 as to where the disconnect would be placed in a m ixed occupancy building. It was also noted that w alkable pathways cannot always be placed over str uctural members. The committee indicated so me support for placing the pro posal in an appendix until the issues of concern are resolved.

Assembly Action:

F31-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The com mittee felt that the definitions were unclear a nd not written in complete sentences. Also, the definitions should be correlated with the definitions in NFPA 70 which makes a distinction between legally required and optional standby power.

Assembly Action:

F32-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal w ould result in an increase in hazard. Also, the section would apply to all buildings, not just r esidential. The committee also felt t hat any increase in storage quantity should be in outdoor storage tanks.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

F33-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that, because the requirem ent would apply to all shaft exhaust fans, the proposal is redundant since the s ubject matter is already covered in Chapter 7 and Section 909.11 of the IBC and Chapter 6 of the IMC. The committee felt that there need not be so much duplication of requirements in all I-codes.

Assembly Action:

F34-09/10

Committee Reason: The committee preferred code change F35-09/10.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

F35-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The committee preferred this code change over code chan ge F34-09/10 on the same subject because it is simpler and more broadly applicable to all types of emergency lighting equipment, not just battery-operated types.

Assembly Action:

F36-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal contains vague language (e.g., "...or for similar reasons...") and includes a "laundry list" of e lectrical hazards that is not exh austive and provides no guidance as to what standards are to be used to judg e electrical systems as being deficient. The committee was also concerned that the proposal would put the fire code official and/or the fire department in the role of being an electrical expert.

Assembly Action:

F37-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal would leave out the building official and the electrical inspector. The committee also felt that the proposal is redundant since the code already contains provisions for referring electrical hazards to the appropriate code official

Assembly Action:

F38-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the subject matter is adequately addressed in NFPA 70 where it belongs. The committee was also concerned that the proposal would put the fire code official in the role of being an electrical inspector and that these issues are manageable under the building permit process.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

F39-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. The proposal clarifies confusing language regarding ammonia refrigerant controls.

Assembly Action:

F41-09/10

F40-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. The proposal clarifies confusing lan guage reg arding exactly which batteries are su bject to the section.

Assembly Action:

F42-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.

F43-09/10

F44-09/10

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 ANSI/UL 142-06 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria. UL 80-07 is currently referenced in the IRC. **Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal provides a needed set of safeguards for regulating cooking oils.

Assembly Action:

F45-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal is outside the purview of the fire code official and more properly belongs in the International Plumbing Code. The committee also fe It that the proposal excludes other occupancies or a reas that have similar splash hazards and that this is a fede ral OSHA requirement that does not need to be in the IFC.

Assembly Action:

242

Approved as Submitted

Withdrawn by Proponent

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

F46-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The relabeling of existing fir e doors is a common practice and due to the importance of the rating requirements a level of monitoring by a third party to ensure the labeling matches the rating of the door assembly is necessary. It was suggested that the new language could be better located in it s ow n subsection.

Assembly Action:

F47-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that it was unnecessar y to make the IFC Table 803.3 de aling with existing buildings correlate with IBC Table 803.9 for new buildings. In addition, there was concern that this would be overly restrictive for existing buildings to have to upgrade their interior finishes and would be difficult to enforce.

Assembly Action:

F48-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal as it clarifies when NFPA 286, NFP A 265 and ASTM E84 can be used for testing tex tile wall and ceiling coverings. NFPA 265 is limited to w alls based upon limitations on the test. NFPA 286 can be applied to wall and ceiling coverings. ASTM E84 can be used to test wall and ceiling coverings but such coverings can only be located in sprinklered buildings.

Assembly Action:

F49-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal addresses concerns of the committee going back several cycles and will make the requirements for testing in accordance with ASTM E84 and UL723 consistent with the IBC for newly introduced textile wall and ceiling coverings including the proper mounting procedures used during the test.

Assembly Action:

F50-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved the provisions add ing a separate s ection detailing the testing requirements for expanded vinyl wall coverings to help cl arify when and how the various tests apply to these materials. Thes e provisions would apply to existing and ne wly introduced expanded vin yl wall or ceiling coverings. The provisions correlate with the IBC.

Assembly Action:

F51-09/10

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 ASTM D2859 (2006) indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There were a couple concerns with this proposal including the inconsistencies between the current sections within the IBC and the language proposed for the IFC. In addition there were several typographical errors and the new standard being introduced was not currently referenced in that portion of the IBC.

Assembly Action:

F52-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved related to concerns with enforceability. These provisions would be applicable to all occupancies which seemed too be broad and application. The proposed text would require that anytime furniture is taken from one building to another, such as one apartment building to another, that the furniture would need to meet this requirement.

Assembly Action:

F53-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as the committee felt that often college housing interior furniture is often found on balconies, decks and porches and pose a significant hazard and should be required to meet the requirements of 805.4. There was some concern expressed with the approval of this proposal that this requirement would affect furniture originally intended for outdoor use.

Assembly Action:

F54-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as it was felt that regulating furniture in this way in Group A occupancies intended for food or drink was overly restrictive and would be difficult to enforce. This would prohibit the use of antique furniture. Many of the occupancies would be required to be sprinklered and the phrase "food or drink" would include Group A-2 occupancies serving both alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages.

Assembly Action:

F55-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as loss data was not presented to justify the regulation of furnishings in Group E occupancies. In addition, the more vulnerable occupants in Group E occupancies are excluded which are those found in Group E Daycare facilities. The committee also felt that the enforcement of these requirements would be difficult.

Assembly Action:

F56-09/10

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 NFPA 289-2009 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

244

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal as approved provides a more applicable test. This test focuses specifically on items such as decorative vegetation instead of NFPA 701 which was originally designed for the testing of draperies.

Assembly Action:

F57-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as it was unclear how the reference to the building construction type would equate to the rating and construction materials needed for the fabric materials in room dividers.

Assembly Action:

F58-09/10

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

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard NFPA 289-2009 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I- IFC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The approval of the proposal was based upon the fact that this new test is an appropriate testing alternative for the hazard being assessed. The use of the 20 KW ignition source was intended to make the test equivalent to the current standard referenced, UL 1975.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IBC GENERAL

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal based upon the action taken on Part I of the proposal.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

F59-09/10

Committee Reason: This proposal adds Group I-1 Occupancies so that this section now regulates all Group I occupancies with regard to the size and material performance for wastebaskets and linen containers. The committee felt that Group I-1 occupants are particularly vulnerable and should have this same level of protection to prevent fires from becoming particularly hazardous due to the type of materials the waste containers are typically constructed of and the combustible waste they contain.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

F60-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal as it was felt important to regulat e the type of materials that waste materials are stored in at Group R-2 college and university dormitories. These particular occupancies are particularly vulnerable to fires in such locations. It was emphasized that such waste containers would also include recycling containers.

Assembly Action:

F61-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal to regulate combustible lockers in the IFC as they are essentially a n interior finish t hat poses a sub stantial hazard t hat non comb ustible lockers do not. Some concern was expressed that they should be addressed by Section 805 as the y are more of a furnishing but as they are typically bolted down the committee felt it was more appropriate to address them as interior finish.

Assembly Action:

F62-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee R eason: This pr ovision to require c ertain size room for fire pumps and risers was felt by the committee to fit well in the general requirements of Cha pter 9. This location in Chapter 9 enco urages the consideration of such spaces e arly in the design. Additionally commit ee me mbers felt comf ortable that manufactures have fairly consistent dimensions required for equipment and the size of the room would be fairly easy to plan for early in the design process.

Assembly Action:

F63-09/10

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 NFPA 204-2007 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it was consistent with the action taken on code change F146-09/10 requiring the maintenance of smoke and heat vents and mechanical smoke exhaust in accordance with NFPA 204.

Assembly Action:

F64-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

901.9 Discontinuation or change of service. Notice shall be made to the fire code official whenever contracted alarm services for monitoring or testing or inspection of an existing fire alarm system are terminated for any reason, or a change in alarm monitoring provider or other service provider is made. Notice shall be made in writing, to the fire code official by the building owner and where required, by the alarm service provider being terminated.

Committee Reason: The committee felt that it was necessary for the fire official to be notified when the alarm

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

246

system was no longer being maintained or monitored. One concern was that the language as proposed would put this responsibility on the building owner which may be the one who does not understand the significance of the problem and would not notify the fire code official. Therefore a modification was made to remove the building owner and place the responsibility to contact the Fire official on the alarm service provider. This concept was equated to auto insurance companies notifying states when drivers fail to pay their premiums on their insurance.

Assembly Action:

F65-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The proposal was disapproved as the IBC all ready a ddresses the issue of fire walls creating separa te buildings thoro ughly and more appropriately and it is not necessary in this section of the code.

Assembly Action:

F66-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal as it felt the language was considered more as commentary to the definition of "fire area" and was unnecessary for the application of this section. In addition, the term fire wall was not included and may cause conflicts with the definition of fire area.

Assembly Action:

F67-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it would include all Group A-2 occupancies whether or not the y serve alcohol. Without differentiating between the higher risk Group A-2 occupancies (such as a nightclub) from other lower risk Group A-2 occupancies (such as a quick service restaurant), an increase in the occupant load threshold could not be made.

Assembly Action:

F68-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The committee approved this proposal as it felt that sprinkler protection needs to be provided not simply within the fir e area but also needs to addres s the floor where the Gro up B Ambulator y Healthcare facility is located and all floors below.

Analysis: Code change G15-09/10 contains a similar revisi on which was approved as submitted by the IBC General Committee.

Assembly Action:

F69-09/10 Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

903.2.4 (IBC [F] 903.2.4) Group F-1. An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout all buildings containing a Group F-1 occupancy where one of the following conditions exists:

1. Where a Group F-1 fire area exceeds 12,000 square feet (1115 m²);

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

None

- 2. Where a Group F-1 fire area is located more than three stories above grade plane; or
- Where the combined area of all Group F-1 fire areas on all floors, including any mezzanines, exceeds 24,000 square feet (2230 m²).
- Where a Group F-1 occupancy <u>that</u> is used for the manufacture of upholstered furniture or mattresses exceeds 2,500 square feet (232 m²).

903.2.7 (**IBC** [**F**] **903.2.7**) **Group M.** An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout buildings containing a Group M occupancy where one of the following conditions exists:

- 1. Where a Group M fire area exceeds 12,000 square feet (1115 m²);
- 2. Where a Group M fire area is located more than three stories above grade plane; or
- 3. Where the combined area of all Group M fire areas on all floors, including any mezzanines, exceeds 24,000
 - square feet (2230 m²). ; or
- Where a Group M occupancy <u>that</u> is used for the display and sale of upholstered furniture or mattresses <u>exceeds 5,000 square feet (464 m²).</u>

903.2.9 (IBC [F] 903.2.9) Group S-1. An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout all buildings containing a Group S-1 occupancy where one of the following conditions exists:

- 1. A Group S-1 fire area exceeds 12,000 square feet (1115 m²);
- 2. A Group S-1 fire area is located more than three stories above grade plane; or
- The combined area of all Group S-1 fire areas on all floors, including any mezzanines, exceeds 24,000 square feet (2230 m²).
- A Group S-1 fire area used for the storage of commercial trucks or buses where the fire area exceeds 5,000 square feet (464 m²).
- A Group S-1 occupancy <u>that</u> is used for the storage of upholstered furniture or mattresses <u>exceeds</u> 2,500 square feet (232 m²).

Committee R eason: The committee approved the proposal as the y felt that Group F -1 and Group S-1 occupancies manufacturing and storing upholst ered furnishings and matt resses pose the same hazard to occupants and fire fighters that Group M occupancies displaying and selling such materials. The proposal was modified to provide a reasonable thre shold that w ould not penalize occupancies with very small amounts of such materials. These thresholds were based on the thresholds in Chapter 23 of the IFC with regard to size of high piled storage areas.

Assembly Action:

F70-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that in order for a 13D system to be used in this application for Group I-1 occupancies that additional controls w ere necessary to increase the integrity of the system, therefore the proposal was approved as submitted.

Assembly Action:

F71-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved in favor of code change F69 -09/10. A threshold was felt to be necessary but the thres holds provided in the modification to code change F69-09/10 were mor e reasonable. Ad ditionally the term "occupancy" versus "fire area" is preferred. M ore specifically, the term "fire area" may penalize a situation where a small Group M furniture store is located in a strip mall with independent egress. The st rip mall is likely to be consider ed as a single fire area and sprinklers would be req uired throughout versus just in the Group M occupancy selling furniture.

Assembly Action:

F72-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

F73-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the excepti on f or o pen parking garages as there were concerns with fighting fires in u nsprinklered open parking structures. There was also a concer n with the increasing combustibility of vehicles.

Assembly Action:

F74-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: T his pro posal to delete the e xception for Group R oc cupancies w as considered appropriate based upon other act ions the committee has taken and since the code now requires all Group R occupancies to be sprinklered without exception.

Assembly Action:

F75-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt this proposal was necessary for fire fighter safety. The distance that a fire fighter must drop when accessing basements through openings must be limited.

Assembly Action:

F76-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The com mittee felt that t his proposal cla rified the intent of the code w ith regard to obstructions in the basement causing challenges to fire fighting operations. It should be noted that there was some concern from committee members that the present code language already addresses this hazard and this language is unnecessary.

Assembly Action:

F77-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

903.2.11.2 Rubbish and li nen chutes. An automatic sprinkler system shall be installed at the top of rubbish and linen chutes and in their terminal rooms. Chutes shall have additional sprinkler heads installed at alternate floors and at the lowest intake. When a rubbish chute extends through a building more than one floor below the lowest intake the extension shall have sprinklers installed which are recessed from the drop area of the chute and protected from freezing in a ccordance with Section 903.3.1.1. These sprinklers shall be installed on the exterior of the chute at alternate floors beginning with the second level below the last intake and ending with the floor above the discharge. Chute sprinklers shall be accessible for servicing. A dry pipe automatic sprinkler system shall be required for exterior chute extensions unless otherwise approved.

Committee Reason: Currently the code conflicts with NFPA 82 and this proposal was approved to address these conflicts. The modification addresses the fact t hat sprinklers need to be recessed and freezing concerns are specifically addressed within NFPA 13.

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

F78-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify proposal as follows:

903.3.1 (IBC [F] 903.3.1) Standards. Sprinkler systems shall be designed and installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1, 903.3.1.2 or 903.3.1.3 and <u>other c</u>Chapters 23 and 34 of this code, as applicable.

Committee Re ason: The committee felt that it w as necessary that the code us er is notified that there a re many more sections in the code that have specific sprinkler req uirements add ressing specific hazards. A modification was proposed and accepted that provided more general reference to other applicable chapters as Chapter 23 and 34 were not the only chapters containing sprinkler requirements.

Assembly Action:

None

F79-09/10

Unpublished Errata: Replace Items 1 and 2 of the proposal with the following:

1. Revise as follows:

[F] 903.3.1.1 (IBC [F] 903.3.1.1) NFPA 13 sprinkler systems. Where the provisions of this code require that a building or portion thereof be equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with this section, sprinklers shall be installed throughout in accordance with NFPA 13 except as provided in Sections 903.3.1.1.1 and 903.3.1.1.2.

2. Add new text as follows:

903.3.1.1.2 (IBC [F] 903.3.1.1.2) Bathrooms. In Group R occupancies, other than Group R residential care facilities, sprinklers shall not be required in bathrooms that do not exceed 55 square feet in area and are located within individual dwelling units or sleeping units.

Reason: (No change to published reason and cost impact statement.)

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved primarily with a concern that the proposed language di d not include the 15 minute rating on the bathroom enclosure as part of the allowance to omit sprinklers.

Assembly Action:

F80-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it is consistent with Exception 5 to Section 903.3.1.1.1 for Fire Service Access Elevators and IBC Section 3008.8 which prohibits a shunt trip.

Assembly Action:

F81-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this item as the y felt that the language explaining what is considered as fully sprinklered appeared unnecessary for the code. The committee noted that such issues are better addressed within the standard and in the commentary for the IBC and IFC.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

N

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

F82-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved based upon the action taken on code change F81-09/10. This language was felt to be inappropriate for the code and is better addressed by the standard and in the commentary for the IBC and IFC.

Assembly Action:

F83-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as the existing language could be interpreted as being a manual water supply when the intent is for an automatic water supply. This additional language will clarify the need for an automatic secondary water supply.

Assembly Action:

F84-09/10

Unpublished Errata: In Exception 1, the word "protecting" should have been included in the dash-out, as shown below:

903.4 (IBC [F] 903.4) Sprinkler system supervision and alarms. All valves controlling the water supply for automatic sprinkler systems, pumps, tanks, water levels and temperatures, critical air pressures and water-flow switches on all sprinkler systems shall be electrically supervised by a listed fire alarm control unit.

Exceptions:

- Automatic sprinkler systems protecting one- and two-family dwellings installed in accordance 1. with NFPA 13D.
- 2. through 7. remain unchanged.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal as it was poorly worded and takes away the occupancy oriented approach currently being used within the exception. This proposal would also prohibit the application of this exception to 13R systems which is inappropriate and would discourage the installation of such systems.

Assembly Action:

F85-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it clarifies that a fire alarm system is not required but instead some type of audible device on the exterior of the building to alert people on the outside of the building that the sprinkler system has activated.

Assembly Action:

F86-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

251

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

F87-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify proposal as follows:

904.1.1 (IBC [F] 904.1.1) Certification of service personnel for fire extinguishing equipment. Service personnel providing or conducting maintenance on *automatic fire extinguishing systems*, other than *automatic sprinkler systems*, shall possess a valid Certificate issued by an *approved* third party certification organization, an *approved* governmental agency, or other *approved* organization for the type of system and work performed.

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved as it was felt that certification programs are necessary and with this require ment such certification w ill be c reated. The m odification simply removed th e phrase "a n approved third party certification organization" to provide more control to the jurisdiction.

Assembly Action:

F88-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The proposal w as approved as it w as felt important to clarif y that all fire protection systems whether newly installed or existing need to appropriately work together to avoid causing unnecessary hazards.

Assembly Action:

F89-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee prefe rred the app roach t aken in code ch ange F 87-09/10 requiring a certification program.

Assembly Action:

F90-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee prefe rred the app roach t aken in code ch ange F 87-09/10 requiring a certification program.

Assembly Action:

F91-09/10

Committee Action:	Com	mittee	Action:
-------------------	-----	--------	---------

Committee Reason: The code change was disapproved based u pon the proponents request and due to the fact that as currently written creates possible problems with existing buildings.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

..

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

F92-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

905.3.6 (IBC [F] 905.3.6) Helistops and heliports. Buildings with a rooftop helistop or heliport shall be provided with a Class I or III standpipe system extended to the roof level on which the helistop or heliport is located in accordance with Section 1107.5.

1107.5 Standpipe systems. A building with a rooftop helistop or heliport shall be provided with a Class I or III standpipe system-extended to the roof level on which the helistop or heliport is located. All portions of the helistop and heliport area shall be within 150 feet (45 720 mm) of a 2¹/2-inch (63.5 mm) outlet on the standpipe system.

Committee Reason: The proposal refocuses the need for r ooftop standpipes based on the presence of a helistop or heliport versus simply extending a standpipe to the rooftop if a heliport or helistop is located there. The committee felt that the fuel and related hazards presented by rooftop heliports and helistops necessitates the need for a standpipe regardless of whether the building is required to have, or already has a standpipe. The modification simply clarifies where in the build ing the provisions were applicable and makes the language in Section 905.3.6 consistent with the language in Section 1107.5.

Assembly Action:

F93-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The com mittee approved the proposal as t he revisions would make the provisions consistent with NFPA 14 which will now only require one standpipe connection on the roof.

Assembly Action:

F94-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that even within sprinklered buildings fire extinguishers have made a difference in fig hting fires ther efore the exception for quick re sponse sprinklers in Gro ups A, B and E occupancies was deleted. In addition people are used to seeing extinguishers within buildings and having them available for use.

Assembly Action:

F95-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved to be consistent with the action on code change F94 -09/10 that deleted the exception for quick response sprink lers. In addition, it was felt that there have been many situations in Group R-2 dormitories where extinguishers have been necessary.

Assembly Action:

F96-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

906.3 (IBC [F] 906.3) Certification of service personnel. Service personnel providing or conducting maintenance shall possess a valid Certificate issued by an approved third party certification organization, an approved governmental agency, or other approved organizations for the type of work performed.

Approved as Modified

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

None

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal to be consistent with the action taken on code change F87-09/10. In addition, it will provide more leeway for the jurisdiction to ask for a certain level of qualifications. The modification was the same as that made for code change F87-09/10 which deleted the phrase "an approved third party certification organization" to provide more control to the jurisdiction.

Assembly Action:

F97-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved in favor of the approach taken in code changes F96-09/10 and F87-09/10 and to be consistent with the actions taken on code changes F89-09/10 and F90-09/10.

Assembly Action:

F98-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it removed the ability of the fire code official to ask for more information when reviewing fire alarm designs.

Assembly Action:

F99-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change proposal as it was felt that it would create conflicts and confusion within the code based upon section references such as to Section 907.3 which deals with existing systems. It was suggested that the intent of the proposal needs to be further clarified through the public comment process.

Assembly Action:

F100-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was felt to be a good attempt to fix the confusion caused in the application of the fire alarm requirements for Assembly occupancies.

Assembly Action:

F101-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as it was too broad in its application. Manual fire alarm boxes can be cause of frequent and unnecessary alarms. The committee suggested that the proponent take a more specific look at in which particular occupancies removal of this exception may be most appropriate.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

None

F102-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee disapprov ed the prop osal with concern t hat this appro ach, which was used in code change F100-09/10, is not considered appropriate due to the large occupant loads ad dressed by this section.

Assembly Action:

F103-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt it was more appropriate to r ely on NFPA 72 to a ddress how public address systems interconnect with the alarm s ystem. It is likely that solutions already exist within the code to allow the use of public address systems. Some committee members expressed i nterest that public address systems supplement and not replace alarm system components.

Assembly Action:

F104-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The format of the code change proposal seemed to be awkward. More specifically, as written the langu age in more restrictive than the main section w hich would only require an alarm when the occupants in a Group A occupancy exceed 300. The new section would essentially bring that nu mber to 100 for Group A-2 occupancies. The committee felt it to me more appropriate to address the threshold found in the main Section 907.2.1.

Assembly Action:

F105-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

907.2.1.2 (IBC [F] 907.2.1.2) Emergency voice/alarm communication captions. Stadiums, arenas and grandstands required to caption audible public announcements shall be in accordance with Section 907.6.2.2.4.

907.6.2.2.4 (IBC [F] 907.5.2.2.4) Emergency voice/alarm communication captions. Where stadiums, arenas and grandstands are required to caption audible public announcements in accordance with Section 1108.2.7.2 of the *International Building Code*, the emergency/voice alarm communication system shall also be captioned. Prerecorded or live emergency captions shall be from an *approved* location constantly attended by personnel trained to respond to an emergency, The caption displays shall be permitted to serve as the visual notification appliances for the assembly seating area.

Committee Reason: This proposal provides for the necessary captioning of emergency voice communication systems for those who are unable to hear the message. The committee felt that this provision was a necessary addition to the code. The modification removed the last sentence of the original proposal as it would have removed all visual notification devices and would depend completely upon something such as the large screens in the assembly seating area. The committee did not yet have complete confidence in that concept.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

F106-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The p roposal which would have removed the exception a llowing sprinklers in lieu of smoke detection w as disapproved as it w ould take aw ay the incentive for sprinkle rs. In addition since the section is so new it should first have a chance to be applied before be revised.

Assembly Action:

F107-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this proposal was necessary as schools are dealing with a host of threats such as f ires and to mados and in mor e recent history an increase in school lockdown situations. This provides a better method of c ommunication during em ergencies than traditional fire alarm a nd occupant notification systems

Assembly Action:

F108-09/10

PART I- IFC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the pr oposal since, as currently written, the language was confusing and a cleaner approach is necessary. In addition, there was concern that the allowance of the use of smoke detection sy stems could possibly result in the loss of smoke detection n and alarm thr ough othe r exceptions such as that found in Section 907.2.8.2.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC B/E

F109-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved the prop osal due to the unique hazards that a re present in Group R-2 college and university buildings. Mor e specifically, there are often more common a reas than found in other t ypes of Group R-2 occ upancies where occupants congregate. Also it is not uncomm on to have activities such as cooking in these common areas.

Assembly Action:

F110-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal to add an a utomatic smoke detection s ystem to Group R-2 occupancies was disapproved as it appeared to be too restrictive. In addition, these requirements would be applicable more often than the manual fire alarm requirements. Group R-1 occupancies require both manual and automatic fire alarm systems but the occupants found in such occupancies are generally more unfamiliar with the building and necessitate this higher level of protection.

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

F111-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The reason provided by the proponent for this revision did not correlate well with the proposal and adequate justification for elimination of the exception when the facility is sprinklered throughout in accordance with NFPA 13 was not provided. Additionally, it was felt that the resulting level of protection if the exception was eliminated appeared to be overly restrictive.

Assembly Action:

F112-09/10

PART I- IFC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change as they felt that the standards development process should address concern s with the performance of smoke alarms. There was also a concern that by stating a specific type of technology, future technologies could potentially be limited. Finally, there appeared to be conflicting data on the performance of ionization and photoelectric smoke alarms with the reason statement.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: The proposed language would only permit the photoelectric type. This change would exclude other types and would limit future technology.

Assembly Action:

F113-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The prop osal was disapp roved with concer n th at connect ion to the main fire alar m occupant notification s ystem m ay cre ate man y unn ecessary alarms throug hout the building. T hese unnecessary alarms w ould result in occupants not reac ting appropriately in a sit uation where evacuation is necessary.

Assembly Action:

F114-09/10

All thre e p arts of this code cha nge pro posal were hea rd b y the IFC Code **Development Committee.**

PART I- IFC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it correlates and clarifies the application of the various codes with respect to the requirements for smoke alarms in Group R and I-1 occupancies. Previously Group I-1 was merely described in many locations as "dw ellings not classified as Group R Occupancies" where in other locations it specifically stated Group I-1.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

PART II- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved Part II based upon the action taken on Part I of this proposal. Additionally IBC Chapter 34 ha d not addresse d this r equirement which w ould be inconsistent with the requirements of the IFC and the IEBC.

Assembly Action:

PART III- IEBC

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved Part III based upon the action taken on Part I of this proposal. . IEBC Section 1004.1 was specifically correlated with IEBC Section 704.4.3 to include Group I-1 occupancies.

Assembly Action:

F115-09/10

PART I- IFC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved by the committee as it was felt that without this particular language many jurisdictions do not allow the use of wireless technology for the interconnection of the smoke alarms required in the code.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Re ason: This chan ge permits wireless alarms as an alternate to wired interconnection. Also, clarity is added by placing the in terconnection requirements in a separate section. This is consistent with the IFC.

Assembly Action:

F116-09/10

PART I- IFC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal as the requirements seemed difficult to enforce and unnecessary. More specifically, the hazards that the proponent is concerned with are already addressed with the reference to the National Electrical Code.

Assembly Action:

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

Committee Reason: The electrical portion of the code already provides for protection with the arc-fault circuitinterrupter. There was no documentation provided that a product exists that will provide activation at 475°F.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

F117-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved with concerns that allowing the alarm to activate outside the building where the fire detection device has activated could be problematic and lead to delays in appropriate response to an emergency. The offsite location may not only be in a different building but may be in a distant location far from the facility.

Assembly Action:

F118-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as adding the term "visible" correlates with NFPA 72.

Assembly Action:

F119-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal as the additional language clarifies that in high rise buildings there may be many other occupancy based requirements that would require smoke detection beyond the locations listed within this section.

Assembly Action:

F120-09/10

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

PART I- IFC **Committee Action:**

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

907.2.13.1.2 (IBC [F] 907.2.13.1.2) Duct smoke detection. Duct smoke detectors complying with Section 907.3.1 shall be located as follows:

- In the main supply air duct of each air-handling system having a design capacity greater than 2,000 1. cubic feet per minute (cfm) (0.94 m³/s), downstream of any filters.
- 2. In the main return of each air handling system having a design capacity greater than 15,000 cubic feet per minute (cfm)(7.1 m³/s). Such detectors shall be located in a serviceable area downstream of the last duct inlet.
- 3. In the supply air system where multiple air-handling systems share common or supply return air ducts or plenums with a combined design capacity greater than 2,000 cfm (0.9 m³/s),
- 4. At each story in return air systems having a design capacity greater than 15,000 cfm (7.1 m³/s), where return air risers serve two or more stories.
- 5. At each connection to a vertical duct or riser serving two or more stories from a return air duct or plenum of an air-conditioning handling system with a design capacity of greater than 15,000 cfm (7.1 m³/s). In Group R-1 and R-2 occupancies a listed smoke detector is allowed to be used in each return air riser carrying not more than 5,000 cfm (2.4 m³/s) and serving not more than 10 air inlet openings.

Exception: Smoke detectors are not required in the return air system where all portions of the building served by the air distribution system are protected by area smoke detectors connected to a fire alarm system in accordance with the International Fire Code.

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it cor relates with NFPA 90A and provides the detection on the supply side where it is most effective. The modification was simply to change the terminology from "airconditioning" to "air handling" to be consistent with the intent and the wordin g throughout the proposed revisions.

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Assembly Action:

PART II- IMC

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: This prop osal was approved to be consistent with the action taken on Part I of this proposal.

Assembly Action:

F121-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as the ex ception has limited applicability and the code format of the exception was inappropriate. More specifically, the exception as written is actually a requirement which would be cause for confusion.

Assembly Action:

F122-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal to delete t he exception because it was felt that if the exception remains, early notification and alarm would be jeo pardized since sprink lers react slower than smoke detectors.

Assembly Action:

F123-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as the language provides a tool for inspections and provides more direction as to the locations of manual fire alar m boxes. There were some concerns expressed with the use of the term "visible" and how it would be applied.

Assembly Action:

F124-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as the committee felt it is nece ssary to ensure t hat the two way communication for those w aiting for an elevator would function as necessary. The audible n otification typically provided in these areas may be to o loud and make it h and for t hem to hear specific instructions for evacuation. This is also considered consistent with the requirements of Section 3008.

Assembly Action:

F125-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The com mittee approved the proposal t o create consistency with NFP A 72 which addresses minimum sound pressure levels more appropriately and in more detail.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

F126-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal as the provisions may be applied beyond highrise buildings. This proposal would limit the application of the paging zones only to high-rise buildings. In addition, NFPA 72 does not address the activation of the system and, if the code change were approved, activation of the system would only apply to high rise buildings.

Assembly Action:

F127-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it inappropriately limits the paging zones to interior stairways versus all stairways.

Assembly Action:

F128-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Although the committee agreed that clarification of this section was necessary the proposal was disapproved with the primary concerns being that the revisions may conflict with ICC/ANSI A117.1 and would not clarify the intent of the section for visible alarm notification.

Assembly Action:

F129-09/10

Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it felt that having sprinkler related requirements within the alarm zoning section was confusing. Note that there was an editorial fix in this code change to revise the section reference from Section 1019.2 to 1021.2 to correspond to the 2009 code numbering.

F130-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent F131-09/10

F132-09/10

PART I- IFC

PART II- IRC B/E

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/2009-10cvcle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standards NFPA 720-2009 and UL 2075-2004 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standards did comply with ICC standards criteria. Standard UL 2075 is already referenced in the IFC but not currently in the IRC. If the code change is approved, UL 2075 would be added to Chapter 44 of the IRC as a referenced standard.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

261

None

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

Withdrawn by Proponent

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent's request for disapproval. The proponent will rework this and bring it back to the Final Action.

Assembly Action:

None

F133-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

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 NFPA 720-2009 and UL 2034-2008 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standards did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Modify proposal as follows:

908.7 (**IBC [F] 908.7**) **Carbon monoxide alarms.** Group I or R occupancies located in a building containing a fuel-burning appliance or a building which has an attached garage shall be provided with single station carbon monoxide alarms. The carbon monoxide alarms shall be listed as complying with UL 2034 and be installed and maintained in accordance with NFPA 720 and the manufacturer's instructions. An open parking garage, as defined in the *International Building Code*, <u>or enclosed parking garage ventilated in accordance with Section 404 of the *International Mechanical Code* shall not be deemed to be an attached garage.</u>

Exception: Sleeping units or dwelling units which do not themselves contain a fuel-burning appliance or have an attached garage, but which are located in a building with a fuel-burning appliance or an attached garage, need not be provided with single station carbon monoxide alarms provided that:

- 1. The sleeping unit or dwelling unit is located more than one story above or below any story which contains a fuel-burning appliance or an attached garage;
- 2. The sleeping unit or dwelling unit is not connected by duct work or ventilation shafts to any room containing a fuel-burning appliance or to an attached garage; and
- 3. The building is provided with a common area carbon monoxide alarm system.

908.7.1 Carbon monoxide detection systems. Carbon monoxide detection systems, that include carbon monoxide detectors and audible notification appliances, installed and maintained in accordance with this section for carbon monoxide alarms and NFPA 720 shall be permitted. The carbon monoxide detectors shall be listed as complying with UL 2075.

4606.1 Carbon monoxide alarms. Existing Group I or R occupancies located in a building containing a fuelburning appliance or a building which has an attached garage shall be provided with single station carbon monoxide alarms. The carbon monoxide alarms shall be listed as complying with UL 2034 and be installed and maintained in accordance with NFPA 720 and the manufacturer's instructions. An open parking garage, as defined in the *International Building Code*, <u>or enclosed parking garage ventilated in accordance with Section</u> <u>404 of the *International Mechanical Code* shall not be deemed to be an attached garage.</u>

Exception: Sleeping units or dwelling units which do not themselves contain a fuel-burning appliance or have an attached garage, but which are located in a building with a fuel-burning appliance or an attached garage, need not be provided with single station carbon monoxide alarms provided that:

- 1. The sleeping units or dwelling unit is located more than one story above or below any story which contains a fuel-burning appliance or an attached garage;
- 2. The sleeping units or dwelling unit is not connected by duct work or ventilation shafts to any room containing a fuel-burning appliance or to an attached garage; and
- 3. The building is provided with a common area carbon monoxide alarm system.

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Rea son: The committee approved the proposal adding CO detectors to the code since having provisions within the IBC and IF C is a better approach than what has been occurring on a state level through the legislative process. This also makes the IB C and IF C consistent with the IRC. The first modification clarifies that ventilated enclosed parking garages were not intended to be considered as an attached garage for the purposes of enforcing this section. The second modification includes the us e of CO det ectors and associated systems in accordance with UL 2075. Such detectors are allowed by NFPA 720 and the committee felt it was appropriate to recognize both CO alarms and detectors.

Assembly Action:

F134-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal for a couple reasons. First, it was felt that the proposed exception is best dealt with as an alternative method in accordance with Chapter 1. The second reason was concern with the inconsistency with terminology related to pressurized systems. Finally there was concern that there are other pressurization methods such as elevator pressurization that should be correlated with this section.

Assembly Action:

F135-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this code change with concern that Section 909.18.8.2.1 did not include the engineer and on ly referenced the contractor. In addition it would be more app ropriate to reference the fire code official versus the building official. Generally there was concern that allowing third party accreditation may lessen the tes ting requirements. It should be noted that t he committee did like that the proposal coordinated the smoke control special inspection requirements between the IBC, IFC and the IMC.

Assembly Action:

F136-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal as there was concern with the allowance in the proposed item 6.6 for "doors t ypically maintained in a closed position" which was considered subjective and could possibly lead to inconsistent enforcement. In addition there was concern with the lack of reference to IBC Section 715 for rating requirements.

Assembly Action:

F137-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This code change was disapproved as there was no justification provided to remove the safety factor for pressure testing of ducts w hen used with a smoke control sy stem. In addition, there is no referenced standard provided by the proponent to support the proposal.

Assembly Action:

F138-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as there needs to be confirmation that all a spects of the smoke control system are operative with confirmation of power downstream of the disconnects.

Assembly Action:

F139-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as there was not felt a need to restrict racewa ys to metal as man y other t ypes are used without a p roblem. If t he concern is survi vability, then the section needs to address that concern with specific language.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

263

None

None

None

None

None

Disapproved

F140-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The revision removes ambiguity as to what is meant by an "approved agency for flame and smoke characteristics" by providing a reference to a specific section of the IMC that addresses pneumatic tubing

Assembly Action:

F141-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

909.19 (IBC [F] 909.19) System acceptance. Buildings, or portions thereof, required by this code to comply with this section shall not be issued a certificate of occupancy until such time that the fire code official determines that the provisions of this section have been fully complied with and that the fire department has received satisfactory instruction on the operation, both automatic and manual, of the system and a written maintenance program complying with the requirements of Section 909.20.1 has been submitted and approved by the fire code official.

Exception: In buildings of phased construction, a temporary certificate of occupancy, as approved by the fire code official, shall be allowed provided that those portions of the building to be occupied meet the requirements of this section and that the remainder does not pose a significant hazard to the safety of the proposed occupants or adjacent buildings.

Committee Reason: The code change proposal was approved as it provides the necessary next step for the maintenance of the smoke control system. Since the authority that will follow the future maintenance of systems is the fire department a modification was approved that adds the language "by the fire code official" to the end of the section.

Assembly Action:

F142-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that it would be too restrictive to require the proposed level of qualifications for the maintenance of approved smoke control systems.

Assembly Action:

F143-09/10

F144-09/10

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 NFPA 204-2010 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria in terms of the availability of a consensus draft for the committee hearing. Note that section 3.6.3.1 of CP28-05 requires that the standard be completed and readily available prior to Final Action Consideration. The final action of this proposal will occur May 14-23, 2009.

Review of the proposed standard FM 4430-07 indicated that in the opinion of ICC Staff the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria. More specifically the standard did not meet the consensus process of requirement of Section 3.6.3.2 of CP28-05.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Withdrawn by Proponent

Modify proposal as follows:

910.2.1 (IBC [F] 910.2.1) Group F-1 or S-1 -A mechanical smoke removal system shall be installed in one story-buildings or portions thereof used as a Group F-1 or S-1 occupancy exceeding 50,000 square feet.

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

None

264

Disapproved

910.2.3 (IBC [F] 910.2.3) Sprinklered high-piled combustible storage. A mechanical smoke removal system shall be installed in one story buildings or portions thereof containing high-piled combustible storage which is protected by an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 413 and the *International Fire Code*.

[F] 910.4. Mechanical smoke removal system. Where required by Sections 910.2.1 and 910.2.3, a mechanical smoke removal system shall be provided in accordance with this section.

Exceptions:

- **<u>1.</u>** Buildings or portions thereof which are protected by ESFR sprinklers.
- 2. Buildings equipped with smoke and heat vents designed in accordance with NFPA 204, when permitted by NFPA 13.

910.4.6 (IBC [F] 910.4.6) Wiring and control. Wiring for the operation and control of smoke removal system fans shall be connected ahead of the main disconnect provided with power in accordance with Section 909.11 and be protected by materials with a finish rating of 30 minutes not less than 1 hour.

2306.7 Smoke and heat venting. Where smoke and heat venting is required by Table 2306.2 in buildings not protected by an automatic sprinkler system, smoke and heat vents and draft curtains shall be provided in accordance with Section 910. Smoke and heat venting shall not be required where storage areas are protected by early suppression fast response (ESFR) sprinkler systems installed in accordance with NFPA 13. Where Table 2306.2 requires smoke and heat venting in a building with a standard sprinkler system, a mechanical smoke removal system shall be provided in accordance with Section 910.4. Where draft curtains are required by Table 2306.2, they shall be provided in accordance with Section 910.3.4.

Revise Table 2306.2 Note j as follows:

j. Smoke and heat venting shall not be required when storage areas are protected by early suppression fast response (ESFR) sprinkler systems installed in accordance with NFPA 13. Where a standard sprinkler system is installed in these locations, a mechanical smoke removal system shall be provided in accordance with Section 910.4. See Section 2306.7.

NFPA

204-2010 2007 Standard for Smoke and Heat Venting

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee R eason: The com mittee approved the pro posal with amendments as it w as felt th at a majo r revision to this section was ne cessary. The p roposal essentially requires mec hanical smoke removal in sprinklered buildings and using smoke and heat vents in unsprinklered buildings. There were four major modifications to this code change. The first removed the phrase "one-story" from sections 910.2.1 and 910.2.3 as mechanical smoke removal does not need to be limited to 'one story" buildings as smoke and heat venting is limited. The second modification n increases the rating of the wiring for the smok e removal system from 3.0 minutes to 1 ho ur and also requires standby power and some associated passive protection of such power supplies in accordance with Section 909.11. Members of the committee felt smoke removal systems are critical emergency systems that need additional protection even in buildings where sprinklers are operating. The third modification recognizes some situations that are per mitted by N FPA 13 to allo w smoke and he at vents in sprinklered buildings. Allowing smoke and heat vents as an option when appropriate was felt to be necessary. This revision adds a new exception to Section 910.4 to allow this in lieu of smoke removal systems. In addition, Section 2306.7 and footnote j to Table 2306.2 makes the refer ence to smoke removal more general to be inclusive of mechanical smoke removal and sm oke and h eat v ents. T he fourth modification changes th e referenced edition of NFPA 204 from the 2010 edition to the 2007 edition. The reason for the change of edition years relates to the fact that the 2010 edition is likely not to be available prior to the final action hearings.

Assembly Action:

F145-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee disapproved the p roposal with concern t hat aisle configuration often changes and in most cases draft curtains are not required in sprinklered buildings with high-piled storage.

Assembly Action:

None

None

Disapproved

265

F146-09/10

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 NFPA 204-2007 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria. Note that section 3.6.3.1 of CP28-05 requires that the standard be completed and readily available prior to Final Action Consideration. The final action of this proposal will occur May 14-23, 2009.

Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

NFPA

204-20072010 Standard for Smoke and Heat Venting

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Rea son: The committee approved the p roposal as it provides the encessary m aintenance requirement for smoke and he at vents that the code currently lacks. The m odification simply revises the standard edition of NFPA 204 to the 2010 edition.

Assembly Action:

F147-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the pr oposal as there are already so many labels involved with the building and often times the caps on fire department connections go missing. Additionally, colors often cannot be seen at night. Other comments addressed the fact that the methodology of labeling may vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Assembly Action:

F148-09/10

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

PART I- IFC Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The p roposal w as disapp roved for sever al r easons. More specifically it is unclear whether the intention was to r equire the device in all buildings or only in specific buildings. Currently the language appears to apply to all buildings and occupancy classifications. I n addition it appears to be proprietary in its requirements. The requirements may cause some technical difficulties with concerns with how the term "heat sensors" are defined and how the system would be turned back on after an event.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IFGC

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the action taken on Part I of this proposal.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Modified

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

F149-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement

Assembly Action:

F150-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval in order to work with the fire se rvice and oth er stakeholders in preparing a very clear definition of the term "occupied" based on the number of persons.

Assembly Action:

F151-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1030.2 Reliability. Required exit accesses, exits or exit discharges shall be continuously maintained free from obstructions or impediments to full instant use in the case of fire or other emergency when the areas served by such exits are occupied. An exit or exit passageway shall not be used for any purpose that interferes with other than as a means of egress.

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement. The modification removes former e xit passage way lang uage from the prop osal t hat could have lead to inconsistent enforcement and would have made the proposed revisions more restrictive for existing buildings than for new buildings.

Assembly Action:

F152-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. The revised requirements will be less restrictive that those required by the OSHA directive listed in the bibliography, which requires fire detection at such work stations.

Assembly Action:

F153-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and preferred this proposal over F154-09/10, which its prop onent offered to withdraw in fav or of this pro posal. It was felt t hat new dry cleaning equipment addresses the safety hazards adequately. Also, stating the exceptions in the code text is preferable to requiring the inspector to carry the referenced standard into the field as code change F154-09/10 would do. It was also noted that California and several other states have banned perchloreth ylene which requires that operators purchase new equipment and the committee felt that adding a sprinkler requirement on top of that capital expense would be a hardship.

Assembly Action:

F154-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

None

None

F155-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee had conc erns about combustible finishes being delet ed and disagreed with the blanket removal of dipping operations from IBC Section 416.5 since the IFC does require fire protection for some dipping operations.

Assembly Action:

F156-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The com mittee did not fe el that it had adequate informati on to properly e valuate the proposal and that there was inadequate justification provided. It was unclear as to how the 4 scf per cubic foot of booth volume was determined. The current tim e-out interlock is straight forward and easy to inspect while the volume-based interlock would be difficult to inspect.

Assembly Action:

F157-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The com mittee did not fe el that it had adequate informati on to properl y e valuate the proposal and that there was inadequate justification provided. The current stated air velocity is straight forward and eas y to me asure, whereas determining 25 % of the LFL would require e xpensive equipment and it is unclear as to who would be responsible to provide such equipment.

Assembly Action:

F158-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. The proposal removes reliance on only arc haic fog ging technology which required heating to disperse the insecticidal vapors.

Assembly Action:

F159-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1701.1 Scope. Fumigation and thermal insecticidal fogging operations within buildings, structures and spaces shall comply with this chapter.

1703.1 General. Buildings, structures and spaces in which fumigation and thermal insecticidal fogging operations are conducted shall comply with the fire protection and safety requirements of Sections 1703.2 through 1703.7.

1703.3 Notification. The fire code official and fire chief shall be notified in writing at least 48 hours before the building, structure or space is to be closed in connection with the utilization of any toxic or flammable fumigant. Notification shall give the location of the enclosed space to be fumigated or fogged, the occupancy, the fumigants or insecticides to be utilized, the person or persons responsible for the operation, and the date and time at which the operation will begin. Written notice of any fumigation or thermal insecticidal fogging operation shall be given to all affected occupants of the building, structure or space in which such operations are to be conducted with sufficient advance notice to allow the occupants to evacuate the building, structure or space. Such notice shall inform the occupants as to the purposes, anticipated duration and hazards associated with the fumigation or insecticidal operation.

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Modified

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement. The modification provides correlation with the action taken on code change F158-09/10.

Assembly Action:

F160-09/10

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 ANSI/UL 2360-00 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1803.10.1.2 Combustible tools. Where the horizontal surface of a combustible tool is obstructed from ceiling sprinkler discharge, automatic sprinkler protection that covers the horizontal surface of the tool shall be provided.

Exceptions:

- An automatic gaseous fire-extinguishing local surface application system shall be allowed as an 1. alternative to sprinklers. Gaseous-extinguishing systems shall be actuated by infrared (IR) or ultraviolet/infrared (UVIR) optical detectors.
- 2. Tools constructed of materials that are listed as Class 1 or Class 2 in accordance with UL 2360 and or approved for use without internal fire extinguishing system protection.

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The committee generally agreed with the proponent's reason statement. The proposed revision to Section 1803.10.1.2, Exception 2 would strip the fire code official of the authority to approve unlisted tools however, the modification restores that authority.

Assembly Action:

F161-09/10

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

PART I- IFC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval to allow additional dialogue on the subject with the fire service.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IMC **Committee Action:**

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exceptions:

An approved automatic fire suppression system shall not be required in ducts conveying materials, fumes, mists and vapors that are nonflammable and noncombustible and where

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

None

None

None

Approved as Modified
flammable contaminant are diluted to below 25% of their lower flammability limit under all conditions and at any concentrations.

- 2. Automatic fire suppression systems shall not be required in metallic and noncombustible, q nonmetallic exhaust ducts in semiconductor fabrication facilities.
- 2.3. An *approved* automatic fire suppression system shall not be required in ducts where the largest cross-sectional diameter of the duct is less than 10 inches (254 mm).
- 3.4. For laboratories, as defined in Section 510.1, automatic fire protection systems shall not be required in laboratory hoods or exhaust systems.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the propon ent's reason statement. The modification returns the original text of Exception 1 and adds a new Exception 2 to clarify where automatic sprinklers are required in hazardous exhaust systems.

Assembly Action:

F162-09/10

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

PART I- IFC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: In the floor testimony, it was indicated that a revised version of ASTM E2336 which would include other th an grease duct applications is n ot read y now nor will it be re ady in time for the final action hearing as required by CP-28, Section 3.6. Also, the proponent offered a modification that would have included deletion of the re ferences to ASTM E2336. The committee did not move the modification and disapproved th e code change because it felt that a specific testing standard is essential to the proposal. Also, the committee felt that the assembly needs to be tested as-installed rather than installed-as-tested and should not be subject only to the manufacturer's instructions.

PART II- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action taken on Part I.

Assembly Action:

Assembly Action:

F163-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee preferred code change F164-09/10 over this proposal to avoid conflicting requirements with NFPA 318.

Assembly Action:

F164-09/10

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 NFPA 318-09 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The committee prefer red this proposal over F163- 09/10 because it is more comprehensive in its approach to the subject matter by referencing a nationally recognized standard that SAGS facilities will be required (by insurers) to comply with anyway. Also, F163-09/10 would only regulate ventilation whereas NFPA 318 regulates the entire concept of SAGS.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

F165-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal provides needed correlation with current technology and industry practices.

Assembly Action:

F166-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal provides a needed update to current performance-based technology.

Assembly Action:

None

None

F167-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1805.3.1 Corridors and exit enclosures. Corridors and exit enclosures in new buildings or serving new fabrication areas shall not contain HPM, in quantities greater than the maximum allowable quantity per control area, except as permitted in exit corridors by Section 415.8.6.3 of the *International Building Code* and Section 1805.3.2 of this code.

1805.3.2 Transport in corridors <u>and exit enclosures</u>. Transport in corridors <u>and exit enclosures</u> shall be in accordance with Sections 1805.3.2.1 through 1805.3.3.

1805.3.2.1 Fabrication area alterations. When existing fabrication areas are altered or modified in existing buildings, HPM is allowed to be transported in existing corridors when such corridors comply with Section 415.8.3 of the *International Building Code* and Section 2703.10 of this Code.

1805.3.2.2 HPM transport in corridors and exit enclosures. HPM in quantities equal to or less than the maximum allowable quantity per control area is allowed to be transported in corridors. <u>Non-production HPM is allowed to be transported in corridors and exit enclosures if utilized for maintenance, lab work and testing when the transportation is in accordance with Section 2703.10.</u>

1805.3.3 Service corridors. When a new fabrication area is constructed, a service corridor shall be provided where it is necessary to transport HPM, in quantities greater than the maximum allowable quantity per control area, from a liquid storage room, HPM room, gas room, or from the outside of a building to the perimeter wall of a fabrication areas. Service corridors shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the *International Building Code*.

1805.3.4 Carts and trucks. Carts and trucks used to transport HPM in corridors and exit enclosures in existing buildings shall comply with Section 2703.10.3.

IBC [F] 415.8.3 Corridors. Corridors shall comply with Chapter 10 and shall be separated from fabrication areas as specified in section 415.8.2.2. Corridors shall not contain HPM and shall not be used for transporting such materials in quantities greater than the maximum allowable quantity per control area except through closed piping systems as provided in section 415.8.6.3

Excepti ons:

2

existing

- 1. <u>Non-production HPM is allowed to be transported in corridors if utilized for maintenance, lab</u> work and testing.
- 2. Where existing fabrication areas are altered or modified, HPM is allowed to be transported in corridors, subject to the following conditions:
 - _1. Corridors. Corridors adjacent to the fabrication area where the alteration work is to be done shall comply with Section 1018 for a length determined as follows:
 - 2.1.1. The length of the common wall of the corridor and the

area: and

- fabrication 2. 1.2.
 - _1.2. For the distance along the corridor to the point of entry of HPM into the corridor serving that fabrication area.
- 2. _2. Emergency alarm system. There shall be an emergency telephone system, a local manual alarm station or other approved alarm-initiating device within corridors at not more than 150-foot

(45 720 mm) intervals and at each exit and doorway. The signal shall be relayed to an approved central, proprietary or remote station service or the emergency control station and shall also initiate a local audible alarm.

2.3. Pass-throughs. Self-closing doors having a fire protection rating of not less than 1 hour shall separate pass-throughs from existing corridors. Pass-throughs shall be constructed as required for the corridors and protected by an approved automatic fire-extinguishing system.

Committee Reason: The committee generally agreed with the proponent's reason statement but preferred the modified version of the proposal. In response to concerns expressed by the fire service, the modification clarifies that the proposal is applicable to small maintenance, lab and testing quantities of HPM and not production quantities and would allow transport in corridors as within any other Group H occupancy.

Assembly Action:

F168-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the code change will further open the door to the new technology of biodiesel fuels.

Assembly Action:

F169-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the code change is consistent with the trend toward not using "laundry lists" in the code.

Assembly Action:

F170-09/10

F171-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action:

F172-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that self-certification is inconsistent with the code and should not be approved. The proponent also requested disapproval in order to submit a modification in a public comment.

Assembly Action:

F173-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the code change better accommodates alcohol-blended fuels.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

272

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

F174-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

2209.3.1 Location of dispensing devices. Dispensing devices shall be located above ground. In addition to the requirements of Section 2203.1, dispensing shall be located in accordance with the following:

- Ten feet (3048 mm) or more from the nearest public street or sidewalk.
- Fifty feet (15,240 mm) from the nearest rail of any railroad main track. 2
- Five feet or more from the nearest enclosing wall. 3.
- 4 Dispensing equipment shall be allowed under weather protection in accordance with the requirements of Section 2704.13 and constructed in a manner that prevents the accumulation of hydrogen gas.

Exceptions:

- 1. Compression, storage or dispensing equipment shall be allowed in buildings in accordance with Section 2209.3.2.2.
- 2 Compression, storage and dispensing equipment shall be allowed in vaults in accordance with Chapter 30.

2209.3.2.5 4 Liquefied Cryogenic fluid hydrogen storage. Storage of Cryogenic fluid hydrogen shall be in accordance with Chapters 32 and 35.

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal as modified for consistency with the action taken on code chan ges F214- and F215-09/10. The modification removes proposed Section 2209.3.1 which was originally intended for tanks rather than dispensers and retains the current text of Section 2209. 3.2.5 which contains the corr ect terminology. The Approved as Modified action also enabled withdrawal of code changes F176- and F177-09/10.

Assembly Action:

F175-09/10

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: Drafts of the proposed CSA HGV 4 standards were not submitted for review.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The documents proposed as referenced s tandards are still in draft form an d were not submitted to staff or the committee for review.

Assembly Action:

F176-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent Withdrawn by Proponent

F177-09/10

F178-09/10

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 UL 2017-08 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

Disapproved

None

3704.2.2.10.1 Gas detection system components. Gas detection system control units shall be listed and labeled in accordance with UL 864 or UL 2017, or approved. Gas detectors shall be listed and labeled in accordance with UL 2075 for use with the gases and vapors being detected, or approved.

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement. The modification provides the fire code official with the ability to approve gas detection system components that may not be listed and labeled

Assembly Action:

F179-09/10

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 FM 4996-07 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.2.1. ASME MH1-2005 was not submitted for review.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal as it would severely limit the ty pes of pallets allowed. A mor e generic appro ach was preferred versus allowing wood pallets in all ca ses but limiting other types of pallet t hrough a testing procedure. In addition, the standard FM 4996 was not ed by st aff as not complying with the CP28 and ASME MH1 w as not provided for review. This prop osal would also remove idle pallets from the high hazard category which created concern for some committee members.

Assembly Action:

F180-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as it was felt that aisles are an integral part of the fire protection in a warehouse and should not be excluded in the definition.

Assembly Action:

F181-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The p roposal w as disapproved as it is common for c ommodities to change an d commodities are often moved around. Enforcing this exception allowing no separation would be very difficult.

Assembly Action:

F182-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as it appears to counter the needs of the fire department by allowing doors 200 feet apart. In addition, as proposed, the language is confusing.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

F183-09/10

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 FM 4996-07 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.2.1.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based both upon the action on code change F179-09/10 and also per the proponents request. Additionally, the standa rd was noted by staff as not complying with ICC CP28.

Assembly Action:

F184-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The p roposal w as approved as it provide s a necessary tool to address an ongoing problem of maintaining flue spaces in a rack configuration in high-piled storage applications.

Assembly Action:

F185-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The com mittee disapprov ed the prop osal with concerns r elated to t he sa fety of fire fighters when operating the storage equipment and trying to manually shut down the pallet movers.

Assembly Action: F186-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

3302.1 Definitions. The following words and terms shall, for the purposes of this chapter and as used elsewhere in this code, have the meanings shown herein.

EXPLOSIVE. A chemical compound, mixture or device, the primary or common purpose of which is to function by explosion. The term includes, but is not limited to, dynamite, black powder, pellet powder, initiating explosives, detonators, safety fuses, squibs, detonating cord, igniter cord, igniters and display fireworks, 1.3G (Class B, Special).

The term "Explosive" includes any material determined to be within the scope of USC Title 18: Chapter 40 and also includes any material classified as an explosive other than consumer fireworks, 1.4G (Class C, Common) by the hazardous materials regulations of DOTn 49 CFR Parts 100-185.

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal removes an unnecessary redundancy in the table. The modification completes the code change since the 2009 edition was not available when the proponent prepared the code change and also removes potential conflict between the fireworks and explosives definitions.

Assembly Action:

None

275

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

F187-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee felt that the proposal pr ovides a reasonable clarification of the combustible dust requirements without creating a "laundry list" of conditions.

Assembly Action:

F188-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal will provide guidance to designers and field inspectors on how systems are to be installed.

Assembly Action:

F189-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee felt that relocation of the control area flo or require ments to a table footnote would increase the floor fire-resistance rating requirements of shorter buildings without justification. Also, a feature a s important as the floor rating requirement should remain in the body of the text and not be relegated to a table note. The proposal is generally inconsistent with the interpretive and instructional history regarding control areas.

Assembly Action:

F190-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The com mittee felt that the proposal, while consistent with the issued committee interpretations, does not clarify the code because the interpretations themselves are a pro blem. The code has always allowed multi-story control areas. The committee did feel, however, that the proposed revision to the definition of Control Area had merit and should be pursued in a public comment.

Assembly Action:

F191-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal provides needed clarity to the code.

Assembly Action:

F192-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

F193-09/10

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

PART I- IFC

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action:

F194-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The com mittee felt that the pro posal would introduce confusion and disrupt the correlation that currently e xists bet ween the I FC and IM C. T he proposal would also introduce subjective language that could create problems with enforcement as well as introducing un wieldliness through the use of tables from the Code of Federal Regulations.

Assembly Action:

F195-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that deletion of the entir e section in favor of a r eference to NFPA 99 would require the inspector to carry another book into the field in order to have access to the same material that is the current content of Section 3006. The committee also felt that since the original intent of the legacy Uniform Fire Code from which the IFC text was derived was to apply to dent al offices and similar small occupancies, the IFC should remain as curr ently written. Also, deletion of Section 3006. 3 would sever the current reference link with Section 4004 and outdoor storage provisions.

Assembly Action:

F196-09/10

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 APA 87-1 (2001) indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.11 and 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal is inconsistent with the action taken on code change F186-09/10 and that a modification suggested by the proponent to r esolve that inconsistency was mor e confusing than h elpful. Also, the proposed r effected standard does not comply with ICC CP-28, Section 3.6 and was also found to be unclear and confusing by some committee members.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

F197-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action taken on co de change F196-09/10.

Assembly Action:

F198-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consist ency with the action taken on code changes F196- and F197-09/10.

Assembly Action:

F199-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 3304.5.2(3) TABLE OF DISTANCES (Q-D) FOR BUILDINGS AND MAGAZINES CONTAINING EXPLOSIVES-DIVISION 1.4°

Restricted to articles, including articles packaged for shipment, that are not regulated as an explosive c. under Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms regulations, or unpacked articles used in process operations that do not propagate a detonation or deflagration between articles. This table shall not apply to consumer fireworks, 1.4G and novelties, 1.4G

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because it provides an appropriate change to the table title. The modification provides consistency with the action taken on code changes F196- and F197-09/10.

Assembly Action:

F200-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The com mittee felt that t he proposal r epresents an important public healt h issue and approved it based on the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action:

F201-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. The proposal also provides correlation with Table 7.3.3 of NFPA 30.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

278

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

F202-09/10

Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the prop onent's reason state ment that the proposal will provide increased safety for protected aboveground tanks installed indoors and storing Class I liquids.

Assembly Action:

F205-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

3404.2.9.5.2 Fill pipe connections. Fill pipe connections for tanks storing Class I, II and IIIA liquids and Class IIIB liquids connected to fuel-burning equipment shall be in accordance with Section 3404.2.9.7.7.

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee R eason: The committee agreed with the prop onent's reason state ment that the proposal will provide parity between protected aboveground tanks and non-protected aboveground tanks. The m odification provides an exemption for certain tanks containing Class IIIB liquids but t hat are not connected to fuel-burning equipment.

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: The proponent's concern is galvanic action where dissimilar materials are joined but the proposal does not reflect that. To the contrary, the proposal would limit the use of steel tanks or require them to be lined, including retroactivel y. The histor y of storing alcohol blended fuels in steel tanks has show n no problems with corrosion. Cur rent section 3704.2.9. 1 adequately addresses the proponent 's concerns. The committee also noted that its disapproval is not in conflict with the action taken on code change F173-09/10.

Assembly Action:

F203-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

3404.2.7.3.2 Vent-line flame arresters pressure-vacuum vents. Listed or approved flame arresters or pressure-vacuum (PV) vents that remain closed unless venting under pressure or vacuum conditions shall be installed in normal vents of tanks containing Class IB and IC liquids.

Exception: When determined by the fire code official that the use of such devices can result in damage to the tank.

Vent-line flame arresters and venting devices shall be installed and maintained in accordance with their listings and or API 2000 and maintained in accordance with Section 21.8.6 of NFPA 30 or API 2000. Use of Inline flame arresters in piping systems shall be installed and maintained in accordance with their listing and or API 2028. Pressure vacuum vents shall be installed in accordance with Section 21.4.3 of NFPA 30 or API 2000 and maintained in accordance with Section 21.8.6 of NFPA 30 or API 2000.

3404.2.9.7.3 Flame arresters. Approved flame arresters or pressure breather valves shall be installed in normal vents.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal provides a needed improvement in the level of protection affor ded to aboveg round tanks that are not classified as protected abovegroun d t anks. The modification to Section 3404.2.7. 3.2 adds a refe rence to the appropriate NFPA 30 section as an alternative to API 2000. The modification to reinstate Section 3404.2.9.7.3 maintains the extra measure of protection that has always been afforded to protected aboveground tanks.

F204-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

None

279

None

None

Disapproved

F206-09/10

Committee Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal will provide better correlation with NFPA 30.

Assembly Action:

F207-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and agreed that the table should be correlated with the latest fire test data.

Assembly Action:

F208-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

3405.2.4 Class I, II and III liquids. Class I liquids or when heated to or above their flash points, Class II and Class III liquids shall be transferred by one of the following methods:

- 1. From safety cans complying with UL 30.
- 2. Through an approved closed piping system.
- From containers or tanks by an approved pump taking suction through an opening in the top of the 3. container or tank.
- For Class IB, IC, II and III liquids, from containers or tanks by gravity through an approved self-closing 4. or automatic-closing valve when the container or tank and dispensing operations are provided with spill control and secondary containment in accordance with Section 3403.4. Class IA liquids shall not be dispensed by gravity from tanks.
- 5. Approved engineered liquid transfer systems.

Exception: Liquids in containers not exceeding a 5.3-gallon (20 L) capacity.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. The modification corrects an editorial error in the proposal.

Assembly Action:

F209-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that it was unclear as to whether the proposed standard takes into account the ele vated tempe ratures of liquids he ated up to or a bove their flash points as regula ted by this section

Assembly Action:

F210-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

3405.2.4 Class I, II and III liquids. Class I liquids or Class II liquids and Class III liquids that are heated up to or above their flash points shall be transferred by one of the following methods:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

Disapproved

None

280

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Modified

- 2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

- 1. From safety cans with UL 30.
- Through an approved closed piping system. 2
- From containers or tanks by an approved pump taking suction through an opening in the top of the 3. container or tank.
- For Class IB, IC, II and III liquids, from containers or tanks by gravity through an approved self-closing 4. or automatic-closing valve when the container or tank and dispensing operations are provided with spill control and secondary containment in accordance with Section 3403.4. Class IA liquids shall not be dispensed by gravity from tanks.
- Approved engineered liquid transfer systems. 5.

Exception: Liquids in original shipping containers not exceeding a 5.3-gallon (20 L) 1.3-gallon (5 L) capacity.

Committee Reason: The committee agree d with the proponent's reason statement but felt that the modified proposal better achieves the proponent's intent by preventing the transfer of liquids from temporary, single-use containers and provides more direct correlation with Section 18.4.2 of NFPA 30.

Assembly Action:

F211-09/10

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 propos ed new standard UL 1204-04 ind icated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.11 and 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal provided clearer guidance on the standard to which the machines must be listed.

Assembly Action:

F212-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and that the proposal will provide increased safety.

Assembly Action:

F213-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standards IEC 60601-1-1-2:2004 and UL/CE 60601-1-03 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, th e standards did no t comply with ICC standards crit eria, Sections 3.6.2.11 an d 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

3405.5 Alcohol-based hand rubs classified as Class | or II liquids. The use of wall-mounted dispensers containing alcohol-based hand rubs classified as Class I or II liquids shall be in accordance with all of the following:

- The maximum capacity of each dispenser shall be 68 ounces (2 L). 1.
- The minimum separation between dispensers shall be 48 inches (1219 mm). 2.
- 3 The dispensers shall not be installed directly adjacent to, directly above or below an electrical receptacle, switch, appliance, device or other ignition source. The wall space between the ispenser and the floor shall remain clear and unobstructed.
- Dispensers shall be mounted so that the bottom of the dispenser is a minimum of 42 inches (1067 mm) and a maximum of 48 inches (1219 mm) above the finished floor.
- 5. Dispensers shall not release their contents except when the dispenser is manually activated.

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Modified

None

Approved as Submitted

Facilities shall be permitted to install and use automatically activated "Touch Free" alcohol based handrub dispensing devices with the following requirements:

The touch free dispensing system shall be listed as being in compliance with UL/CE 60601-5.1. 1 and IEC 60601-1-2 for medical devices.

<u>5.1 5.2.</u> The facility or persons responsible for the dispensers shall test the dispensers each time a new refill is installed in accordance with the manufacturer's care and use instructions

5.2 5.3. Dispensers shall be designed and must operate in a manner that ensures accidental or malicious activations of the dispensing device are minimized. At a minimum, all devices subject to or used in accordance with this section shall have the following safety features: <u>5.2.1</u> 5.3.1. Any activations of the dispenser shall only occur when an object is placed ithin four inches of the sensing device. 5.2.2 5.3.2. The dispenser shall not dispense more than the amount required for hand ygiene consistent with label instructions as regulated by the Food and Drug Administration.

<u>5.2.3</u> 5.3.3. An object placed within the activation zone and left in place will cause only one activation.

Storage and use of alcohol-based hand rubs shall be in accordance with the 6.

applicable provisions of Sections 3404 and 3405.

7. Dispensers installed in occupancies with carpeted floors shall only be allowed in smoke

compartments or fire areas equipped throughout with an approved automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2.

Chapter 47:

w

h

IEC

International Electrotechnical Commission IEC Central Office 3. ru de Varembe, P.O. Box 131, CH-1211 GENEVA 20, Switzerland.

60601-1-2:2004 EMC Standards for Electrical Medical Equipment

UL

UL/CE 60601-1-03 Medical Electrical Equipment, Part I: General Requirements for Safety

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal is a public health improvement that will reduce contamination of the dispenser oper ating mecha nism. The committee also expr essed some concern over accidental or mischievious/malicious activations of the dispensers and suggested a public comment to address those issues. The modifica tion suggested by the proponent deletes references to standards that were determined not to be in compliance with ICC CP-28, Section 3.6 and could only be used to certify products but could not be used for listing.

Assembly Action:

F214-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

3504.2.1 Distance limitation to exposures. Outdoor storage or use of flammable compressed gases other than hydrogen shall be located from a lot line, public street, public alley, public way, or building not associated with the manufacture or distribution of such gases in accordance with Table 3504.2.1. The outdoor storage of hydrogen compressed gas shall comply with the separation distances in NFPA 55.

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Re ason: T he committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement. T he modification suggested by the proponent reta ins the current t ext in anticipation of the submitt al of a more comprehensive code change proposal in the future that will correlate the subject matter of several competing code changes.

Assembly Action:

F215-09/10

Committee Action: Modify the proposal as follows:

3501.1 Scope. The storage and use of flammable gases shall be in accordance with this chapter. Compressed gases shall also comply with Chapter 30 and cryogenic fluids shall also comply with Chapter 32. Bulk hydrogen and other bulk flammable compressed gas systems and bulk liquefied hydrogen and other bulk flammable cryogenic fluid gas systems shall comply with NFPA 55. Hydrogen motor fuel-dispensing stations

Approved as Modified

Approved as Modified

None

and repair garages and their associated aboveground hydrogen storage systems shall also be designed and constructed in accordance with Chapter 22.

3502.1 Definitions. The following words and terms shall, for the purposes of this chapter and as used elsewhere in this code, have the meanings shown herein.

BULK FLAMMABLE COMPRESSED GAS SYSTEM. An assembly of equipment, consisting of but not lim ited to, storage containers, pressure regulators, press ure relief devices, vaporizers, manifolds, and p iping, with a storage capacity of mor e than 5000 ft³ (scf) (142 m³) of compressed flammable gas including unconnected reserves integral to the s system. The bulk s system terminates at t he point where the gas sup ply, at service pressure, first enters the supply line. The containers are either stationary or portable, and the gas is stored as a compressed gas.

BULK FLAMMABLE CRYOGENIC FLUID GAS SYSTEM. An accembly of equipment, consisting of but not limited to, storage containers, pressure regulators, pressure relief devices, vaporizers, manifolds, and piping, with a storage capacity of more than 45 gal (170 L) of flammable cryogenic fluid including unconnected recerves integral to the system. The bulk system terminates at the point where the gas supply, at service pressure, first enters the supply line. The containers are either stationary or portable, and the gas is stored as a cryogenic fluid.

3504.2.1 Distance limitation to exposures. Outdoor storage or use of non-bulk_flammable compressed gases shall be located from exposures not associated with the manufacture or distribution of such gases in accordance with Table 3504.2.1.

TABLE 3504.2.1 NON-BULK FLAMMABLE GASES – DISTANCE TO EXPOSURES^{*} (Entire table to be deleted)

3504.2.1.1 Weather protection canopies. Where weather protection is provided for sheltering outdoor nonbulk flammable gas storage or use areas, such areas shall be constructed in accordance with Section 2704.13 and the International Building Code. Outdoor storage or use of non-bulk flammable compressed gases shall be located from exposures in accordance with Table 3504.2.1 except that Note a of Table 3504.2.1 shall not apply to separation from lot lines, public streets, public alleys or public ways when storage or use areas are sheltered by weather protection.

3504.2.1.2 Building openings. Outdoor storage and use of non bulk flammable gases shall be separated from building openings by 25 feet.

3504.2.1.2.1 Fire barrier. Fire barriers as shown in Note a to Table 3504.2.1 shall be allo wed to be used as a means to separate storage and use areas from openings including building exits and the exit discharge.

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal as modified for consistency with the action taken on code change F214-09/10. The modification correlates the proposal with the modified F214-09/10 which, by referencing NFPA 55, accomplishes the correction to Table 3504.2.1 that the C GA was attempting to make in this proposal. Since the correct table appears in NFPA 55, Table 3504.2.1 is no longer needed and is therefore being deleted by the modification.

Assembly Action:

F216-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee R eason: The committee felt that t he proposal was taking too broa d an app roach with a total prohibition of LPG containers on roofs and felt that the code should not override the referenced standard, NFPA 58, which allows containers on ro ofs under certain conditions. The committee suggested that a cont ainer size limitation might be useful and also that the prop osal should clarify that it would be applicable only to permanent installations and not to DOTn cylinders used in roofing operations.

Assembly Action:

F217-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal is attempting to address a contractual issue which is outside the scope of the IF C and also felt that the attendant se ction is not the correct location for such a proposal.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

F218-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

3809.14 Automated LP-gas vending machines. The use of automated LP-gas vending machines or racks that are not operated by an attendant to purchase or exchange LP-gas containers is prohibited.

3809.15 LP-gas cylinder exchange for resale. In addition to other applicable requirements of this chapter, facilities operating cylinder exchange stations for LP-gas that are accessible to the public shall comply with the following requirements.

- 1. Cylinders shall be secured in a lockable, ventilated metal cabinet or other approved enclosure.
- 2. <u>Cylinders shall be accessible only by authorized personnel or by use of an automated exchange system in accordance with Section 3809.15.1.</u>
- 3. A sign shall be posted on the entry door of the business operating the cylinder exchange stating "DO NOT BRING LP-GAS CYLINDERS INTO THE BUILDING" or similar approved wording.
- 4. An emergency contact information sign shall be posted within 10 feet of the cylinder storage cabinet. The content, lettering, size, color and location of the required sign shall be as required by the fire code official.

3809.15.1 Automated cylinder exchange stations. Cylinder exchange stations that include an automated vending system for exchanging cylinders shall comply with the following additional requirements:

- 1. The vending system shall only permit access to a single cylinder per individual transaction.
- 2. <u>Cabinets storing cylinders shall be designed such that cylinders can only be placed inside when they are oriented in the upright position.</u>
- Devices operating door releases for access to stored cylinders shall be permitted to be pneumatic, mechanical or electrically powered.
- 4. <u>Electrical equipment inside of or within 5 feet of a cabinet storing cylinders, including but not limited to electronics associated with vending operations, shall comply with the requirements for Class I, Division 2 equipment in accordance with NFPA 70.</u>
- A manual override control shall be permitted for use by authorized personnel. On newly installed cylinder exchange stations, the vending system shall not be capable of returning to automatic operation after a manual override until the system has been inspected and reset by authorized personnel.
- Inspections shall be conducted by authorized personnel to verify that all cylinders are secured, access doors are closed and the station has no visible damage or obvious defects, which necessitate placing the station out of service. The frequency of inspections shall be as specified by the fire code official.

Committee Reason: The committee felt that due to the rapid increase in the use of LP-gas cylinders over the past decade, automated refill and exchange stations for consumer propane tanks have created new public safety hazards in need of reasonable regulation. In approving the modification, the committee agreed that, rather than prohibiting automated LPG exchange racks as recommended in the original proposal, the modification replacing the original proposal provides an appropriate set of safety controls that have been jointly developed by fire service and industry representatives. With these controls in place, LPG exchange racks will be suitably regulated by the IFC. The committee also suggested that a public comment would be useful to clarify to whom the term "authorized personnel" is referring in Sections 3809.15(2), 3809.15.1(5) and 3809.15.1(6).

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Submitted

F219-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee felt that the proposal clarif ies that the fire code official do es have the authority to require alterations in buildings not built under the build ing code. The r evision to Table 4604.18.2 provides protection to new buildings by correlating the sprinklered building travel distance limitations to make them less restrictive that those for ne w buildings, thus preventing a ne w building from being in violation upo n issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Assembly Action:

F223-09/10

Committee R eason: The committee agreed with the pr oponent's reason state ment. The prop osal w ould provide correlation with Chapter 9.

Assembly Action:

F224-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The committee felt that removing the re quirement for a utomatic sy stems w ould be inappropriate. It was also noted that the title of t he section indicates that it is applicable to Group R-4 but th e text indicates Group R-2.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

F221-09/10

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

4603.5.2 Existing helistops and heliports. Existing buildings with a rooftop helistop or heliport located more than 30 feet above the lowest level of fire department access to the roof level on which the helistop or heliport is located shall be equipped with standpipes in accordance with Section 1107.5.

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. The modification provides correlation with the action taken on code change F92-09/10.

Assembly Action:

F222-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the action taken on code change F221-09/10 adequately provides for standpipes i n existing multi- story buildings. Also, the action s taken on code changes F8- and F9-09/10 should be given an opportunity to develop some history upon which to base any future requirements and avoid unintended consequences that could arise from approving this proposal.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal would create a finan cial hardship in these difficult economic times for existing businesse s, especially small retailers, and w ould affect all occupancies in mixeduse buildings that house these types of businesses. The propo sal should also be correlated with the action taken on code change F6 9-09/10 which established a thres hold for these occupancies when new to prevent a more restrictive requirement for existing buildings.

F220-09/10

Committee Action:

None

Non

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

F225-09/10 **Committee Action:**

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

provides needed clarification to the code text.

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal would allow for the avoidance altogether of installing smoke alarms for buildings originally built under a code that did not require them. For buildings that were no t built under any construction code, this becomes a property maintenance issue that does not belong in the IFC. The proposed la nguage could also be in conflict with state legislations that require retroactive smoke alar m installations.

Assembly Action:

F226-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that replacement of an entire unserviceable system may not always be necessary but would be required by this proposal which could create a hardship for building owners.

Assembly Action:

F227-09/10

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal is needed for fire fighter safet y when utilizing fire escapes during fireground ope rations, given the loads imposed by personnel and equipment.

Assembly Action:

F228-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal provides needed correlation between the IFC and the IBC...

Assembly Action:

F229-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The committee felt that Ch apter 46 should remain intact within the bod y of the code. Moving it to an a ppendix would require removal of the many "pointer" sections within the code that no w direct the user to Chapter 46 because the code style does not allow directing the user to optional appendices since they are not part of the cod e. The committee al so expressed its desire that Chapter 46, which is new to the 2009 edition of the IFC, be allow ed to develop some us e history before being substantially chan ged. The committee also observed that jurisdictions that adopt the code always have the authority to make a mendments to it in their adopting ordinance and can just as easily amend out Chapter 46 if so desired.

Assembly Action:

F230-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Committee Action:

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal provides needed clarification to the code text.

Assembly Action:

F232-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Because of the action take n on code change F23 1-09/10, the proponent suggested a modification to retain the section title only so that the end result would be that the current text would be deleted and the added t ext from F231-09/10 would become the new text. The modification was ruled out of order and the committee suggested that the proponent sub mit a public comment to resolve the issues between the two code changes.

Assembly Action:

F233-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent 's reason statement and felt that the proposal provides needed clarification to the code text.

Assembly Action:

F234-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement

Assembly Action:

F235-09/10

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 P.L. 109-295 in dicated that, in the opinion of IC C staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.11 and 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal was vague and unenf orceable and contains mostly commentary, making it difficult to determine what is required. The committee reiterated its suggestion from its action on a similar prop osal in the 2007 -2008 cy cle t hat e xisting technology, s uch as "Reverse 911", that provide better notification can be used to accomplish many of the proponent's goals without creating the need for outside sirens which already mean something different (weather alert, volunteer fire department alert, etc.) to the public and would generate confusion.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

F231-09/10

F236-09/10

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

PART I- IFC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that this would be a useful appendix tool for the fire department. The committee also pointed out that sections dealing with symbol size and lettering size need to b e correlated because, as written, the lettering sid e would be larg er than the symbol wing space into which it must be placed.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IBC GENERAL Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed appendix should not be placed in the IBC because it is predominantly fire department specific in mu ch of it s content (i.e., pertaining to FD traini ng, tactics, procedures, etc.).

Assembly Action:

F237-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal would provide a good starting point for comm unity planning t hat takes into account the need for road traffic safety in fire apparatus access road design.

Assembly Action:

F238-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard CSFM Solar Photovoltaic Guideline, April 22, 2008 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.1, 3.6.2.11, and 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal because it would conflict with the approval of code change F8-09/10 and because the proposed referenced st andard does not comply with CP-28. Also, it was unclear why the sprinkler exception in Section K101.1 would not apply to buildings under four stories. The proposal also contained non-code language when referring to residential occupancies.

Assembly Action:

F239-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal as it would enable smoke exhaust to be provided in buildings greater than one story as smoke and heat vents can only be installed on the roof. Previously the requirements were limited to one story buildings.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

288

None

None

_

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the issue of this proposal is a local one and need not be included in the code.

Assembly Action:

F241-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal would be in conflict with the action taken on cod e change F1 00-09/10 which clarifies the same requirements for n ew Group A oc cupancies and provides for Group A occupancies that are separated from one another.

Assembly Action:

F242-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This propo sal w as disapproved based upon the action taken on F144 -09/10 which completely revised Section 910 and would specifically not require mechanical smoke removal f or buildings equipped with ESFR sprinklers.

Assembly Action:

F243-09/10

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved by the committee as it was felt that the current references to Sections 905.4, 905.5 and 905.6 in the opening section could be misinterpreted as requiring full standpipe systems when they are not necessarily required.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL FUEL GAS CODE COMMITTEE

FUEL GAS CODE COMMITTEE

John Wiggins, PE - Chair

Senior Project Engineer Underwriters Laboratories Inc. Research Triangle Park, NC

Tennison Barry – Vice Chair

Chief Mechanical Division State of Michigan Lansing, MI

Edward Angelone, C.G.E

Rep: American Gas Association Consultant National Grid Brooklyn, NY

James Anjam

Chief, Inspection Section Inspection Services, Arlington County, VA Arlington, VA

Keith Bienvenu

Rep: Plumbing Heating and Cooling Contractors Bienvenu Brothers Enterprises, Inc. Sec/Treasurer Metairie, LA

Paul Cabot, C.G.E

Rep: American Gas Association Administrator, National Fuel Gas Code American Gas Association Washington, DC

Mike Deegan

Rep: American Gas Association Gas Operations Manager Clearwater Gas System (City of Clearwater) Clearwater, FL

Ronnie Ray Frazier

Rep: American Gas Association Codes and Standard Manager Atmos Energy Dallas, TX

Dennis Holden

Rep: American Gas Association Director, Customer Relations Southwest Gas Corporation Tucson, AZ

Windell Peters, CBO

Rep: American Gas Association AGL Resources, Inc. Atlanta, GA

Thomas Pitcherello

Code Specialist State of New Jersey - Dept. of Community Affairs Trenton, NJ

Staff Secretariat:

Gregg Gress Senior Technical Staff International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL FUEL GAS CODE COMMITTEE **HEARING RESULTS**

FG1-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted Committee Reason: As used in the code, the term "appliance" does not always refer to a gas-fired appliance, therefore, the definition should not be fuel specific.

Assembly Action:

FG2-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The 3 criteria in the definition of noncombustible are unenforceable. It is inappropriate to state testing requirements in a definition. The definition of noncombustible could caus e code officials to require ASTM E136 testing of all materials commonly known to be noncombustible.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

FG3-09/10

Committee Reason: Adding the new definition supports the action taken on FG26-09/10 which introduces code coverage for such devices.

Assembly Action:

FG4-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The definition is not needed as the term is no longer used in the code.

Assembly Action:

FG5-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Current Section 403.10.2. of the cod e recognizes such joints which are a ppropriately described as a type of mechanical joint.

Assembly Action:

FG6-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The value of 18% is unenforceable and could be misco nstrued as requ iring field measurement.

Assembly Action:

291

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproval

None

None

Disapproved

None

FG7-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The change to "point of delivery" is consistent with Section 101.2.2 of the code which intends that LP systems with pressures between 2 and 20 psi also be covered by the code. The revision to "service pressure regulator" distinguishes between natural and LP systems and clearly distinguishes the service pressure regulator from upstream first stage and downstream line regulators that could be in the system.

Assembly Action:

FG8-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Current Section 403.10.2 alread y covers the definition by reference to ANSI LC-4. The definition inappropriately contains a requirement in the last sentence.

Assembly Action:

FG9-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There is no text addressing water heaters in association with this definition.

Assembly Action:

FG10-09/10

PART I- IMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Rating plate information is prescribed by the listing process or fede ral law, not by the code.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IFGC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on FG10-09/10 Part I.

Assembly Action: PART III- IRC-M **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: It is difficult or impossible for the code offi cial to verify in the field whether a piece of equipment such as a heat pu mp unit or a cond ensing unit meets the ener gy efficiency rating required by the IECC. Heat pump and condensing units are typically not referred to as appliances, but, n eed to be included in what is required to bear the prescribed nameplate information.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

DF

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

FG11-09/10

PART I- IMC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: It is too restrictive to extend the use water. Assembly Action:	requireme nt for a pan to all appliance s that contain or None
PART II- IFGC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the	e action taken on FG11-09/10 Part I.
Assembly Action:	None
PART III- IRC-M Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: This subject matter is already com	vered in current Section 1411.
Assembly Action:	None
FG12-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed revision would n facings.	ot recognize gypsum board made with noncombustible
Assembly Action:	None
FG13-09/10	Withdrawn by proponent
FG13-09/10 FG14-09/10	Withdrawn by proponent
FG13-09/10 FG14-09/10 PART I- IFGC Committee Action:	Withdrawn by proponent Disapproved
FG13-09/10 FG14-09/10 PART I- IFGC Committee Action: Committee Rea son: The pro posed text does accor compliance with any product standard. There is no evi the proposed text.	Withdrawn by proponent Disapproved nplish the proponent's intent as it do es not guar antee denc e of problems with fittings that do not comply with
FG13-09/10 FG14-09/10 PART I- IFGC Committee Action: Committee Rea son: The proposed text does accor compliance with any product standard. There is no evi the proposed text. Assembly Action:	Withdrawn by proponent Disapproved nplish the proponent's intent as it does not guar antee dence of problems with fittings that do not comply with None
FG13-09/10 FG14-09/10 PART I- IFGC Committee Action: Committee Rea son: The proposed text does accor compliance with any product standard. There is no evi the proposed text. Assembly Action: PART II- IMC Committee Action:	Withdrawn by proponent Disapproved nplish the proponent's intent as it does not guar antee dence of problems with fittings that do not comply with None Disapproved
FG13-09/10 FG14-09/10 PART I- IFGC Committee Action: Committee Rea son: The proposed text does accor compliance with any product standard. There is no evit the proposed text. Assembly Action: PART II- IMC Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the	Withdrawn by proponent Disapproved mplish the proponent's intent as it do es not guar antee denc e of problems with fittings that do not comply with None Disapproved e action taken on FG14-09/10 Part I.
FG13-09/10 FG14-09/10 PART I- IFGC Committee Action: Committee Rea son: The proposed text does accor compliance with any product standard. There is no evi the proposed text. Assembly Action: PART II- IMC Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the Assembly Action:	Withdrawn by proponent Disapproved mplish the proponent's intent as it does not guar antee dence of problems with fittings that do not comply with None action taken on FG14-09/10 Part I. None
FG13-09/10 FG14-09/10 PART I- IFGC Committee Action: Committee Rea son: The proposed text does accor compliance with any product standard. There is no evi- the proposed text. Assembly Action: PART II- IMC Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the Assembly Action: PART III-IRC-M Committee Action:	Withdrawn by proponent Disapproved mplish the proponent's intent as it does not guar antee dence of problems with fittings that do not comply with None a action taken on FG14-09/10 Part I. None Approved as Submitted
FG13-09/10 FG14-09/10 PART I- IFGC Committee Action: Committee Rea son: The proposed text does accorded text does accorded text. Assembly Action: PART II- IMC Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the Assembly Action: PART III-IMC Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the Assembly Action: PART III-IRC-M Committee Action: Committee Action: Committee Action: Committee Action:	Withdrawn by proponent Disapproved mplish the proponent's intent as it do es not guar antee dence of problems with fittings that do not comply with None a cation taken on FG14-09/10 Part I. None Approved as Submitted e means by which compliance with the code referenced

FG15-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Current code text requires appliances and equipment to be installed in accordance with the listing, manufacturer's instructions and the code, but, a listed piping system such as CSST is not accurately described as equipment or an appliance. The proposed text will provide coverage for CSST s ystems to make sure that they are installed as is required for other listed products.

Assembly Action: FG16-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Customer-owned piping would operate at 2 psi and less and such pressur e would not result in significant migration of g as leakage. No documentation was provided to ju stify the current prohibition on underground penetrations. The proposed new text restores previous code text that prescribed the method of protecting and sealing underground penetrations of foundation walls. The current text will require extra piping, fittings and joints that will be exposed to physical damage with increased risk of leakage. The p roposed text is consistent with other fuel gas codes.

Assembly Action:

FG17-09/10

PART I - IFGC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Current text has been misconstrued to prohibit the installation excess flow valves and the new exception clarifies that this was not the intent of this code section.

Assembly Action:

FG18-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The current text favors one material over others without reason. Other mat erials have been used successfully for many years. Other materials, besides metal, that hav e been tested and proven to have the structural strength necessary to support piping should be allowed.

Assembly Action:

FG19-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The p roposed figure illustrates w hat the code tex t inten ds and will help assure that sediment traps are effective.

Assembly Action:

FG20-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Seasonal use appliances shouldn't have a problem with sediment.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

FG21-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee R eason: The proposed r evisions w ould eliminate, w ithout justification, the flex ibility in valve location afforded by current t ext. In some circu mstances, it would be safer to have the valve in a remot e location.

Assembly Action:

FG23-09/10

Committee Action: Committee Reason: The current distance limit of 50 feet assure s that convenient access is provided without requiring the valve to be located on the same floor level as the appliance served.

Assembly Action:

FG24-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The current text of Section 410.1 alrea dy addresses the p rotection of reg ulators from physical damage.

Assembly Action:

FG25-09/10

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

Analysis: The standard was not submitted for review.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed standard is not yet published and available.

Assembly Action:

FG26-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed text is consistent with ANSI Z223.1 and provides the needed installation requirements for these devices. The current code lacks coverage for devices which are being sold and installed now.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Committee R eason: CSA Re quirement 3 -88 has been withdrawn by the p romulgator in favo r of ASME B16 44

Assembly Action:

FG22-09/10

Committee Action:

FG27-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed text offers protection from potential flashback into the fuel supply system and also protects against the backflow of gases into the supply system of different gases.

Assembly Action: FG28-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed revision is premature as gas-fired hot plates still exist.

Assembly Action:

FG29-09/1

FG30-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: CSA 8 was withdrawn without replacement. Only the cont rol valves were listed in the past. The proposed text provides code official guidance by accurately describing these devices.

Assembly Action: FG31-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This section is redundant with cur rent section 618.8 and Section 618.8 is favored because it more clearly states the intent.

Assembly Action:

FG32-09/10

PART I- IFGC **Committee Action:** Modify the proposal as follows:

618.5 Prohibited sources. Outdo or or return air f or a forced-air h eating s ystem s hall not be t aken from the following locations:

- Closer than 10 feet (30 48 mm) from a n appliance vent outlet, a vent op ening from a plumbin g 1. drainage system or the discharge outlet of an exha ust fan, unless the outlet is 3 feet (914 mm) above the outside air inlet.
- Where there is the presence of objectionable odors, fumes or flammable vapors; or where located 2. less than 10 feet (3048 mm)a bove the surface of an y abutting p ublic way or dri veway; or where located at grade level by a sidewalk, street, alley or driveway.
- 3. A hazardous or i nsanitary location or a refrigeration machinery room as defined in the International Mechanical Code.
- 4 A room or space, the volume of which is less than 25 percent of the entire volume served by such system. Where connected by a permanent opening having an area sized in accordance with Section 618.2, adjoining rooms or spaces shall be considered as a single room or space for the purpose of determining the volume of such rooms or spaces.

Exception: The minimum volume requirement shall not apply where the amount of return air take n from a room or space is less than or equ al to the amount of supply air delivered to such room or space.

5 A room or space containing an appliance where such a room or space serves as t he sole source of eturn air.

Exception: This shall not apply where:

296

Disapproved

None

Withdrawn by proponent

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

None

- 1. The *appliance* is a direct-vent *appliance* or an *appliance* not requiring a vent in accordance with Section 501.8.
- The room or space complies with the following requirements:
 The return air shall be taken from a room or space having a volume exceeding 1 cubic foot for each 10 Btu/h (9.6L/W) of combined input rating of all fuel-burning appliances therein.
 - 2.2. The volume of supply air discharged back into the same space shall be approximately equal to the volume of return air taken from the space.
 - 2.3. Return-air inlets shall not be located within 10 feet (3048 mm) of a draft ho od in t he same room or space or the combustion chamber of any atmospheric burner *appliance* in the same room or space.
- 3. Rooms or space s containing solid fuel-burni ng a ppliances, provid ed that retu rn-air inlets are located not less than 10 feet (3048 mm) from the firebox of such appliances.
- 6. A closet, bathroom, toilet room, kitchen, garage, me<u>chanical room</u>, boiler room, furnace room o r unconditioned attic.

Exceptions:

- 1. Where ret urn ai r intakes are lo cated not less than 10 feet (3048 mm) fr om cooking appliances and serve only the kitchen area, taki ng return air from a kitchen area shall not be prohibited.
- <u>2.</u> Dedicated Forced air <u>heating</u> systems serving only a gar age. shall not be prohibite d from obtaining return air from the garage.
- 7. A cra wl space b y means of direct connection to the return side of a for cced-air system. Transfer openings in the crawl space enclosure shall not be prohibited.

Committee Reason: Current text unintentionally prohibits the taking of return air f rom a garage for a system that serves only a garage. Substituting "atmospheric burner" for "appliance firebox" differentiates between open and sealed combustion chamber appliances. The modification maintains the prohibition on taking return from a mechanical room and simplifies the proposed second exception.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IMC Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

None

Modify the proposal as follows:

918.6 Prohibited sources. Outdo or or return air f or a forced-air h eating s ystem s hall not be t aken from the following locations:

- 1. Less than 10 feet (3048 mm) from an *appliance* vent outlet, a vent opening from a plumbing drainage system or t he discharge outlet o f an e xhaust fan, unless the outl et is 3 feet (914 mm) ab ove the outdoor air inlet.
- 2. Where there is t he presence of objectionable odors, fumes or flammable vapors; or where located less than 10 feet (3048 mm)a bove the surface of an y abutting p ublic way or driveway; or where located at grade level by a sidewalk, street, alley or driveway.
- 3. A hazardous or insanitary location or a refrigeration *machinery room* as defined in this code.
- 4. A room or space, the volume of which is less than 25 percent of the entire volume served by such system. Where connected by a permanent opening having an area sized in accordance with Sections 918.2 and 918.3, adjoining room s or spaces shall be considered as a single r oom or space for the purpose of determining the volume of such rooms or spaces.

Exception: The minimum volume requirement shall not apply where the amount of return air take n from a ro om or space is less than or equ al to t he amount of su pply air delivere d to such room or space.

5. A closet, bathroom, toilet room, kitchen, garage, me<u>chanical room</u>, boiler room, furnace room o r unconditioned attic.

Exceptions:

- 5.1. Where ret urn ai r intakes are lo cated not less than 10 feet (3048 mm) fr om cooking appliances, and serve the kitchen area o nly, taki ng return air f rom a kitchen shall not be prohibited.
- 5.2. Dedicated- Forced air <u>heating</u> systems serving only a gar age. shall not be p rohibited from obtaining return air from the garage
- 6. An unconditioned crawl space by means of direct connection to the return side of a forced air system. Transfer openings in the crawl space enclosure shall not be prohibited.
- 7. A room or space containing a fue l-burning *appliance* where such room or space serves as the sole source of return air.

Exceptions:

- 7.1. This shall not apply where the fuel-burning *appliance* is a direct-vent *appliance*.
- 7.2. This shall not apply where the room or space complies with the following requirements:
 - 7.2.1. The return air shall be taken from a room or space having a volume exceeding 1 cubic foot for each 10 Btu/h (9.6 L/W) of combined input rating of all fuel-burning appliances therein.
 - 7.2.2. The volume of supply air disc harged back into the same space shall be approximately equal to the volume of return air taken from the space.
 - 7.2.3. Return-air inlets shall not be loca ted within 10 feet (3048 mm) of a draft hood in the same room or space or the combustion chamber of any atmospheric burner *appliance* in the same room or space.
- 7.3. This shall not apply to r ooms or spaces containing solid-fuel-burning appliances, provided that return-air inlets are located not less than 10 feet (3048 mm) from the fire box of the appliances.

Committee Reason: The reason is the same as given for FG32-09/10 Part I.

Assembly Action:

None

PART III-IRC-M Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

M1602.2 Prohibited sources. Outdoor and return air for a forced-air heating or cooling system shall not be taken from the following locations:

- Closer than 10 feet (3048 mm) to an *appliance* vent outlet, a vent opening from a plumbing drainage system or the discharge outlet of an exhaust fan, unless the outlet is 3 feet (914 mm) above the outside air inlet.
- 2. Where flammable vapors are present; or where located less than 10 feet (3048 mm) above the surface of any abutting public way or driveway; or where located at grade level by a sidewalk, street, alley or driveway.
- 3. A room or space, the volume of which is less than 25 percent of the entire volume served by the system. Where connected by a permanent opening having an area sized in accordance with ACCA Manual D, adjoining rooms or spaces shall be considered as a single room or space for the purpose of determining the volume of the rooms or spaces.

Exception: The minimum volume requirement shall not apply where the amount of return air taken from a room or space is less than or equal to the amount of supply air delivered to the room or space.

4. A closet, bathroom, toilet room, kitchen, garage, mechanical room, boiler room, furnace room, unconditioned *attic* or other *dwelling unit*.

Exception: <u>Dedicated forced air systems serving only a garage shall not be prohibited from obtaining return air from the garage.</u>

5. A room or space containing a fuel-burning *appliance* where such room or space serves as the sole source of return air.

Excepti ons:

1.

The fuel-burning *appliance* is a direct-vent *appliance* or an *appliance* not requiring a vent in accordance with Section M1801.1 or Chapter 24.

- 2. The room or space complies with the following requirements:
 - 2.1. The return air shall be taken from a room or space having a volume exceeding 1 cubic foot for each 10 Btu/h (9.6 L/W) of combined input rating of all fuel-burning *appliances* therein.
 - 2.2. The volume of supply air discharged back into the same space shall be approximately equal to the volume of return air taken from the space.
 - 2.3 Return-air inlets shall not be located within 10 feet (3048 mm) of <u>a draft hood in the</u> <u>same room or space or the combustion chamber of</u> any <u>atmospheric burner</u> appliance firebox or draft hood in the same room or space.
- 3. Rooms or spaces containing solid-fuel burning *appliances*, if return-air inlets are located not less than 10 feet (3048 mm) from the firebox of those *appliances*.
- 6. An unconditioned crawl space by means of direct connection to the return side of a forced air system. Transfer openings in the crawl space enclosure shall not be prohibited.

Committee Reason: The reason is the same as given for FG32-09/10 Part I.

Assembly Action:

FG33-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: No evidence was presented to prove that any harm is caused by these appliances. No evidence was presented to show that houses are excessively tight such that problems w ill result with the installation of these appliances.

Assembly Action:

FG34-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There is no reason to disallow the use of these heaters. It would be difficult to enforc e this proposed text because of the need to go back and inspect the dwelling after new heaters are added.

Assembly Action:

FG35-09/10

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

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

Committee Action:

Analysis: A review of the standard(s) proposed for inclusion in the code, ANSI Z 83.19-01 and Z83.20-08, for compliance with ICC cr iteria for referenced standards given in Section 3.6 of Council Poli cy #CP 28 will be posted on the ICC website on or before September 24, 2009.

Committee Reason: ANSI Z83.19 and Z83.20 are the replacements for Z83.6.

Assembly Action:

FG36-09/10

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. Note that the standard was submitted in a consensus draft form.

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Add new text as follows:

SECTION 636 (IFGC) OUTDOOR DECORATIVE APPLIANCES

636.1 General. Permanently fixed-in-place outdo or decorative ap pliances shall be tested in accordance w ith ANSI Z21.97 and shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions.

636.2 Unlisted Units. Unlisted outdoor decorative appliances shall be approved and shall be installed outdoors in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions, and with clearances to combustible materials of not less than 36 in. (910 mm) from the sides measured horizontally. Such appliances shall not be located under combustible construction.

2. Add standard to Chapter 8 as follows:

ANSI

Disapproved

- -

None

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

ANSI Z21.97-09 Outdoor Decorative Appliances

Analysis: A review of the standard(s) proposed for inclusion in the code, ANSI Z21.97-09, for compliance with ICC criteria for referenced standards given in Section 3.6 of Council Policy #CP 28 will be posted on the ICC website on or before September 24, 2009.

Committee Reason: The code currently lacks coverage for a popular class of appliances and this proposal corrects that deficiency. The modification deletes t he provision for unlisted app liances because Section 105 already allows for code official approval of unlisted appliances.

Assembly Action:

None

FG37-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: These appliances need to comply with an y specific requirements that ar e part of t he appliance listing and/or manufacturer's installation instructions in addition the gen eral ventilation requirements of the current text.

Assembly Action:

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL MECHANICAL CODE COMMITTEE

Edmund Velaski, CBO—Chair

Chief Mechanical Inspector City of Mobile Mobile, AL

Tony Longino, CBO—Vice Chair Chief Mechanical Inspector County of Greenville Greenville, SC

Wm. Scott Copp Senior Project Manager FRA Engineering Rochester, NY

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

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

Richard Grace, MCP Engineer III Fairfax County Government Fairfax, VA

Billy Hinton, Jr., PE Code Official-Chief Mechanical Eng. NC Dept. of Insurance Engineering Division Raleigh, NC

William Ivey, PE President-Ivey Engineering Inc. San Diego, CA

David McMillan, CBO

City of San Marcos San Marcos, TX

Mark Riley

Inspector Supervisor City of Troy Troy, MI

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

John Sedine President Engineered Heating & C

Engineered Heating & Cooling Walker, MI

Walter J. Sperko President, Sperko Engineering Services, Inc. Greensboro, NC

John K. Taecker, PE Senior Staff Engineer Underwriters Laboratories Inc. San Jose, CA

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

Staff Secretariat:

Gregg Gress Senior Technical Staff International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL MECHANICAL COMMITTEE **HEARING RESULTS**

M1-09/10

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

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

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

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

Assembly Action:

Assembly Action:

M2-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M3-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M4-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

302

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

M5-09/10

defined in the code.

Committee Action:

Assembly Action:	None
M6-09/10 PART I - IMC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's reason.	
Assembly Action:	None
M7-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposed revision provides good guidance to	the code user.
Assembly Action:	None
M8-09/10	
PART I - IMC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: There is no standard to which to list the appliance stated in the proposed text, such as combust limits on room locations as these appliances formula stated. The definition proposed could include or exclude other p	es. The requirements of UL 1370 are not inface temperature limits. There are no dr ooms as proposed. There is no fuel roducts.
Assembly Action:	None

Committee R eason: Appr oval is consistent w ith the ac tion tak en on M14 6-09/10 and M1 47-09/10. The proposed definition makes a distinction bet ween press joints and push- fit joints and push- fit joint is currently

PART II - IFC **Committee Action:**

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

Assembly Action:

M9-09/10

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

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

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Approved as Submitted

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

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

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

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

Assembly Action:

M10-09/10

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

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

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M11-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

None

M12-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

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

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

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

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

M13-09/10

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

None
M14-09/10

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

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M15-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M16-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

M17-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

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

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

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Appr oval is based upon the proponent's pr inted reason. The modification m ore clearly describes how the vertical distance is measured.

Assembly Action:

M18-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Parking I ots should not be deleted because of the contaminants pres ent in such locations. The current text is more clear.

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

None

None

Disapproved

None

M19-09/10

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

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

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

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

Assembly Action:

M20-09/10

Committee Actio	n:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason:	Approval was based upon the proponent's printed re	eason.

Assembly Action:

M21-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action:

M22-09/10

M23-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M24-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M25-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

TABLE 403.3 MINIMUM VENTILATION RATES

(Portions of table not shown remain unchanged)

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

None

a. through d. (No change)

Rates are per water closet or urinal. The higher rate shall be provided where the exhaust system is e. designed to operate intermittently. The lower rate shall be permitted only where the exhaust system is designed to operate continuously during occupancy while occupied.

f. Rates are per room unless otherwise indicated. The higher rate shall be provided where the exhaust system is designed to operate intermittently. The lower rate shall be permitted only where the exhaust system is designed to operate continuously during occupancy while occupied. g through h (No change)

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M26-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.1 and 3.6.3.2

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M27-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M28-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M29-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

M30-09/10

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

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M31-09/10

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Re ason: The p roposal limit s desi gner flex ibility. The text could be misconstrued to prohibit common exhaust shaft arrangements with subducts. The term manifold is not defined.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

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

Assembly Action:

M32-09/10

This proposal was heard by the IFC committee

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M33-09/10

This proposal was heard by the IFC committee

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M34-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

M35-09/10

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Rea son: Screws that protrude ¼ in ch into ducts can create blockages and allow ing 1/8 inch protrusions is not much safer. **Assembly Action:** None

PART II - IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

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

M1502.4.2 Duct installation. Exhaust ducts shall be supported at 42 foot intervals not to exceed 12 feet and shall be secured in place. The insert end of the duct shall extend into the adjoining duct or fitting in the direction of airflow. Exhaust duct joints shall be sealed in accordance with Section M1601.4.1 and shall be mechanically fastened. Ducts shall not be joined with screws or similar fasteners that protrude more than 1/8 inch (3.2 mm) into the inside of the duct.

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

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Assembly Action:

M36-09/10

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

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

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

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

Assembly Action:

M37-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

M38-09/10

PART I - IMC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed revision deletes a viable option. There is no pro 504.6.4.2 t o d welling installat ions because the duct lengt h labe I requirement ad o replacements.	blem with applying Section dresses the issue of d ryer
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed revision deletes a viable installation option.	
Assembly Action:	None
M39-09/10	
PART I - IMC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee R eason: The UL standard for su ch units is not y et available. The requirement for a label stating th at a power ventilator is part of the installed system allow such units to be tested to a ny criteria or standard, thus allowing all units to be power ventilators without consistency in product safety.	e proposed te xt lacks a . The proposed text would sold a s dryer exhaust duct
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed standard is not yet available.	
Assembly Action:	None
M40-09/10	
PART I - IMC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Rea son: Disapproval is consistent with the acti on taken on M39-09 wording is not proper standa rd text. No lette r size or location specifications are give requirements are stated for the "electrical system connection."	/10. The propos ed placard ven for the placard and n o
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with action taken on M39-09/10. The	signage requirement lacks
application text.	signage requirement lacks

M41-09/10

Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Rea son: In the previous code change c ycles th justification for increasing the distance to 35 feet.	nat created th e cur rent te xt, th ere was ample
Assembly Action:	None
M42-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's p	rinted reason.
Assembly Action:	None
M43-09/10	Withdrawn by Proponent
M44-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason : Approval is consistent with the action take Section 504.8 is dedicated to serve only clothes dryers.	en on M29-09/10. Current text fails to state that
Assembly Action:	None
M45-09/10	
PART I - IMC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is consistent with the action take	en on M29-09/10.
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's	printed reason.
Assembly Action:	None
M46-09/10	
PART I - IMC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Re ason: Ground water could back up into the due specification that could preclude other designs.	ct. Clean earth is not defined. Ite m 2.4 is a
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: There is concern for entry of insects, wat	er and radon gas.
Assembly Action:	None

M47-09/10

Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed	reason.
Assembly Action:	None
M48-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: UL 1978 applies to factory-built ducts only. Field the performance tests required in UL 1978.	d fabricated ducts can not be submitted to
Assembly Action:	None
M49-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason : Disapproval is based upon the committee's pref approach in M50-09/10.	erence for the more prescriptive
Assembly Action:	None
M50-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed serves" thereby assuring consistent construction.	reason. Item #1 speaks to the "duct it
Assembly Action:	None
M51-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed	reason.
Assembly Action:	None
M52-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The metal would be subject to corrosion when to moisture. Ducts need to be tested prior to covering. The backfill i necessary for such ducts.	installed in soil and back fill and expose d s not specif ied. Concrete enc asement is
Assembly Action:	None

M53-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The cod e lacks coverage for such s ystems the propos ed text fills that void. The allowance for black steel as an option to stainless steel provides cost savings.

Assembly Action:

M54-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M55-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M56-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M57-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

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

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

None

314

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Modified

M58-09/10

Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: There is no reason to refer to only one applicable provis	sion because there are many.
Assembly Action:	None
M59-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason	
Assembly Action:	None
M60-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval is based upon the action tak en on M59 clarifying the intent of this section.	-09/10 which does a better job of
Assembly Action:	None
M61-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason	
Assembly Action:	None
M62-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The IMC is concerned with the h eat and moisture efficience of a formula to replace what is being proposed for d eletion. Desubstitute guidance is not acceptable.	fluent from such appliances. The eleting the te xt without providin g
Assembly Action:	None
M63-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason	
Assembly Action:	None
M64-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Re ason: Approv al is based up on the prop onent's printed performance criteria is desired in applying the code. The proposed text is const	rea son. Having a measurable sistent with NFPA 96.

M65-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M66-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M67-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M68-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: T he laun dry list of excep tions w as delete d and replaced w ith simplified t ext in the previous code change c ycle and the pr oposed new text would be starting the laundr y list again. Current text already allows the HVAC system to be designed to handle the effluent load from the dishwashing machine.

Assembly Action:

M69-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M70-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

M71-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M72-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The current text allows the designer to account for venting and pressure issues. Positive pressure mainte nance could ca use odor migrat ion from the kitchen. The exce ption needs to identif y the reference space to which the positive pressure is to be measured.

Assembly Action:

M73-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The pro posed text will prevent the misus e of such mater ials. ASTME 2336 does address the application prohibited by the proposed text.

Assembly Action:

M74-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M75-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M76-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: No stand ard e xists for t he prop osed alter nate enclosure system. Chapt er 1 alrea dy allows for app roval of alternative designs. Hazardous exha ust sy stems are potentially dange rous sy stems. ASTM E2336 is limited to grease duct enclosures and not applicable in the proposed application.

Accombly	/ Action
ASSCIIDIN	

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

317

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

M77-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Excepti ons:

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

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: The modification restores the original text of exception # 1 and adds a new exception to specifically add ress semiconduc tor fabrication f acilities so that other occupan cies are not aff ected. The proposed revision eliminates a conflict w ith the IFC which currently exempts specific types of du cts in H 5 occupancies from the requirem ent for fire sup pression where the exha ust stream is diluted to below the flammability ran ge, whereas, th e IMC would require suppression ex cept where the exhaust gases are fundamentally n on flammable regardless of dilution. There is no fire history for metallic and noncombustible non-metallic ducts.

Assembly Action:

M78-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standards did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.1, 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M79-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M80-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.1, 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

318

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

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

Assembly Action:

M81-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M82-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M83-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action: None

M84-09/10

Assembly Action:

M85-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M86-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted **Committee Action:** Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. None Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

M87-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M88-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M89-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M90-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

M91-09/10

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

Analysis: The standard was not submitted for review.

Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Delete and substitute as follows:

602.2.1.1 Wiring. Combustible electrical w ires and cables and optical fiber c ables exposed within a plenum shall be listed as having a maximum peak optical density of 0.50 or less, an average optical density of 0.15 or less, and a maximum flame spread distance of 5 feet (1524 mm) or less when tested in accordance with NFPA 262 or shall b e installed in metal race ways or me tal shea thed cable. Co mbustible optical fiber and communication raceways exposed within a plenum shall be listed as having a maximum peak optical density of 0.5 or less, an a verage optical density of 0.15 or less, and a ma ximum flame spre ad distance of 5 feet (1524 mm) or less when tested in accordance with A NSI/UL 2024. Only plenum-rated wires and cabl es shall be installed in plenum-rated raceways. Electrical wires and cables, optical fiber cables and raceways addressed in this section shall be listed and labeled and shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 70.

2. Add new standards as follows:

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

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

320

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed revision correlates w ith NFPA 70 and cur rent practice. The modification strikes the addition of UL 2424 which is not referenced within the code text.

Assembly Action:	None
M92-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Rea son: The action taken o n M 91-09/10 add resses metal sheathed cable proposed text is redundant and unnecessary.	es, the refore, th e
Assembly Action:	None
M93-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on M90-09/10.	
Assembly Action:	None
M94-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval is based upon the action taken on M95-09/10.	
Assembly Action:	None
M95-09/10	
Committee Action: Approved	as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.	
Assembly Action:	None
M96-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The term "discrete" is subjective. UL 2043 is not equivalent to ASTM E proposed text is too broad in scope.	E 84 or UL 723. The
Assembly Action:	None
M97-09/10	
PART I - IMC Committee Action: Approved	as Submitted
Committee Reason: Such cavities can not be properly sealed and will always allow air lea is in harmony with the IECC.	kage. The proposal
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action: Approved	as Submitted

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

M98-09/10

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposed text conflicts with recognized SMACNA standards.

Assembly Action: PART II - IRC

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The intent of the proposed deletion of 0.0175 inch for alum inum duct is unc lear. The SMACNA standards may not recognize 30 gage duct metal.

Assembly Action:

M99-09/10

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

M100-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: No pass/fail criteria is stat ed. The words "that are consider ed discrete" are subjective. There are no definitive limits stated in UL 2043. The words "forced air" used to describe fittings are odd because fittings are fittings regardless of the air type.

Assembly Action:

M101-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

603.7 Rigid duct penetrations. Duct system penetrations of walls, floors, ceilings and roofs and air transfer openings in such building components shall be protected as required by Section 607. Ducts in a private garage that penetrate a wall or ceiling that separates a dwelling from a private garage shall be continuous, shall be constructed of sheet steel having a minimum thickness of 0.0187 inch (0.4712 mm) (No.26 Gage) and shall have no openings into the garage. Fire and smoke dampers are not required in such ducts passing through the wall or ceiling separating a dwelling from a private garage except where required by Chapter 7 of the International Building Code.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. The modification clarifies that the revised text is applicable to private garages.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Modified

M102-09/10

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:** Disapproved Committee Rea son: The proposed text limits plastic technolo gies. Fittings cannot be tested t o UL 181 therefore the proposed text creates an impossibility. **Assembly Action:** None PART II - IRC **Committee Action:** Disapproved Committee Reason: Fittings cannot be tested to UL 181 and UL 181 is not the appropriate standard for plastic ducts. Plastic solvent-welded ducts should be encouraged for energy efficiency. Exposed DWV PVC plastic is acceptable, so why not PVC ducts ? Assembly Action: None M103-09/10 PART I - IMC **Committee Action:** Disapproved Committee Rea son: PVC coat ed ducts fail un derground b ecause of dama ge to the coating caused b y handling and backfilling. Assembly Action: None PART II - IRC **Committee Action:** Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on Part I. The proposed re quirements could be proprietary.

Assembly Action:

M104-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on M103-09/10. The SMACNA standards for the listed materials should have been included in the proposal.

Assembly Action:

M105-09/10

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. Listed tapes demonstrate smoke and flame properties.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

PART II - IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

M1601.4.1 Joints and seams. Joints of duct systems shall be made substantially airtight by means of tapes, mastics, liquid sealants, gasketing or other approved closure systems. Closure systems used with rigid fibrous glass ducts shall comply with UL181A and shall be marked 181A-P for pressure-sensitive tape, 181A-M for mastic or 181 A-H for heat-sensitive tape. Closure systems used with flexible air ducts and flexible air connectors shall comply with UL181B and shall be marked 181B-FX for pressure-sensitive tape or 181B-M for mastic. Duct connections to flanges of air distribution system equipment or sheet metal fittings shall be mechanically fastened. Mechanical fasteners for use with flexible nonmetallic air ducts shall comply with UL 181B and shall be marked 181B-C. Crimp joints for round metal ducts shall have a contact lap of at least 11/2 inches (38 mm) and shall be mechanically fastened by means of at least three sheet-metal screws or rivets equally spaced around the joint. Closure systems used to seal metal ductwork shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions. Unlisted duct tape is not permitted as a sealant on any duct.

Exceptions:

- Spray polyurethane foam shall be permitted to be applied without additional joint seals. 1
- 2. Where a duct connection is made that is partially inaccessible, three screws or rivets shall be equally
 - spaced on the exposed portion of the joint so as to prevent a hinge effect.
- 3. Continuously welded and locking type longitudinal joints and seams in ducts operating at static pressures less than 2 inches of water column (500 Pa) pressure classification shall not require additional closure systems.

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The pro posal requires that proper listed materials be used for duct sealing. The modification is editorial.

Assembly Action:

M106-09/10

-			
Com	mitton	Action	
COIIII	IIIIIEE	ACTION.	

Committee Reason: The 10 foot interval proposed for deletion gave good guidance. The proposed text offers no guidance for the approval of other support methodologies.

Assembly Action:

M107-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed text is too re strictive and too broad in scope. Non-public areas would not be allowed the necessary space for ducts.

Assembly Action:

M108-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: The standard was not submitted for review.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

None

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

M109-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.1, 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on M26-09 /10. Testing and balancing is already covered in Chapter 3.

Assembly Action:

M110-09/10

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: A conflict can be cr eated where incomplete (partial) provisions are taken from the IECC. Residential and commercial provisions need to be separated as they are in the IECC.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposed terminology; "unconditioned space" and "outside of building" is not clear as to intent.

Assembly Action:

M111-09/10

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason Labeling assists the inspection process.

Assembly Action: PART II - IRC **Committee Action: Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: : Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

M112-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: More data is needed to justify the prohibition. The insulation manufacturer should be able to determine the suitability of their product for such applications.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval is based on the proponent's request and the action taken on Part I.

Assembly Action:	None

M113-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed revision does not allow the designer to design a sy stem with a "design capacity" based on equipment choices and duct static pressures.

Assembly Action:

M114-09/10

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponen t's printed reason. Labeling assists the inspection process.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: : Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

M115-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

M116-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: App roval is based upon the propone nt's print ed reason. Approval is con sistent with action taken on M115-09/10. Labeling assists the inspection process.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

M117-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: : Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

M118-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed revisions provide a uniform set of requirements and helps assure that such products are safe. Labeling assists the inspection process.

Assembly Action:

M119-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: : Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

M120-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Rebuilt or rehabilitated cooling to wers would have to be listed if the y were not already listed before they could be re used or reinstalled. An optional standard is needed. Major components such as cooling towers should not be required to be listed. Some towers are huge structures that might not be able to be listed.

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

None

None

M122-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Revise as follows:

912.4 3 Support. Infrared radiant heaters shall be fixed in a position independent of fuel and electric supply lines. Hangers and brackets shall be of noncombustible material.

912.1 General. Electric infrared radiant heaters shall comply with UL 499.

2. Add new standard to Chapter 15 as follows:

UL

499-05 Electric Heating Appliances - with revisions through August 2008.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's pr inted reason. The modification m oves the proposed new text to a separate section as it does not relate to the subject of Section 912.1, support.

Assembly Action:

M123-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

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:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

M125-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standards did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The clearance inspection requirement of proposed Section 928.2 is not e nforceable because of the reference to NFPA 70.

Assembly Action:

M126-09/10

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The prop osed text gives the code user direct ion for the installation of this equipment without having to search the codes for the numerous applicable provisions.

Assembly Action:

PART II – IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

Delete and substitute as follows:

M1413.1 General. Evaporative cooling equipment and appliances shall be installed:

- according to the manufacturer's installation instructions 1
- 2 on level platforms in accordance with Section M1305.1.4.1
- 3. so that openings in exterior walls are flashed in accordance with Section R703.8
- so as to protect the potable water supply in accordance with Section P2902 4.
- 5 so that air intake opening locations are in accordance with Section R303.4.1

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason. The mo dification adds the appropriate term "appliances" based on the definition of the term.

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

329

Disapproved

None

None

None

Approved as Modified

M127-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

 PART I - IMC
Committee Action:
 Approved as Submitted

 Committee Action:
 Approved as Submitted

 Assembly Action:
 None

 PART II - IRC
Committee Action:
 Approved as Submitted

 Committee Reason:
 Approved as Submitted

Assembly Action: None

M128-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

PART II - IRC	Withdrawn by Proponent	
PART I - IMC	Withdrawn by Proponent	
M130-09/10		
Assembly Action:	None	
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.		
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted	
M129-09/10		
Assembly Action:	None	
Committee Reason: : Approval was based on the proponent's printed reas	son.	
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted	
Assembly Action:	None	
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason	n.	
PART I - IMC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted	

M131-09/10

PART I - IMC

PART II - IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

M1411.6 Locking access port caps. Refrigerant circuit access ports located outdoors shall be fitted with locking-type tamper-resistant caps or shall be otherwise secured to prevent protected from unauthorized access. in an approved manner.

Reason: During the last code cycle, the provision requiring locking-type tamper-resistant caps to restrict access to refrigerants was approved at the Final Action Hearings. This proposal would expand the means of restricting access to other approved methods. An example would be the placement of the equipment in inaccessible locations. Also, we are aware of only one locking-type tamper-resistant cap.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason. The modification makes the text less restrictive, allowing more options.

Assembly Action:

M132-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed revision offers more options to secure the intent to prevent tampering.

Assembly Action:

M133-09/10

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Legal action will likely ensue for those cases where the service personnel fail to install the devices. The locking caps are an "hones t man's" lock and if some one is intent on getting refrigerant from the system, they will find a way to overcome the locking caps. Refrigerant can be obtained by making a hole in the coil tubing or connecting piping. The service personnel should not be made re sponsible for this. The proposed text conflicts with the intent of Section 102.2.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposed text is ret ro-active and unenforceable. The IPMC is the more appropriate place for such text.

Assembly Action:

M134-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon t he proponent's printed reason. The proposed revisions update the table based on the chemicals being used today.

Assembly Action:

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

M135-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Revise as follows:

1105.6 Ventilation. Machinery rooms shall be mechanically ventilated to the outdoors.

Exception: Where a refrigerating system is located outdoors more than 20 feet (6096 mm) from any building opening and is enclosed by a penthouse, lean-to or other open structure, natural or mechanical ventilation shall be provided. Location of the openings shall be based on the relative density of the refrigerant to air. The free-aperture cross section for the ventilation of the *machinery room* shall be not less than:

$$F = \sqrt{G}$$

(Equation 11-1)

(Equation 11-2)

Approved as Modified

For SI:

$$F = 0.138 \sqrt{G}$$

where:

F = The free opening area in square feet (m²).

G = The mass of refrigerant in pounds (kg) in the largest system, any part of which is located in the machinery room.

2. Add new text as follows:

1105.6.3 Ventilation rate. For other than ammonia systems, The mechanical ventilation systems shall be capable of exhausting the minimum quantity of air both at normal operating and emergency conditions, as required by Sections 1105.6.3.1 and 1105.6.3.2. The minimum required ventilation rate for ammonia shall be in accordance with IIAR 2.

Multiple fans or multispeed fans shall be allowed to produce the emergency ventilation rate and to obtain a reduced airflow for normal ventilation.

3. Revise as follows:

1105.6.3.1 Quantity—normal ventilation. During occupied conditions, the mechanical ventilation system shall exhaust the larger of the following:

- 1. Not less than 0.5 cfm per square foot (0.0025 m³/s⋅m²) of *machinery room* area or 20 cfm (0.009 m³/s) per person; or
- 2. A volume required to limit the room temperature rise to 18°F (10°C) taking into account the ambient heating effect of all machinery in the room.

1105.6.3.2 Quantity—emergency conditions. Upon actuation of the refrigerant detector required in Section 1105.3, the mechanical ventilation system shall *exhaust air* from the *machinery room* in the following quantity:

 $\mathcal{O} = 100 \ x \sqrt{G}$

For SI: $Q = 0.07 \times \sqrt{G}$

Where:

Q = The airflow in cubic feet per minute (m³/s).

G = The design mass of refrigerant in pounds (kg) in the largest system, any part of which is located in the machinery room.

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The prop osed revision c onsolidates tex t into one section to improve us ability. The modification deletes references to ammonia and IIAR2 because the revised version of the standard is yet to be completed.

Assembly Action:

M136-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: T he p roponent asked for r disapproval to allow t he p roposal to be re worked and resubmitted as a public comment. The provisions for the discharge of pressure relief valves are lacking.

Assembly Action:

M137-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

M138-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: ASME B3 1.9 is currently an option in the code. Deleting the code text eliminates a prescriptive option to a reference d standard. ASME B31.9 is still an option under current code. T he referenced standard is an additional expense and the code would contain nothing but a reference to a standard.

Assembly Action:

M139-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Some of the proposed standards allow alloys that p romote dezincification. Some of the referenced standards are not currently in Chapter 15. Copper and other materials need to be added.

Assembly Action:

M140-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I - IMC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

M141-09/10

PART I - IMC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the pro-	oponent's printed reason.
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval was based on the pro	pponent's printed reason.
Assembly Action:	None
M142-09/10	
Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Ch <u>http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-100</u>	ange monograph but was published on the ICC website at www.science.com published on the science.com published on the s
Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indic comply with ICC standards criteria.	cated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did
PART I - IMC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the pro	sponent's printed reason.
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval was based on the pro-	pponent's printed reason.
Assembly Action:	None
M143-09/10	
Modify the proposal as follows:	
Delete without substitution:	
1203.1.1 Joints between different piping materials with approved adapter fittings.	. Joints between different piping-materials shall be made
Committee Action:	Approved as Modified
Committee Reason: Dielectric fittings can leak and sentence to continue to allow approved adapter fitting	should not be mandated. The modification retains the first js.
Assembly Action:	None
M144-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval is based upon the	action taken on M143-09/10.
Assembly Action:	None

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

M145-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

M146-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Approval is consistent with the action taken on M147- 09/10. This allo ws existing technology consistent with the IPC.

Assembly Action: M147-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Such joints are allowed by the IPC with a good performance history.

Assembly Action:

M148-09/10

PART I - IMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposed text is not p roduct specific and is not t ied to a specific standard, thus, confusion can re sult. Curr ent Section 1201.3 allo ws ASME B31.9 as an option. The text "cer tified by a third party agency" is unique to the IPC and is not defined in the IMC. The codes should be consistent in referencing an "approved agency."

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

Reason:

M149-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standards did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

335

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

DF

Approved as Submitted

M150-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

M151-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I - IMC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

M152-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I - IMC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.	
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.	

Assembly Action: None

M153-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.3.1, 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The p roposal w ould result in an outdated standard being referenced. The currently referenced edition complies with Council Policy #28. Going backwards in time violates CP # 28.

Assembly Action:

M154-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. The figures do not correlate with any text in the code. NFPA 31 is not related to the appendix figures. The IFGC covers this subject.

Assembly Action:

M155-09/10

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx."

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

M156-09/10

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx."

PART II – IBC

Revise as follows:

1203.1 General. Buildings shall be ventilated with natural ventilation in accordance Section 1203.4, or mechanical ventilation in accordance with the International Mechanical Code.

Where the air infiltration rate in a dwelling unit is less than 5 air changes per hour when tested with a blower door at a pressure of 33.5 psf <u>0.2 inch w.c</u>. (50 Pa) in accordance with Section 402.4.2.1 of the International Energy Conservation Code, the dwelling unit shall be ventilated by mechanical means in accordance with Section 403 of the International Mechanical Code.

PART III – IRC

Insert new section as follows (renumber current Section 303.4 and those following as appropriate):

R303.4 Mechanical ventilation. Where the air infiltration rate of a dwelling unit is less than 5 air changes per hour when tested with a blower door at a pressure of 33.5 psf <u>0.2 inch w.c.</u> (50 Pa) in accordance with Section N1102.4.2.1, the dwelling unit shall be provided with whole-house mechanical ventilation in accordance with Section M1507.3.

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

337

Disapproved

None

Reason: Everyone can agree that when dwelling units become "too" tight, they need mechanical ventilation. The question is, "how tight is too tight?" This code change proposal offers five air changes per hour at 50 Pascal as the "too tight" limit, and directs builders to provide mechanical ventilation at this point.

Why is whole-house mechanical ventilation needed?

Indoor air quality has direct impact on the health of building occupants. Poor indoor air quality is listed by the EPA as being the fourth largest environmental threat to our country.¹ A 2007 California study revealed formaldehyde exposure in most new homes is beyond limits recommended by the California Air Resources Board. Multiple studies have shown that relying on window operation to provide ventilation is not sufficient in practice.^{2,3} If unchecked, pollutants from cleaning chemicals, finishes, furniture, and occupant activities can cause serious health effects on building occupants. Whole-house mechanical ventilation reduces occupant exposure to such pollutants.

Whv 5 ACH 50?

Traditionally, 0.35 natural air changes per hour has been the consensus ventilation rate at which it is believed that sufficient fresh air is being provided to building occupants. This ventilation rate was typically achieved without mechanical ventilation because homes were built without an effective air barrier. As building practices have improved, homes have become tighter, and as homes become tighter, mechanical ventilation must be introduced to provide sufficient levels of ventilation.

ASHRAE Standard 136 was developed to enable calculation of natural air changes per hour as a function of air changes at various pressures. By following the calculation procedures in this standard, it can be shown that a natural infiltration rate of 0.35 air changes per hour is equivalent to somewhere between 7 ACH 50 to 10 ACH 50, depending on the local climatic conditions of the home. Because most dwellings are built this tight, ASHRAE 62.2 requires mechanical ventilation for all homes, with few exceptions. However, based on ASHRAE 136, a conservative code might prescribe whole-house mechanical ventilation for any home with an infiltration leakage rate of 10 ACH 50 or less.

As a second point of reference, California's 2005 Title 24 Chapter 6 requires that, "Continuous mechanical ventilation (either exhaust or supply ventilation) must be installed when the target SLA is below 3.0". California's SLA of 3.0 is roughly equivalent to 6 ACH 50. As a third point of reference, NAHB's National Green Building Standard requires whole-house mechanical ventilation when the infiltration rate falls below 5.0 ACH 50. This requirement provides clear recognition from a consensus standard that whole-house mechanical ventilation should be provided for all homes that meet this threshold.

Based on the previous references, there is broad consensus across states and within consensus standards that whole-house mechanical ventilation should be required when a dwelling's infiltration falls below 5.0 ACH 50.

What states are now requiring whole-house mechanical ventilation? Several states now require mechanical ventilation in dwellings, including MN, VT, WA, CA, and ME.

References:

- ASHRAE Standard 62.2-2007 Ventilation and Acceptable Indoor Air Quality in Low-Rise Residential 1 Buildings. http://www.ashrae.org/technology/page/548
- Price, P.N. and M.H. Sherman "Ventilation Behavior and Household Characteristics in New California 2. Houses," April 2006. LBNL-59620 http://epb.lbl.gov/Publications/lbnl-59620.pdf
- Offermann, F.J., et al., "Window usage, ventilation, and formaldehyde concentrations in new California 3 homes: summer field sessions", in IAQ 2007, Healthy and Sustainable Buildings. 2007, American Society of Heating Refrigerating, and Air Conditioning Engineers, Inc.: Baltimore, MD. p. 497-526 (preprints); http://www.iee-sf.com/pdf/SummerFieldResults.pdf

Cost Impact: Where homes have infiltration rates less than 5.0 ACH 50, and those homes are not already providing whole-house mechanical ventilation, the cost of construction will increase.

PART I - IMC Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The tight ening of the the rmal envelope n ecessitates mechanical ventilation in some cases. The proposal does not require that a blower door test be conducted, but rather, acts on the results of any such test that is conducted by choice. If Section 403 is applied by choice, no testing is required.

Assembly Action:

PART II – IBC

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Same reason as given for approval of M 156-09/10 Part I. The modification corrects the pressure to be consistent with 50 Pa.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Modified

None

None

Approved as Submitted

PART III – IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

Insert new section as follows (renumber current Section 303.4 and those following as appropriate):

R303.4 Mechanical ventilation. Where the air infiltration rate of a dwelling unit is less than 5 air changes per hour when tested with a blower door at a pressure of 33.5 psf (50 Pa) in accordance with Section N1102.4.2.1, the dwelling unit shall be provided with whole-house mechanical ventilation in accordance with Section M1507.3.

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: The proposed threshold is appropriate for determining where mechanical ventilation is required. This provides the builder with options. The modification corrects the pressure to be consistent with 50 Pa.

Assembly Action:

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL PLUMBING/ PRIVATE SEWAGE DISPOSAL CODE COMMITTEE

Ray Moore, PE - Chair

Principal: Mechanical/Plumbing Engineer Spectrum Engineers Salt Lake City, UT

Ronald Braun II, CBO - Vice Chair Plans Examiner

City of Woodinville Woodinville, WA

Paul Bladdick

Master Plumber The LPB Co. Inc. White Lake, MI

Jeremy Brown Codes & Regulatory Manager NSF International Ann Arbor, MI

William Chapin Product Compliance Administrator Cash Acme Cullman, AL

Gregory Farmer, PE Rep: American Society of Plumbing Engineers Hodge Associates, Inc. Knoxville, TN

James Finley, PE

Rep: Plumbing Heating and Cooling Contractors President C.N. Finley New Orleans, LA

McKenzie James

Senior Plumbing Inspector City of Portland Portland, OR

Robert Konyndyk

Chief, Plumbing Division, Dept of Labor State of Michigan Ada, MI

Daryl Kuiper

Plumbing Inspector Supervisor State of Colorado Denver, CO

Randy Lee

Code Official City of Decatur Building Department Decatur, AL

Louis Pody Business Representative Plumbers Local 75 Beloit, WI

Guy Tomberlin Code Specialist III Fairfax County

Fairfax, VA

Staff Secretariat:

Fred Grable, PE Staff Engineer - Plumbing International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL PLUMBING/PRIVATE SEWAGE **DISPOSAL CODE COMMITTEE** HEARING RESULTS

P1-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: Some jurisdictions remove Chapter 1 during adoption which causes Alternate Engineered Design section to be removed. It is more logical for this section to be located in Chapter 3 so that it is not lost for some jurisdictions.

PART II- IPSDC **Committee Action: Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Some jurisdictions remove Chapter 1 during adoption which causes Alternate Engineered Design section to be removed. It is more logical for this section to be located in Chapter 3 so that it is not lost for some jurisdictions.

Assembly Action:	None

P2-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Testimony of opponent indicated that ASME A112.19.2 has a better definition.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Agreed with proponent's reason statement that the definition is out of date and doesn't include waterless urinals.

Assembly Action:

P3-09/10

Committee	Action
COMMITTEE	

Committee Reason: Provides greater clarification between the definition of appliances and fixtures.

Assembly Action:

P4-09/10

P5-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Revised definition is too r estrictive and leads to only specific ty pes of pr oducts being acceptable. Wording is awkward.

Assembly Action:

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None
P6-09/10

Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Having this definition in the code doesn't affect the installation of anything.	
Assembly Action:	None
P7-09/10	
PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Requires testing of items that really don't need to b	e tested.
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P	
Committee Action:	Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:	
P2608.4 Third-party certification. All plumbing products and materials so certification agency as complying with the referenced standards specification code. Products and materials shall be identified in accordance with Section	hall be listed by a third-party t ions and performance criteria of this n P2608.1.
Committee Reason: Modification made to clari fy that p roducts must be certified to refe renced s tandards. Provides for a more uniform m ethod to enforce code requirements and reduces the number of test reports required to be reviewed by code officials.	
Assembly Action:	None
P8-09/10	
PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Descent. Drockage protection of piping is already aposition!	(approved by Sections 205.2 and 205.0
and doesn't need to be in this section.	covered by Sections 305.3 and 305.9
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P	Annual an Online its d
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: It was stated that pipe sleeves below footers are not installed and not found to be necessary.	
Assembly Action:	None
P9-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The need to supply thermal expansion calculations	for every job is unwarranted.
Assembly Action:	None

P10-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Requiring a pipe sleeve for a pipe passing under a footing is ambiguous - it could mean 2 feet or 10 feet below the footing. The requirement is unnecessary as the footing spans over the pipe location.

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: The footing acts as a relieving arch and t herefore, requiring a pipe sleeve under a footer is redundant and unnecessary.

Assembly Action:

P11-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: It is logical not to want hot water piping transferring heat to cold water piping in a piping bundle.

Assembly Action:

P12-09/10

Committee Reason: Based upon committee's action of disapproval of P13 and P14.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

P13-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Subject is not appropriate for the plumbing code. Why would there be a concern about trap covers where there is not a concern for wood cabinetry, plastic fixtures, plastic c valves and plastic piping that are commonly found in toilet rooms?

Assembly Action:

P14-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based upon committee's action of disapproval of P13.

Assembly Action:

P15-09/10

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 ASME A112.18.9-2010 indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria. Standard was submitted in draft form.

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Proponent stated that the standard would not be completed in time to be published and available by the ICC deadline.

Assembly Action:

P16-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Modify the proposal as follows:

305.4 Sealing of annular spaces. The annular space between the outside of a pipe and the inside of a pipe sleeve or between the outside of a pipe and an opening in a building envelope wall, floor, or ceiling assembly penetrated by a pipe shall be sealed in an approved manner with caulking material or closed with a gasketing system. The caulking material or gasketing system shall be suitable designed for the conditions at the penetration location and shall be compatible with the pipe, sleeve and building materials in contact with the sealing materials. Annular spaces created by pipes penetrating fire resistance-rated assemblies or membranes of such assemblies shall be sealed or closed in accordance with Section 713 of the International Building Code.

Committee Reason: Eliminates ambiguity about sealing of pipe penetrations through the walls, ceilings and floors of the building envelope to seal against air leakage and for pipe penetrations through fire-resistance-rated assemblies.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Modify the proposal as follows:

P2603.4 Sealing of annular spaces. The annular space between the outside of a pipe and the inside of a pipe sleeve or between the outside of a pipe and an opening in a building envelope wall, floor, or ceiling assembly penetrated by a pipe shall be sealed with caulking material, foam sealant or closed with a gasketing system. The caulking material, foam sealant or gasketing system shall be suitable designed for the conditions at the penetration location and shall be compatible with the pipe, sleeve and building materials in contact with the sealing materials. Annular spaces created by pipes penetrating fire resistance-rated assemblies or membranes of such assemblies shall be sealed or closed in accordance with the building portion of this code.

Committee Reason: Modification made because foam s ealant is also a viable material to be used for sealing these types of spaces and is commonly available. Proposed language eliminate s ambiguity about sealing of pipe penetrations through the walls, ceilings and floors of the building envelope to seal against air leakage and for pipe penetrations through fire-resistance-rated assemblies.

Assembly Action:

P17-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed language does not require tests to be performed.

Assembly Action:

P18-09/10

P19-09/10

PART I- IPC

Committee Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Proposed language provides for consistency in terminology throughout the code.

Approved as Modified

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

344

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Committee Rea son: Proposed language reads better an d is consistent with action taken by the IPC Committee.

Assembly Action:

P20-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Proposal would not provide enough fixtures for occupancy loads above 60 percent of capacity.

Assembly Action:

P21-09/10

Errata: The following correction of the published code change proposal is noted: In the column title "DRINKING FOUNTAINS", DRINKING was not intended to be struck out.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Where 1 or 2 w ater closets are required in a toilet facility, the percentage do esn't allow urinals. Bottled water should be all or nothing. Requirements in footnotes are not good format.

Assembly Action:

P22-09/10

Errata: The following correction of the monograph is noted: In MALE column the "50" before the 100 should be shown as struck out.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: A single user toilet room per gender fo r up to 250 persons is not adequate w hen on e considers that single user toilet r ooms can be locked by the occupant for significant periods of time leaving no available facilities for up to 249 other persons.

Assembly Action:

P23-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Service sinks are very important to the occupancies regardless of the number of occupants

Assembly Action:

P24-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Proponent's reason stated t hat she and othe r restroom availability advocates have seen occasional queuing at toilet facilit ies when there are more than 50 persons in a re staurant. The proposal will adjust the required fixtures at these low occupant numbers.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

P25-09/10

Committee Action:

Assembly Action: None
P26-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Dual gender toilet facilities provide greater public access to toilet facilities in small
establishments.
Assembly Action: None
P27-09/10

Committee Reason: Provides greater flexibility for smaller establishments.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Restrooms are necessary for customers regardless of the space that the customer s will occupy.

Assembly Action:

P28-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Different tenants don't share toilet facilities and the route to facilities is not assured to be accessible.

Assembly Action: No

P29-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Increases the understanding by the code official and installer as to what the building code already requires.

Assembly Action:

P30-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

403.3.5 ([P]2902.3.5) Door locking. Where a toilet room is <u>designed provided</u> for <u>the use of</u> multiple occupants, the egress door for the room shall not be lockable from the inside of the room. This section does not apply to family or assisted-use toilet rooms.

Committee Rea son: Modification was made to r eplace "designed" as this m ight create conflict w ith the last sentence of the section. Toilet rooms having that are lockable from the inside p rovide too much a vailability for misuse and inap propriate activities however, family/assisted-use rooms need to be exempt as privacy is a key element to having those types of toilet rooms.

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

P31-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Proposed language does not include "floor above or below" or the requirement for an accessible route.

Assembly Action:

P32-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that the figure is inaccurate and misleading as it does not show required partitions for urinals and water closets.

Assembly Action:

P33-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Proponent indicated that he wanted to rework language in public comment phase.

Assembly Action:

P34-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

405.3.1 Water closets, urinals, lavatories and bidets. A water closet, urinal, lavatory or bidet shall not be set closer than 15 inches (381 mm) from its center to any side wall, partition, vanity or other obstruction, or closer than 30 inches (762 mm) center to center between adjacent fixtures. There shall be at least a 21 – inch (533 mm) clearance in front of the water closet, urinal, lavatory or bidet to any wall, fixture or door. Water closet compartments shall be not less than 30 inches (762 mm) wide and 60 inches (1524 mm) deep for floor mounted water closets and not less than 30 inches (762 mm) wide and 56 inches (1422 mm) deep for wall hung water closets (see Figure 405.3.1).

Delete Figure 405.3.1

Committee Rea son: The modification w as made because the committee did not w and the new information shown in a diagram. The proposal was approved as modification because if a 56 in ch deep compartment for a wall hung water closet is adequate for accessibility, then it should be sufficient for standard applications.

Assembly Action:

P35-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: An outdoor travel distance of up to 500 feet in w inter or rainy conditions is too difficult for employees or the public to travel.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Approved as Submitted

that the figure is a inconurs

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

None

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

347

P36-09/10

PART I- IPC

Errata: The following correction of the monograph is noted: Standard ASME A112.4.4 should have been shown as A112 4 3

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statem ent that stated t hat allowing another type of water closet connection method will make more water closets products available to designers and installers and make the code more open to this commonly used international method of connection.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P

Errata: The following correction of the monograph is noted: Standard ASME A112.4.4 should have been shown as A112.4.3.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Consistent with the action of the IPC com mittee. Agreed with the prop onent's reason statement that stated that allo wing another type of water closet connection method will make more water closets products available to des igners and instal lers and make the code more open to this commonly used international method of connection.

Assembly Action:

P37-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Consistent with action on P47 because no manufacturers are known to be listing their products to this standard.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P

Errata: The following correction of the monograph is noted: Standard ASSE 1008 should have been shown as ASSE 1006.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: It is unnecessary to keep standards in the code when manufacturers are not having their equipment listed to the standard.

Assembly Action:

P38-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Increasing pipe size before a connection would require a type of fitting that is not currently made.

Assembly Action:

348

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

P39-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The term "branch drain" was confusing. The term "fixture d rain" is proper and aids in better understanding of the code requirement.

Assembly Action:	None
P40-09/10	
PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The language of P41 is preferred.	
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The language of P41 is preferred.	
Assembly Action:	None

P41-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: An overflow is a safeguar d. The proposed language clarifies the intent of t he code to provide protection against overflow of bathtubs.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The prop osed language clarifies the intent of the code to provide protection against overflow of bathtubs.

Assembly Action:

P42-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This standard is already referenced for other temperature limiting devices required by the code.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: This standard is already referenced for other temperature limiting devices required by the code.

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

-

. .

P43-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The requirements would be unenforceable.

Assembly Action:

P44-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Consistent with action on P43.

Assembly Action:

P45-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The inclusion of the building code requirement in the plumbing code will provide useful information for designers and installers of drinking fountains. The new section on drinking fountain substitutions puts existing bottled water substitution language in a more logical location and includes clarification about the code's intent for making drinking water freely available in all buildings that are required to have drinking fountains.

Assembly Action:

P46-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Encourages a general distrust of public water supplies.

Assembly Action:

P47-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Manufacturers are not listing their products to the standard. No need for code officials to be trying to verify product meets a standard.

Assembly Action:

P48-09/10

P49-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Food waste grinders are not normally used for the disposal of grease so the option of whether disposals need to connect to a grease interceptor (or not) should be left open.

Assembly Action:

350

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Withdrawn by Proponent

P50-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Whether or not a fixture is a public hand wash ing facility is a design decision that the inspector does not need to approve.

Assembly Action:

P51-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that employee and private toilet rooms (not for public use) do not require tempered water. Assembly Action: None P52-09/10 PART I- IPC **Committee Action:** Disapproved Committee Reason: Rescue personnel need the 22 inches to access someone who needs help. **Assembly Action:** None PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:** Disapproved Committee Reason: Lessening of the dimension would make it difficult for the average human to get into and out of the shower. Assembly Action: P53-09/10 PART I- IPC Disapproved **Committee Action:** Committee Reason: Gang showers is not defined and multiple discharge devices is not defined. The requirements are too specific and overly restrictive. **Assembly Action:** PART II- IRC-P

Committee Reason: Unnecessarily limits the type of show er components, such as bod y sprays and multiple showerheads that can be installed.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

P54-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Rea son: Agreed with the proponent's reason which states that if the liner mate rial meets the puncture testing of the referenced standards, the thickness of the material is not important.

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Agreed with the p roponent's reason which states that if t he liner mate rial meets the puncture testing of the referenced standards, the thickness of the material is not important.

P55-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

417.5.2.6 Liquid type, trowel applied, **load bearing, bonded waterproof materials.** Liquid applied type, trowel applied load bearing, bonded waterproof materials shall meet the requirements of ANSI A118.10 and shall be applied in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions.

Committee Reason: New materials and methods provides greater flexibility for installers.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

417.5.2.6 Liquid type, trowel applied, load bearing, bonded waterproof materials. Liquid applied type, trowel applied load bearing, bonded waterproof materials shall meet the requirements of ANSI A118.10 and shall be applied in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions.

Committee Reason: Clarifies the difference between sheet applied and trowel applied materials.

Assem	bly A	Ctio	n:

P56-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Updates the code to the proper standard designation.

Assembly Action:

P57-09/10

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 prop osed ne w standard I GC 161-2007 indica ted that in t he opinion of IC C staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: IGC 161 is not a standard.

Assembly Action:

None

None

None

None

Approved as Modified

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

353

Committee Action:

P58-09/10

Committee Reason: Addition of new standards allows for use of more available products.

Assembly Action:

P59-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Addition of new standards allows for use of more available products.

Assembly Action:

P60-09/10

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 ASME A112.4.2-2003 (R2008) indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Provides for appropriate testing of and performance requirement for these products.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Standard proposed is viable for this type of product and consistency with action of the IPC committee.

Assembly Action:

P61-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: A manufacturer's testimony indicated that the added language was too ambiguous about what constituted the source of hot water. The language should be reworked in a public comment to make clear what is a source.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:

Committee Reason: When ASSE 1017 devices need to be installed, where they are installed is important to achieve the desired safety. This new language provides that location.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

P62-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which states that both storage type water heaters and unfired hot w ater storage tanks w ill be proper ly protected against e xcessive temperature and pressure in case and isolation valve is installed between the two.

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed requirements are already covered in Sections P2803.1 and P2803.2.

Assembly Action:

P63-09/10

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 prop osed new standard CSA 1-06 US ind icated that in the opinion of IC C staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Appears to be supporting a proprietary product.

Assembly Action: PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Such a device would be dangerous to bystanders when it comes apart in an emergency condition.

Assembly Action:	None

P64-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Air gap needs to be in room with the water heater in case piping downstream of air gap is compromised.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: There needs to be an observable point n ear the water heater before the pi ping goes outside the room where the water heater is loc ated. P roposed text conflict with the 2 4 inches in Section P2803.5.2.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

P65-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Re ason: Proposed text clarifies that the pans are n ot required under tankless water heaters or connections to tankless water heaters

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: There are clearly differences between tank type and tankless water heaters such that tankless should not require pans. Consistency with the action of the IPC committee.

Assembly Action:

P66-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Proposal P65 clarifies the intent. Tankless water heaters are not required to have pans.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Proposal P65 clarifies the intent. Tankless water heaters are not required to have pans.

Assembly Action:

P67-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action: Disapproved Committee Reason: An "approved pan" is sufficient. There is n ot a need to spe cify a p an thickness for other materials that might be used. **Assembly Action:** None PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:** Disapproved Committee Reason: The code does not need more specifications for pans.

Assembly Action:

P68-09/10

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 p roposed new standard AW WA C901-08 ind icated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Committee Reason: Adds another standard for type of pipe already in the code.

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted Committee Reason: Adds another standard for a type of pipe already in the code. None

Assembly Action:

Assembly Action:

P69-09/10

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 p roposed new standard AWWA C904-06 ind icated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Adds another standard for pipe already in the code.	
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Adds another standard for pipe already in the code.	

Assembly Action: None

P70-09/10

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 ASTM F 2735-09 and F2769-09 indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

None

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 605.5 PIPE FITTINGS

MATERIAL STANDARD	
Fittings for polyethylene of raised temperature (PE-RT) plastic tubing	ASSE 1061; ASTM F 877 ; ASTM F 1807; ASTM F 2080 ; ASTM F2098; ASTM F 2159; ASTM F2434 ; ASTM F 2735; CSA B137.5

ASTM

F 2735-09 Standard Specification for Plastic Insert Fittings for SDR9 Cross-linked Polyethylene (PEX) and Raised Temperature (PE-RT) Tubing

Committee Reason: Modifications made were suggested by proponent to bring the most correct information to the proposal. Adding new pipe material to the code will provide for more flexibility.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE P2905.6 PIPE FITTINGS		
MATERIAL STANDARD		
Fittings for polyethylene of raised temperature (PE-RT) plastic tubing	ASSE 1061; ASTM F 877 ; ASTM F 1807; ASTM F 2080 ; ASTM F2098; ASTM F 2159; ASTM F2434 ; ASTM F 2735; CSA B137.5	

ASTM

F 2735-09 Standard Specification for <u>Plastic Insert Fittings for</u> SDR9 Cross-linked Polyethylene (PEX) and Raised Temperature (PE-RT) Tubing

Committee Reason: Modifications made were suggested by proponent to bring the most correct information to the proposal. Adding new pipe material to the code will provide for more flexibility.

Assembly Action:

None

P71-09/10

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 p roposed new standard AS TM A240/A240M-08a was not pe rformed as the s tandard is already listed as a referenced standard in the IBC.

PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proposed Standard is not appropriate for pipe products.	
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proposed Standard is not appropriate for pipe products.	

Assembly Action:	None

P72-09/10

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 prop osed new standard PDI WH201-2006 indicated that in t he opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The PDI standard is equivalent to ASSE 1010.	
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Standard not compliant with ICC standards	
Assembly Action:	None

P73-09/10

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 p roposed new standard AW WA C210-03 ind icated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria. Review of proposed new standard ASTM F???? indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Modify the proposal as follows:

605.5 Epoxy coating. Epoxy coating used on existing water service or water distribution piping systems shall comply with NSF 61 and shall comply with ASTM F???? or AWWA C210. Standard was in draft form.

Committee Reason: Agreed with proponent's reason statement which stated that these products are being used and a standard needs to be in the code to assure proper installation of these products.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Modify the proposal as follows:

P2905.19 Epoxy coating. Epoxy coating used on existing water service or water distribution piping systems shall comply to NSF 61 and shall comply to ASTM F???? or AWWA C210.

Committee Reason: Good alternative products for existing steel piping systems. Standard includes information on how material is applied.

Assembly Action:

P74-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the p roponent's reason statement which stated that identification of pipes within bundles is very helpful when repairing or doing renovation work.

Assembly Action:

P75-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Proposed language was in the code b efore and should have stayed in the code. Water heater thermostats are being used for the wrong purpose. Some water heater thermostats are too easily reset just by accidental bumps by walking by.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Water heater thermostats appear to control water temperatures just fine.

Assembly Action:

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

358

Approved as Modified

Approved as Modified

P76-09/10

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that water heater thermostats provide very poor control of hot water discharge temperature such that other control device is needed to assure safe temperature for hot water discharge at the fixture.

Assembly Action:

P77-09/10

Errata: The following correction of the monograph is noted: Standard CSA B-125.1 should have been B125.3

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Master the rmostatic valves might require adjustment to temperatures greater than 120 degrees F to account for temperature losses before delivery point.

Assembly Action:

P78-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Preferred language of P80.

Assembly Action: None

P79-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

607.2 Hot or tempered water supply to fixtures The developed length of hot or tempered water piping, from the source of hot water to the fixtures that require hot or tempered water, shall not exceed 40 50 feet (12192 15240mm). Recirculating system piping and heat traced piping shall be considered to be sources of hot or tempered water.

Committee Reason: Modification and action consistent with P80.

Assembly Action:

P80-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Saves water and improves energy efficiency.

Assembly Action:

P81-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Language ties the requirements of the IECC to the plumbing code and provides IPC users with the required information without having to buy another code book.

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Modified

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

P82-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Rea son: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated energy required by temperature maintenance systems needs to be limited by insulation as required by the IECC.

Assembly Action:

None

P83-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but wa http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges	as published on the ICC website at s/ <u>Standards-Analysis.pdf</u> :
Analysis: Review of pro posed n ew standard CS A B64.1.3-07 indicated that standard did comply with ICC standards criteria	at in t he opinion of ICC staff, the
PART I- IPC	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Allows another standard to be utilized for backflow pro-	ducts.
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Corrects terminology to be aligned with product standa	ard
Assembly Action:	None
P84-09/10	
PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Blue color appears to be promoting a proprietary produ	uct.
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Provides for alternative products to be used.	
Assembly Action:	None

P85-09/10

Errata: The following correction of the monograph is noted. This errata was discovered after the public hearing errata book was published. Proposal P85 in its entirety was published in error. The correct P85 follows:

This is a 2 part code change. Part I was heard by the IPC Code Development Committee. Part II was heard by the IRC Plumbing Code Development Committee.

PART I - IPC

Add new text as follows:

605.25 Listed joint or connection. Joints and connections that are not otherwise addressed in Section 605 and are certified by a third party agency as acceptable for water service or water distribution systems shall be permitted. The joints and connections shall be installed in accordance with their certification and manufacturer's installation instructions.

PART II - IRC

Add new text as follows:

P2905.19 Listed joint or connection. Joints and connections that are not otherwise addressed in Section 605 and are certified by a third party agency as acceptable for water service or water distribution systems shall be permitted. The joints and connections shall be installed in accordance with their certification and manufacturer's installation instructions.

Reason: There are various types of joints and connections utilized in water distribution and water supply systems that are not listed in Section 605. However, these joints or connections are listed by a third party agency as being acceptable for water distributions systems. This new section will indicate that such joints and connections are acceptable. Some examples of these types of joints and connections are unions, rolled groove fittings, and cut groove fittings.

Cost Impact: This code change will not increase the cost of construction.

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Additional information about the type of fitting is necessary. Products can always be submitted to the code official for alternate approval.

Assembly Action: PART II- IRC-P

Errata: The following erratum was found in the errata version of the proposal is noted:

P2905.19 Listed joint or connection. Joints and connections that are not otherwise addressed in Section 605 P2905 and are certified by a third party agency as acceptable for water service or water distribution systems shall be permitted. The joints and connections shall be installed in accordance with their certification and manufacturer's installation instructions.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Special joints can be approved by the code official under alternate approval.

Assembly Action:

P86-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Field testing rarely, if ever, occurs so why require a field testable device?

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Testimony given indicated that ASSE 1019 device failure rate is 9 out of 10. While this points to a problem that needs to be looked into by the industry, it is too early to decide to make the code require a different type of backflow device for hose bibs.

Assembly Action:

P87-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The safety of drinking water should not be limited to just inside the building.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Clarifies where marking of nonpotable water piping is required.

Assembly Action:	None
P88-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee R eason: Agreed with the pro ponent's reason statement approve products and methods, not manufacturers.	which stated that code of ficials only
Assembly Action:	None
P89-09/10	Withdrawn by Proponent
P90-09/10	
PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Rea son: Proposed text would inhibit designer an d may manufacturing facilities would be problematic with this requirement.	vincrease head loss. Design of f ood
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The code should not specify what tools are require	ed to perform work.
Assembly Action:	None
P91-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Clarifies the requirement for the level of protection	against high hazard conditions.
Assembly Action:	None
P92-09/10	
PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Conflicts with existing code language and will cause	se confusion.
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Wording is inconsistent and confusing.	
Assembly Action:	None

Approved as Submitted

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Approved as Submitted

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

P93-09/10

Committee Action:

PART I- IPC

Committee Reason: Proponent stated that he wants to clean up table at a later date.

Assembly Action: None

P94-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Language is not consistent with current ASSE Stan	dards.
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: It is unclear as to whether the terminology aligns wi standards.	th the nationally recognized

Assembly Action:

P95-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: A survey of ASSE and other backflow industry people revealed that the y had no ide a what was meant by the device terminology used in the proposal.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Agreed with the proponent's reason stat ement which was to provide for consistent terminology throughout the code.

Committee Rea son: Proposed language changes properly ad dress the terminology used in the ASSE

Assembly Action:

P96-09/10

Standards

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Committee Rea son: Proponent stated that he w ants to clean up table at a later date. T here was some concern about "high hazard" being removed from some entries.

Assembly Action: None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

363

PART II- IRC-P

Committee Reason: Makes the terminology of the code consistent with the standards.

Assembly Action: None P97-09/10 **Committee Action: Approved as Submitted** Committee Reason: Accurately reflects the terminology used in the standards. Assembly Action: None P98-09/10 **Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted Committee Reason: Accurately reflects the terminology used in the standards. **Assembly Action:** P99-09/10 **PART I- IPC Committee Action: Approved as Modified** Modify the proposal as follows:

608.16.4 Connections to automatic fire sprinkler systems and standpipe systems. The potable water supply to automatic fire sprinkler and standpipe systems shall be protected against backflow by a double check backflow prevention assembly, a double check fire protection backflow prevention assembly or a reduced pressure principle fire protection backflow prevention assembly.

Exceptions:

- Where systems are installed as a portion of the water distribution system in accordance with the 1. requirements of this code and are not provided with a fire department connection, isolation of the water supply system shall not be required.
- 2. Isolation of the water distribution system is not required for deluge, pre-reaction or dry pipe systems.

608.16.4.1 Additives or nonpotable source. Where systems under continuous pressure contain chemical additives or antifreeze, or where systems are connected to a nonpotable secondary water supply, the potable water supply shall be protected against backflow by a reduced pressure principle backflow prevention assembly or a reduced pressure principle fire protection backflow prevention assembly. Where chemical additives or antifreeze are added to only a portion of an automatic fire sprinkler or standpipe system, the reduced pressure principle backflow prevention assembly or the reduced pressure principle fire protection backflow prevention assembly shall be permitted to be located so as to isolate that portion of the system. Where systems are not under continuous pressure, the potable water supply shall be protected against backflow by an air gap or an atmospheric vacuum breaker conforming to ASSE 1001 or CSA B64.1.1.

Committee Reason: The modifications were made because the proposed new language eliminated standard (non-fire protection type) RPZ backflow assemblies. The non-fire protection type RPZ can be used in some applications and offers a wider availability of products that can be used. T he proposal provides for consistent terminology in the code and with the standards.

Assembly Action:

None

364

Committee Action:

PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

P2902.5.4 Connections to automatic fire sprinkler systems. The potable water supply to automatic fire sprinkler shall be protected against backflow by a <u>double check backflow prevention assembly</u>, <u>a</u> double check fire protection backflow prevention assembly. <u>a reduced pressure principle backflow prevention assembly</u> or a reduced pressure principle fire protection backflow prevention assembly.

Exception: Where systems are installed as a portion of the water distribution system in accordance with the requirements of this code and are not provided with a fire department connection, backflow protection for the water supply system shall not be required.

P2902.5.4.1 Additives or nonpotable source. Where systems contain chemical additives or antifreeze, or where systems are connected to a nonpotable secondary water supply, the potable water supply shall be protected against backflow by <u>a reduced pressure principle backflow prevention assembly or</u> a reduced pressure principle fire protection backflow prevention assembly. Where chemical additives or antifreeze is added to only a portion of an automatic fire sprinkler or standpipe-system, the reduced pressure principle fire protection backflow preventer shall be permitted to be located so as to isolate that portion of the system.

Committee Reason: Modification allows more economical alternatives with sacrificing safety. Original proposal language makes the terminology of the code consistent with the standards.

Assembly Action:

P100-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that the change was needed for consistency in terminology throughout the code.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Proposed language makes the terminology of the code consistent with the standards.

Assembly Action:

P101-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Proposed language makes the terminology of the code consistent with the standards.

Assembly Action:

P102-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: Eliminates cloudy wording and clearly specifies that a backflow device is needed wher e cross connections are made.

PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Proposed language makes the terminology of the code consistent with the standards.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Modified

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

P103-09/10

P104-09/10

P105-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that the change was needed for consistency in terminology throughout the code.

Assembly Action:

P106-09/10

P107-09/10 **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: A backflow preventer will not work under these conditions. There are other ways to isolate dead ends such as valve.

P108-09/10

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 stan dard CSA B483.1-07 ind icated that in the opinion of IC C staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria

PART I- IPC

Errata: The following correction of the monograph is noted: In Section 611.2, CSA B438.1 should have been CSA B483.1.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Additional standard is needed in the code for these products

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P

Errata: The following correction of the monograph is noted: In Section P2908.2, CSA B438.1 should have been CSA B483.1.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Additional standard is needed in the code for these products.

Assembly Action:

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

Withdrawn by Proponent

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

P109-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Other types of nonmetallic piping are not ad dresse pipelines that do not require a tracer wire.	ed. There are other methods of tracing
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: There are not any hazards in a sewer line to be av line of sight between cleanouts.	oided. One can locate a sewer line b y
Assembly Action:	None
P110-09/10	
PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: A primed joint works best and many manufacturers cementing.	require priming before solvent
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: A primed joint is easier to inspect. Strength of a prime	med joint is better.
Assembly Action:	None
P111-09/10	
PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Clears up a gray area concerning tubular waste fitti	ngs and eliminates a code conflict.
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action: Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement whic conflict in this section when considering the special fittings used in tubular	Approved as Submitted
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action: Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement whic conflict in this section when considering the special fittings used in tubular Assembly Action:	Approved as Submitted th stated that the language clears up a waste systems. None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action: Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement white conflict in this section when considering the special fittings used in tubular Assembly Action: P112-09/10	Approved as Submitted the stated that the language clears up a waste systems. None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action: Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement whic conflict in this section when considering the special fittings used in tubular Assembly Action: P112-09/10 Errata: The following correction of the monograph is noted: In footnote "f" struck out.	Approved as Submitted th stated that the language clears up a waste systems. None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action: Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement whic conflict in this section when considering the special fittings used in tubular Assembly Action: P112-09/10 Errata: The following correction of the monograph is noted: In footnote "f" struck out. Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted th stated that the language clears up a waste systems. None , dwelling unit should have been Approved as Submitted
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action: Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement whic conflict in this section when considering the special fittings used in tubular Assembly Action: P112-09/10 Errata: The following correction of the monograph is noted: In footnote "f" struck out. Committee Action: Committee Reason: Toilet facilities in malls, factories, motels/hotels are groups.	Approved as Submitted the stated that the language clears up a waste systems. None , dwelling unit should have been Approved as Submitted commonly designed using bathroom

P113-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that because turbulence in a horizontal pipe downstream of a stack dissipates within 10 pipe diameters, there is no logical reason to restrict connections to horizontal offsets at points beyond 10 pipe diameters from the stack.

Assembly Action:	None
P114-09/10	
PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Topic is already adequately covered in Section 712.3.2	
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Pedestrian traffic rated is not defined and to pic is already P3007.3.2	adequately covered in Section
Assembly Action:	None
P115-09/10	
PART I- IPC	

Modify the proposal as follows:

Committee Action:

712.3.3.2 Ratings. Pipe and fittings shall be rated for the maximum system operating pressure and temperature. Pipe fitting materials shall be compatible with the pipe material. Where pipe and fittings are buried in the earth, they shall be approved suitable for burial.

Committee Reason: The code official is already required to approve the discharge piping materials in Section 712.3.3 so there is no need to in clude the term " approved" in the proposed new Section 712.3.3.2. The ter m "suitable" is a better indicator of what is required. The proposal better clarifies what is required for the materials used for sump pump and ejector piping.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Modify the proposal as follows:

P3007.3.3.2 Ratings. Pipe and fittings shall be rated for the maximum system operating pressure and temperature. Pipe fitting materials shall be compatible with the pipe material. Where pipe and fittings are buried in the earth, they shall be approved suitable for burial.

Committee Reason: Eliminates ambiguity about what is required for force main pipe and fittings.

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

Approved as Modified

PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Re ason: Good pro posal except last line of added diameters instead of 10 feet.	text nee ds to b e changed to s ay 10 pipe
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason stateme and horizontal branch drains are also acceptable points of termina	ent which stated that soil stacks, waste stacks tion of an ejector discharge line.
Assembly Action:	None
P117-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proposal goes against what was accomplish	ed by the committee's action on P3.
Assembly Action:	None
P118-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on committee's action on P117.	
Assembly Action:	None
P119-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Creates a safer environment in a kitchen.	
Assembly Action:	None
P120-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:	

802.2 Installation. All indirect waste piping shall discharge through an air gap or air break into a waste receptor Waste receptors and standpipes shall be trapped and vented and shall connect to the building drainage system. All indirect waste piping that exceeds 30 inches (762mm) in developed length measured horizontally, or 54 inches (1372mm) in total developed length, shall be trapped.

Exception: Where a waste receptor receives only clear water waste and does not directly connect to a sanitary drainage system, the receptor shall not require a trap.

Committee Reason: Modification w as made because some equipment might req uire a trap. Agre ed with the proponent's reason statement which indicated that the di stances are aligned with the same distances allowed for waste piping from a combination sink before connection to a trap.

Approved as Submitted

P121-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that open unattended traps of waste receptors located in crawl spaces and attics can dry out or overflow without being noticed by the building occupants.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that open unattended traps of waste receptors located in crawl spaces and attics can dry out or overflow without being noticed by the building occupants.

Assembly Action:

P122-09/10

P123-09/10

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 ASSE 1049-2009 and ASTM F 1 412-01 indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standards did comply with ICC standards criteria. Standard was submitted in draft form.

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: P ast committees have turned this same proposal beca use no standar d existed for chemical air admittance valves. Now that the standard is in place, it is time that the proposal is approved.

Assembly Action:

P124-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Vent terminals should not be used for support of any pieces of equipment regardless of whether the pipe is anchored or not.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that there are no approved anchoring methods for a vent terminal to support anything.

Assembly Action:

P125-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed text elimination would create a venting problem for fixture drains that were purposely oversized to achieve a greater fixture trap to vent distance in certain applications.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Withdrawn by Proponent

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

P126-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: Combination drain and v ent s ystems are used extensively in commercia I kitchens. Proposal would eliminate that type venting system to be used in commercial kitchens.

Assembly Action:

P127-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

912.3 <u>912.2.2</u> Size. The minimum size of a combination drain and vent pipe shall be in accordance with Table <u>912.3</u> <u>912.2.2</u>. The horizontal length of a combination drain and vent system shall be unlimited.

(Renumber Table 912.3 to Table 912.2.2)

(Renumber subsequent sections)

Committee Reason: Modification was made to make the section tie to the existing dry vent connection section (912.2) as that is more logical for the subject mat ter of Section 91 2.3. Proposal eliminates the que stion about whether there is a limit to the maximum length of the combination drain and vent system.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:

Committee Reason: No limit allows for greater design possibilities. There doesn't appear to be any downside to allowing unlimited length.

Assembly Action:

P128-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated because these type of systems are only intended to convey waste (not fecal matter), the term "drain" is an inappropriate term to use. "Waste" is the proper term.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated because these type of systems are only intended to convey waste (not fecal matter), the term "drain" is an inappropriate term to use. "Waste" is the proper term.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

P129-09/10

Committee Reason: Single stack venting has been used successfully for years.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

P130-09/10

Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The requirement is already covered in Section 916.2.	
Assembly Action:	None
P131-09/10	
PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Wording is more concise and clear.	
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Proposal clarifies what is intended.	
Assembly Action:	`None
P132-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which because Section 917.3.2 already indicates what to do when greater than 4 stack.	n stated that the section is redundant branch intervals from the top of the
Assembly Action:	None
P133-09/10	Annual on Submitted
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which the section easier to read and understand.	stated that the new language makes
Assembly Action:	None
P134-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that parking garage floor drains do not require traps if there is a main trap provided prior to connection to a combined sewer.

Assembly Action:

P135-09/10

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: Proposed new standard ASME A112.18.8-09 was not reviewed as standard was not received by ICC staff.

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Elastomeric traps are not as reliable as a liquid seal trap.

Assembly Action: PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Elastomeric traps would violate all other rules concerning traps.

Assembly Action:

P136-09/10

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 p roposed new standard A SSE 1072-06 indicated that in t he opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Assembly Action:

Committee Rea son: There is concern that the floor d rain strainer already restricts flow into the drain so installation of an other device that w ould further restrict the flow would create pr oblems. New text "shall be connected to the trap" is not accurate. There is a pot ential for device to be installed for the wrong application due to device identification issues that could be encountered at a later time.

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:** Disapproved

Committee Re ason: Consistent with action tak en by IPC committee. Standard does not comply with ICC criteria.

Assembly Action:

P137-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that the current language is saying that interceptors and separators should be installed to prevent discharge. The proposed language states the intent (capturing detrimental substances) better.

Assembly Action:

P138-09/10

Committee Actio	ion:
-----------------	------

Committee Reason: Because some jurisdictions require outdoor grease interceptors, the current section creates a conflict for those applications. Elimination of the indicated text solves those conflicts.

Assembly Action:

P139-09/10

Errata: Errata for this code change proposal was published in the "Errata to the 2009/2010 Proposed Changes" as posted on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx It is reproduced here for convenience.

1003.3.1 Grease interceptors and automatic grease removal devices required. A grease interceptor or automatic grease removal device shall be required to receive the drainage from fixtures and equipment with grease-laden waste

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

located in food preparation areas, such as in restaurants, hotel kitchens, hospitals, school kitchens, bars, factory cafeterias and clubs. Fixtures and equipment shall include pot sinks, prerinse sinks; soup kettles or similar devices; wok stations; floor drains or sinks into which kettles are drained; automatic hood wash units and dishwashers without prerinse sinks. Grease interceptors and automatic grease removal devices shall receive waste only from fixtures and equipment that allow fats, oils or grease to be discharged. Where lack of space or other constraints prevent the installation or replacement of a grease interceptor, one or more grease interceptors shall be permitted to be installed on or above the floor and upstream of an existing grease interceptor.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that it is not always possible to retrofit grease interceptors and that multiple types of grease interceptors can be utilized to achieve the desired end results.

Assembly Action:

P140-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Grease interceptors cannot be sized to take the discharge of a food waste grinder without a solids interceptor upstream of the grinder.

Assembly Action:

P141-09/10

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 PDI G102 indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, th e standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: New terms and definitions are in alignment with product standards and industry terminology.

Assembly Action:

P142-09/10

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 CSA B481.1-07 and B481.3-07 in dicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standards did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1003.3.4 Grease interceptors and automatic grease removal devices. Grease interceptors and automatic grease removal devices shall be sized in accordance with ASME A112.14.3, ASME 112.14.4, CSA B481.3 or PDI G101. Grease interceptors and automatic grease removal devices shall be designed and tested in accordance with ASME A112.14.3, ASME 112.14.4, CSA B481.3 or PDI G101. Grease interceptors and automatic grease removal devices shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions. Where manufacturer's installation instructions are not provided, grease interceptors and grease removal devices shall be installed in compliance with ASME A112.14.3, ASME 112.14.4, CSA B481.3 or PDI <u>G101</u>.

Committee Reason: Modification made because installers should have the flex ibility to install to any of the available standards should the manufacturer not provide instructions. Addition of CSA standar d increases product availability.

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

374

P143-09/10

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 UL 2215-00 indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The UL outline provides a needed method for sizing criteria for oil separators.

Assembly Action:

P144-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Not every interceptor or separator has a "trap seal" or acts like a trap so the requirement for venting the outlet of ever y interceptor or s eparator is questionable. Installing two-way cle anouts on interceptor and separator outlets might introduce problems of damage to internal separator and interceptor components.

Assembly Action:

P145-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There is no standard for hair interceptors so it is not known what constitutes a hair interceptor.

Assembly Action:

P146-09/10

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 stan dard CSA B481.4-07 ind icated that in the opinion of IC C staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Maintenance issues are not the responsibility of this code.

Assembly Action:

P147-09/10

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 ASME A112.6.4-2003 (R2008) and A112.6.9-2005 indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standards did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: P148 is more favorable as siphonic roof drain standard does not meet ICC criteria.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

a hair

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted ria for oil separators.

None

None

P148-09/10

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 ASME A112.6.4-2003 (R2008) indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that drains are no longer being manufactured to the A112.21.2M standard but to the A112.6.4 standard.

Assembly Action:

P149-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that inspectors need to assure that the roofing membrane is not blocking the opening of the roof drain.

Assembly Action:

P150-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that the requirements for roof and secondary drains needed clarification.

Assembly Action:

P151-09/10

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 p roposed new standard A SPE 45-2007 indicated that in t he opinion of ICC staff, the standards did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1107.1 General. Siphonic roof d<u>rains and</u> draina ge s ystems shall be designed in accordance with <u>ASME</u> <u>A112.6.9 and</u> ASPE 45.

Add standard to Chapter 13 as follows:

ASPE

A112.6.9-2005 Siphonic Roof Drains

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that siphonic roof drain systems because of their complexity, need to have a standard for design and need to use a roof drain that meets a specific referenced standard.

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

376

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Assembly Action:

Committee Rea son: No concr ete data provided on failures an d inju ries. If a ir testing of plastic piping is performed properly, it is safe.

P152-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Proposal lowers the safety within the building. Makes building owners wastewater purveyors. No standards exist for graywater quality. No approvals exist for equipment needed for graywater processing.

Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proposed language is too restrictive as to the m ways to successfully process gray water.	ethod that must be used. There are other
Assembly Action:	None
P153-09/10	
PART I- IPC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Simply editorial corrections that makes the table	e titles more accurate.
Assembly Action:	None
PART II- IRC-P Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Corrects terminology.	
Assembly Action:	None
Assembly Action: P154-09/10	None Withdrawn by Proponent
Assembly Action: P154-09/10 P155-09/10	None Withdrawn by Proponent
Assembly Action: P154-09/10 P155-09/10 Committee Action:	None Withdrawn by Proponent Approved as Submitted
Assembly Action: P154-09/10 P155-09/10 Committee Action: Committee Reason: Partitions are associated with water closet and partition requirements to be located near the requirements for fixture located near the requirement of the	None Withdrawn by Proponent Approved as Submitted
Assembly Action: P154-09/10 P155-09/10 Committee Action: Committee Reason: Partitions are associated with water closet a not partition requirements to be located near the requirements for fixture loc Assembly Action:	None Withdrawn by Proponent Approved as Submitted Urinals and t herefore it is logical for the bocations. None
Assembly Action: P154-09/10 P155-09/10 Committee Action: Committee Reason: Partitions are associated with water closet a nor partition requirements to be located near the requirements for fixture to Assembly Action: P156-09/10	None Withdrawn by Proponent Approved as Submitted Urinals and t herefore it is logical for the Docations. None
Assembly Action: P154-09/10 P155-09/10 Committee Action: Committee Reason: Partitions are associated with water closet a not partition requirements to be located near the requirements for fixture to Assembly Action: P156-09/10 PART I- IPC Committee Action:	None Withdrawn by Proponent Approved as Submitted urinals and t herefore it is logical for the bocations. None Approved as Submitted
Assembly Action: P154-09/10 P155-09/10 Committee Action: Committee Reason: Partitions are associated with water closet and partition requirements to be located near the requirements for fixture loc Assembly Action: P156-09/10 PART I- IPC Committee Reason: Proposed language is already in Section 312.1 this important safety requirement.	None Withdrawn by Proponent Approved as Submitted Urinals and t herefore it is logical for the bocations. None Approved as Submitted but needs to be in this section to reinforce

Disapproved
P157-09/10

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 CSA B356-00(2005) indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that addition of the standard will increase availability of products for the application.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Consistent with previous actions to add more standards for products to allow greater availability of products for an application.

Assembly Action:

P158-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Adding an alarm to a pan would appear to be redundant. The required pan provides sufficient safety for the application.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: No standard or specification for what this alarm unit is and if it alarms, it will only be useful if someone is present to actually hear it.

Assembly Action:

P159-09/10

PART I- IPC Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: No need to make this code consistent with IMC or IFGC. If odor is an issue, just make vent pipe taller.

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: No technical justification for the change.

Assembly Action:

378

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

P160-09/10

PART I- IPC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that the proposed language will provide simplicity for determining what fixture elevation requires a backwater valve to be installed.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IRC-P **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The likelyhood of a wax ring leaking is low. All fixtures on the same floor level having at least one fixture with flood level rim below the next upstream manhole should be on the backwater valve.

Assembly Action:

P161-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Clarifies the code and is congruent with committee action on P16.

Assembly Action: P162-09/10

Committee Action:

Revise proposal as follows:

403.3 (IBC [P] 2902.3) Required public toilet facilities. Customers, patrons and visitors shall be provided with public toilet facilities in structures and tenant spaces intended for public utilization. The number of plumbing fixtures located within the required toilet facilities shall be provided in accordance with Section 2902.1 for all users. Employees shall be provided with toilet facilities in all occupancies. Employee toilet facilities shall either be separate or combined employee and public toilet facilities.

Exception: Public toilet facilities shall not be required in open or enclosed parking garages. Toilet facilities shall not be required in parking garages where there are no parking attendants. Toilet facilities in buildings adjacent to parking garages shall be permitted to serve parking garage attendants provided that the location of the toilet facilities complies with Section 403.3.2.

Committee Reason: Modification made because standalone parking garages should not depend on adjacent buildings for toilet facilities. The proposal is approved based upon the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action:

P163-09/10 **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent's reason statement which stated that the change provides for consistency throughout the code.

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

P164-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Change organizes chapter in a logical manner.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

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:

Committee Reason: This change will correlate the definition and make it consistent with the definition in the IBC.

Assembly Action:

RB2-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee feels this would be easily misinterpretated 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:

RB3-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB4-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

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

None

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

382

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:

RB8-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

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:

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:

RB11-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB12-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

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:

RB15-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change clarifies the code and eliminates an exception.

Assembly Action:

RB16-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

Disapproved

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

RB17-09/10

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Committee Action:

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:

RB18-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change improves the code and clarifies Table R301.7, as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action:

RB19-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB20-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB21-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB22-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

None

Disapproved

RB23-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB24-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB25-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB26-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There is no data presented to substantiate the need for the door closer. This is a firerated 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:

RB27-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB28-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The language of this change does not clear up the issue but adds confusion.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Committee Action:

Committee Action:

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:

RB34-09/10

Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

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.

The existing language is sufficient and the use of fire-retardant coatings is controlled by Section R104.11 alternate methods.

Assembly Action:

RB32-09/10

Committee Reason: The committee feels this change would eliminate some options that are very needed.

Committee Action:

RB29-09/10

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB28-09/10.

Assembly Action:

RB30-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee feels the term "or equivalent" is sufficient and there is no need to add a list of products.

Assembly Action:

RB31-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

None

RB33-09/10

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

RB35-09/10 **Committee Action:**

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:

RB36-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB37-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB38-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee feels that this change will cause confusion and would permit a ceiling height that is unusable.

Assembly Action:

RB39-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee feels this change is unnecessary and it contains a circular reference.

Assembly Action:

RB40-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

RB41-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change will more clearly define how the measurement of the sill height is to be taken.

Assembly Action:

RB42-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB43-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB44-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB45-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB46-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Modified

389

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

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 (0.5 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 11/4 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:

RB47-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB46-09/10. The committee prefers the rewrite of RB46-09/10.

Assembly Action:

RB48-09/10

~				
(''	۱mm		Action	
υu	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	IILLEE	ACTION.	

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:

RB49-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB50-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

390

RB51-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB52-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB53-09/10 RB54-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB55-09/10

....

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change is not needed as the requirement is already in Section P2904.

RB57-09/10	Withdrawn by Proponent
Assembly Action:	None
Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous a	ction on RB54-09/10.
Committee Action:	Disapproved
RB56-09/10	
Assembly Action:	None

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

RB58-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB59-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB60-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

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:

Committee Reason: The committee prefers the language of FS160-09/10, Part II.

Assembly Action:

RB62-09/10

Committee Action:

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.

- The space is entered only for purposed of repairs or maintenance.
- The foam plastic insulation is protected against ignition using one of the following ignition barrier materials:
 - 3.1. 1 ¹/₂-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.

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

392

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

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:

RB63-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on S207-09/10, Part II.

Assembly Action:

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:

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:

RB65-09/10

RB66-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB67-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB68-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

RB69-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

RB70-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Assembly Action:

RB71-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change is lacking a definition of a pier and beam foundation.

the lintels, limited to CMU, pilaster reinforcement and limited to basement.

Assembly Action:

RB72-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB73-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB74-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

RB75-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The reference in the proposed new item 4 is for top plates and does not apply to bottom plates.

Assembly Action:

RB76-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB77-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

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:

Committee Reason: This change adds the proper reference standard for flat ICF wall systems.

Assembly Action:

RB79-09/10

Committee Action:

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 D_0 , D_1 , and D_2 requirement without providing a solution.

Assembly Action:

RB80-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

395

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

RB81-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB82-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB83-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change will provide flexibility to install the vapor retarder as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action:

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:

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:

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:

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:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

RB86-09/10

Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request and the committee's previous action of	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 of	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 th http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analy Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the comply with ICC standards criteria.	e ICC website at <u>sis.pdf</u> : standard did
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request and the committee's previous action of	on RB85-09/10.
Assembly Action:	None
RB89-09/10	
Committee Action: Approved a	s Submitted
Committee Reason: This change recognizes new technology for end-jointed lumber and proidentify it.	vides a means to
Assembly Action:	None
RB90-09/10	
Committee Action: Approved a	s Submitted
Committee Reason: This change will improve the efficacy of the code by collecting requirements into one section and makes the code easier to use.	all of the deck
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:

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

Approved as Submitted

RB92-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB93-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee feels the placement description is too confusing and should be presented in tabular form.

Assembly Action:

RB94-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB95-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB96-09/10

Committee Action:

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 <u>accepted industry practices</u>, 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 <u>accepted industry practices, such as</u>, 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 <u>accepted industry practices</u>, 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

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

398

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

(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:

RB97-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB98-09/10 and the proponent's request for disapproval.

Assembly Action:

RB98-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change corrects the code language to comport with the controlling reference standard.

Assembly Action:

RB99-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change provides an accepted standard to use as an alternate to the prescriptive code.

Assembly Action:

RB100-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB101-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

<u>R702.7</u> 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.

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Modified

702.7.1 R703.1.3.1 Class III vapor retarders. Class III vapor retarders shall be permitted where any one of the conditions in Table R702.7.1 R601.3.1 is met.

TABLE R702.7.1 R703.1.3.1 **CLASS III VAPOR RETARDERS**

(No change to table values or footnote)

R702.7.2 R703.1.3.2 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 R703.1.3.3 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.

- Vinyl lap or horizontal aluminum siding applied over a weather resistive barrier as specified in Table 1. 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:

RB102-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB103-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB104-09/10

Committee Action:

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

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

None

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 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).

SEISMIC AD	I ABLE R602.10.3(4) SEISMIC ADJUSTMENT FACTORS TO THE REQUIRED LENGTH OF WALL BRACING							
ADJUSTMENT STORY/ BASED ON: SUPPORTING		CONDITION	ADJUSTMENT FACTOR ^{a,b} (Multiply length from Table R602.10.3(1) by this factor)	APPLICABLE METHODS				
Story height	Any story	≤10 ft	1.0					
(Section 301.3)	Ally Story	>10 ft ≤ 12 ft	1.2					
Braced wall line		≤35 ft	1.0	All methods				
spacing, townhouses in SDC C	Any story	>35 ft ≤ 50 ft	1.43	Air methous				
Braced wall line	Any story	<u>></u> 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	Roof only or roof plus one or two stories	<15 psf	1.0	
for wall supporting	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 Sec	tion 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 D_2 , 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 <u>20</u> 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:

RB106-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB107-09/10

Committee Action:

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 stude 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

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

RB108-09/10

Committee Action:

Disapproved

None

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB105-09/10, this issue is adequately addressed.

Assembly Action:

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 91/4 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 <u>or roof trusses</u> above is between 91/4 inches (235 mm) and 151/4 inches (387 mm) blocking between rafters <u>or roof trusses</u> 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 top of the top of the solve is between 9.1/4 inches and 15.1/4 inches lateral load transfer shall be provided in accordance with Section R802.10.3.
- 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 151/4 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 151/4 inches (387 mm), the top plates of the *braced wall panele* 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),
 - 3.2. 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:

RB110-09/10

Committee Action:

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 11/2 inch (38 mm) thickness.

Exceptions:

 Vertical joints of panel sheathing <u>shall be permitted to</u> occurring over a double stud<u>s</u>, 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

None

Approved as Modified

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:

RB111-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB112-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB113-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB114-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB115-09/10

Committee Action:

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

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

RB116-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB117-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB118-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change clarifies the requirements for wall ties for hollow masonry units.

Assembly Action:

RB119-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB120-09/10

PART I - IRC

PART II - IBC

RB121-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB122-09/10

PART I - IRC **Committee Action:**

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:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

None

None

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Withdrawn by Proponent

Withdrawn by Proponent

None

Disapproved

PART II - IBC Fire Safety **Committee Action:**

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

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:

RB123-09/10

PART I - IRC **Committee Action:**

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:

Assembly Action:

1405.13.2.1 Window opening control devices. When required elsewhere in this code, wWindow 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.

<u></u>	
RB124-09/10	Withdrawn by Proponent
RB125-09/10	
PART I - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request f RB123-09/10.	for disapproval and the committee's previous action on
Assembly Action:	None

PART II - IBC Fire Safety Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

None

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on the proponents request for disapproval and to be consistent with previous actions.

Assembly Action:

RB126-09/10

PART I - IRC **Committee Action:**

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:

PART II - IBC Fire Safety **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponents request for disapproval and to be consistent with actions taken on RB123-09/10.

Assembly Action:

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:

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:

RB128-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change makes the code consistent with readily available materials and based on the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action:

RB129-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

RB130-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action. Without RB3-09/10 this change is meaningless.

Assembly Action:

RB131-09/10

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:

Committee Reason: This change adds a standard that is needed and to be consistent with the IBC.

Assembly Action:

RB133-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee feels that ASTM C 1658 is not suitable for this application.

Assembly Action:

RB134-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB135-09/10

Committee Action:

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 <u>fasteners</u> 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:

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Withdrawn by Proponent

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

RB136-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based on proponent's request for disapproval. The proponent will work with industry and bring this back for Final Action.

Assembly Action:

RB137-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB138-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB139-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB140-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB141-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

RB142-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB143-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

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:

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent's request for disapproval. The proposed reference standard does not comply with the ICC criteria.

Assembly Action:

RB145-09/10

~		
$(^{\circ} \cap m)$	mittoo	Action
COIII	muce	ACTION.

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:

RB146-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB147-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

410

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:

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:

RB149-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB150-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB151-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's published reason. This change makes improvements to the figure.

Assembly Action:

RB152-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB153-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change allows the use of wood roof trusses for structures within the scope of the IRC.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

..

None

None

RB154-09/10

Errata: Change Table R802.11 to read as shown:

		EXPOSURE B								
Rafter or	Roof	Basic Wind Speed (MPH)								
Truss	Span (faat)	8	5	9	<u>0</u>	<u>1(</u>	<u>100</u>		<u>110</u>	
spacing	(leet)	Roof Pitch		Roof Pitch		Roof Pitch		Roof Pitch		
		<u><5:12</u>	<u>≥5:12</u>	<u><5:12</u>	<u>≥5:12</u>	<u><5:12</u>	<u>≥5:12</u>	<u><5:12</u>	<u>≥5:12</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>	
12" o.c.	<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>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>	
16" o.c.	<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></u>	<u>32</u>	<u>113</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>153</u>	<u>133</u>	239	<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>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>	404	<u>351</u>	
24" o c	<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>	
24 0.0.	<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>	209	<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>	
					EXPOS	SURE C				
Rafter or	Roof			Ba	sic Wind S	Speed (MP	<u>'H)</u>			
Truss	Span ((ast)	8	5	9	0	<u>1(</u>	00	<u>1</u> '	<u>110</u>	
Spacing	(reet)	<u>Roof</u>	Pitch	<u>Roof</u>	Pitch	<u>Roof</u>	Pitch	<u>Roof</u>	Pitch	
		<u><5:12</u>	<u>≥5:12</u>	<u><5:12</u>	<u>≥5:12</u>	<u><5:12</u>	<u>≥5:12</u>	<u><5:12</u>	<u>≥5:12</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>	204	<u>177</u>	268	233	
	<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>	
12" о с	<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>	
12 0.0.	<u>32</u>	<u>182</u>	<u>158</u>	224	<u>195</u>	<u>314</u>	<u>273</u>	<u>414</u>	<u>360</u>	
	<u>36</u>	200	174	246	<u>214</u>	<u>346</u>	<u>301</u>	456	<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>	254	<u>221</u>	<u>313</u>	<u>272</u>	<u>441</u>	<u>384</u>	<u>583</u>	<u>507</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>	
	18	160	139	194	169	271	236	356	310	
10"	24	194	169	238	207	334	291	439	382	
<u>16°0.C.</u>	28	<u>21</u> 8	<u>190</u>	<u>267</u>	232	<u>376</u>	<u>327</u>	495	431	
	32	242	<u>21</u> 1	<u>298</u>	<u>259</u>	<u>418</u>	<u>364</u>	<u>551</u>	479	
	36	266	231	327	284	460	400	606	527	

TABLE R802.11 RAFTER OR TRUSS UPLIFT CONNECTION FORCES FROM WIND (POUNDS PER CONNECTION)

	<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>
	48	338	294	<u>416</u>	<u>362</u>	<u>587</u>	<u>511</u>	775	<u>674</u>
	<u>12</u>	188	<u>164</u>	228	<u>198</u>	<u>314</u>	<u>273</u>	412	<u>358</u>
	<u>18</u>	<u>240</u>	<u>209</u>	<u>292</u>	<u>254</u>	<u>408</u>	355	536	466
<u>24" o.c.</u>	24	<u>292</u>	<u>254</u>	<u>358</u>	<u>311</u>	<u>502</u>	437	660	574
	<u>28</u>	328	<u>285</u>	402	<u>350</u>	<u>566</u>	<u>492</u>	744	<u>647</u>
	32	364	<u>317</u>	448	<u>390</u>	<u>628</u>	<u>546</u>	828	720
	<u>36</u>	400	<u>348</u>	<u>492</u>	428	<u>692</u>	<u>602</u>	<u>912</u>	<u>793</u>
	42	454	<u>395</u>	<u>558</u>	<u>485</u>	<u>786</u>	<u>684</u>	1040	<u>905</u>
	48	508	442	626	<u>545</u>	882	767	1166	1014

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Action:

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:

RB155-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB154-09/10 and RB156-09/10.

Assembly Action:

RB156-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change adds a simplified method for roof uplift connections as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action:

RB157-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB158-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent's request for disapproval. This change needs additional work and will be brought back.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved
RB159-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent's request for disapproval. This change needs additional work and will be brought back.

Assembly Action:

RB160-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB161-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

R806.4 Unvented attic <u>and unvented enclosed rafter</u> 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:

RB162-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB146-09/10.

Assembly Action:

RB163-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB164-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee feels the existing language is clear and the new text is not needed and is confusing.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

RB165-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB166-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There is no technical data justifying this change and it exceeds the tested manufacturer's specification.

Assembly Action:

RB167-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB168-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

RB169-09/10

PART I - IRC **Committee Action:**

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:

PART II - IBC Fire Safety **Committee Action:**

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:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

RB170-09/10

Committee Action:

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.

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

RB171-09/10

Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: Based upon the committee's preview request for disapproval.	vious action on RB163-09/10 and the proponent's
Assembly Action:	None
RB172-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change broadens the scope of t	his section and clarifies it.
Assembly Action:	None
RB173-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Decorative shrouds that are part of the	ne entire listed system are also listed.
Assembly Action:	None
RB174-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous a	ction on RB173-09/10.
Assembly Action:	None
RB175-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee has a concern or connected to a watercourse".	how the building official is to determine "directly
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:**

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:

PART II - IBC **Committee Action:**

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:

RB178-09/10

RB179-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request for disapproval and ICC has begun the process of developing a Swimming Pool Code.

Assembly Action:

RB180-09/10

Committee Action:

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:

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:

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:

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

RB182-09/10

Committee Action:

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: 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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

RB187-09/10

"This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to <u>http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx</u>

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:

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL PLUMBING/MECHANICAL CODE COMMITTEE

Dave Cantrell - Chair

Chief Plumbing Inspector Public Health - Seattle & King County Renton, WA

Lynn Underwood, CBO – *Vice Chair*

Building Official City of Norfolk Norfolk, VA

Patrick Bridges

Rep: National Association of Home Builders Pat Bridges & Assoc. Inc. Portland, OR

Mel Fink

Rep: National Association of Home Builders Melvin Fink & Associates Brockton, MA

Greg Ford, CBO

Field Insp. And Assist. Manager Military Housing Institute for Building Technology and Safety Rautown, MO

Gary Kozan, CPD

Rep: Plumbing Heating and Cooling Contractors COO Ridgeway Plumbing Boynton Beach, FL

Miriam McGiver, PE

Senior Bldg Construction Engineer New York State, Department of State Albany, NY

Richard Meyer

Rep: National Association of Home Builders Asst. Manager, Military Housing Institute for Building Technology and Safety Stafford, VA

Clarence Milligan, MCP

Assistant Township Manager Upper Providence Township Oaks, PA

Barry Pines, CPD

Estimator C&R Plumbing & Heating, Inc. Shelby Township, MI

Gil Rossmiller

Chief Building Official Town of Parker Parker, CO

Richard Schunk

Rep: National Association of Home Builders Wyndham Homes, Inc. Brewster, NY

Staff Secretariat:

Gregg Gress Senior Technical Staff International Code Council

Fred Grable, PE Staff Engineer - Plumbing International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL PLUMBING/MECHANICAL CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS PLUMBING PORTION

RP1-09/10

Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Air testing gives the installer a needed alternate method	od of testing.
Assembly Action:	None
RP2-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: An additional product standard will allow greater choic	es of products to use.
Assembly Action:	None
RP3-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Rea son: There is n o technical justification to pro hibit clothes bathroom.	washer standpipes in a residential
Assembly Action:	None
RP4-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Language of RP5 is preferred.	
Assembly Action:	None
RP5-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Allows for flexibility for supply of low threshold shower	s in accessibility applications.
Assembly Action:	None
RP6-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proposal would prevent the installation of instant hot soups making). Dishwasher hot water temperature would also be limited.	water dispensers (for coffee, tea &

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

RP7-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Additional standard provides more flexibility in selection of products.

Assembly Action:

RP8-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Provides for consistency with the IPC. There is not any reason why 2 inches is not just as sufficient as 3 inches.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

RP9-09/10

Committee Reason: Fifty feet is too short of a distance. Language doesn't account for "home run" type systems. Circulating systems are too expensive. No data to support the need for these systems in a home.

Assembly Action:

P2904.2 Hot water supply temperature maintenance. Where the developed length of hot water piping from the source of hot water supply to the furthest fixture exceeds 49 50 feet (12192 15240mm), the hot water supply system shall be provided with a recirculating pump system to maintain hot water temperature to a point that is not further than 40 50 feet (12 192 15240mm) in developed pipe length from any fixture.

RP10-	09/1	0
--------------	------	---

Withdrawn by Proponent

RP11-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Change will allow partial fire sprinkler systems to be installed in accordance with Section P2904 where the building is not required to have a sprinkler system. This will increase safety.

Assembly Action: RP12-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the code change proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASSE 7010 indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed standard does not meet ICC criteria and the added requirement may conflict with some state backflow prevention programs.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

RP13-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

P2904.2.4.2 Obstructions to coverage. Sprinkler discharge shall not be blocked by obstructions unless additional sprinklers are installed to protect the obstructed area. Additional sprinklers shall not be required where the sprinkler separation from obstructions complies with the greater either of the minimum distance indicated in Table P2904.2.4.2 and the minimum distances specified in the sprinkler manufacturer's instructions where the manufacturer's instructions permit a lesser distance.

Committee Reason: Modification made to clarify that the distance between a sprinkler and an obstruction can be less than that indicated in the table as long as manufacturer allows the lesser d istance. Proposed change will provide greater flexibility in locating sprinklers.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

RP14-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

RP15-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The term of "nonlooped" is undefined and p roposal seems to limit the scope of Section P2904.

Assembly Action:

INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL PLUMBING/MECHANICAL CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS MECHANICAL PORTION

RM1-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

CHAPTER 14 HEATING AND COOLING EQUIPMENT AND APPLIANCES

M1401.2 Access. Heating and cooling equipment and appliances shall be located with respect to building construction and other equipment and appliances to permit maintenance, servicing and replacement. Clearances shall be maintained to permit cleaning of heating and cooling surfaces; replacement of filters, blowers, motors, controls and vent connections; lubrication of moving parts; and adjustments

Exception: Access shall not be required for ducts, piping, fittings or other components intended approved for concealment.

M1401.3 Sizing. Heating and cooling equipment and appliances shall be sized in accordance with ACCA Manual S based on building loads calculated in accordance with ACCA Manual J or other approved heating and cooling calculation methodologies.

M1401.4 Exteri or installations. Equipment and appliances inst alled outdoors shall be listed an d labeled for outdoor installation. Supports and foundations shall prevent excessive vibration, settlement or movement of the equipment. Supports and foundations shall be in accordance with Section M1305.1.4.1.

Committee Re ason: App roval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. The modification makes the exception relate to components that are approved by the code official for concealment, as opposed to "intended" for concealment.

Assembly Action:

RM2-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Section M1305.1.4.1 provides coverage only for items that are supported from grade and deletion of Section M1403.2 will result in lost coverage for heat pumps.

Assembly Action:

RM3-09/10

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:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

RM4-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standards did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section (3.6.3.2)

Committee Action:

Disapproved

None

None

Committee Reason: The proposed standards do not comply with ICC Council policy # 28.

Assembly Action:

RM5-09/10

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify proposal as follows:

M1406.3 Installation of radiant panels. Radiant panels installed on wood or steel framing shall conform to the following requirements:

- 1. Heating panels shall be installed parallel to framing members and secured to the surface of framing members or mounted between framing members.
- Mechanical fasteners shall penetrate only the unheated portions provided for this purpose. Panels shall not be fastened at any point closer than ¼ inch (7 mm) to an element. Other methods of attachment of the panels shall be in accordance with the panel <u>manufacturer's</u> installation instructions.
- 3. Unless listed and labeled for field cutting, heating panels shall be installed as complete units.

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. The modification makes it clear that it is the manufacturer's installation instruction that govern.

Assembly Action:

RM6-09/10

Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.	
Assembly Action:	None
RM7-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.	
Assembly Action:	None
RM8-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.	
Assembly Action:	None

RM9-09/10

Committee Action: Modify proposal as follows:

M1413.1 General. Cooling equipment that uses evaporation of water for cooling shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions. Evaporative coolers shall be installed on a level platform or base not less than 3 inches (76 mm) above the adjoining ground and secured to prevent displacement. Openings in exterior walls shall be flashed in accordance with Section R703.8. Evaporative cooling equipment and appliances shall comply with UL 1995.

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. The modification recognizes that the term "equipment" excludes appliances.

Assembly Action:

RM10-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

RM11-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

M1502.4.4.1 Specified length. The maximum length of the exhaust duct shall be 35 feet (10,668mm) from the connection to the terminus of the transition duct from the dryer to the outlet terminal. Where fittings are utilized, the maximum length of the exhaust duct shall be reduced in accordance with Table M1502.4.4.1. The maximum length of the exhaust duct does not include the transition duct.

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason. The modification clarifies that the length does not include the transition duct. The reference to "terminus" suggests that it is the outlet terminal.

Assembly Action:

RM12-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: RM12-09/10 is redundant with RM11-09/10 and is therefore unnecessary. RM11-09/10 already changes the length to 35 feet.

Assembly Action:

RM13-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed text goes beyond minimum code. Recirculating hoods should be allowed as an option. Window s provide adequate ventilation. Gr ease fires are the result of failure to clean the hood system.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

426

Approved as Modified

None

None

Disapproved

RM14-09/10

Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: There is no definition of "pre-manufactured."	
Assembly Action:	None
RM15-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason : The proposed text goes beyond minimum code and is over is not provided, continuous exhaust would be required.	ly restrictive. If a range hood
Assembly Action:	None
RM16-09/10	

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section (3.6.3.2)

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed text goes beyond minimum code. Windows should always be allowed as the means of ventilation. The proposed standard does not comply with ICC Council Policy # 28.

Assembly Action:

RM17-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

LOCAL EXHAUST. An exhaust system that uses one or more fans to exhaust air from a specific room or rooms within a dwelling

WHOLE-HOUSE MECHANICAL VENTILATION SYSTEM. An exhaust system, supply system, or combination thereof that is designed to mechanically exchange indoor air for outdoor air for the purpose of diluting and removing indoor air contaminants within a dwelling. when operating The system is designed to provide ventilation air continuously or through a programmed intermittent schedule to satisfy the whole-house ventilation rates required for the whole house. Local exhaust or supply fans can serve as such a system.

R303.1 Habitable rooms. All habitable rooms shall have an aggregate glazing area of not less than 8 percent of the floor area of such rooms. Natural ventilation shall be through windows, doors, louvers or other approved openings to the outdoor air. Such openings shall be provided with ready access or shall otherwise be readily controllable by the building occupants. The minimum openable area to the outdoors shall be 4 percent of the floor area being ventilated.

Exceptions:

- 1. The glazed areas need not be openable where the opening is not required by Section R310 and a whole-house mechanical ventilation system is installed in accordance with Section M1507.
- 2. The glazed areas need not be installed in rooms where Exception 1 above is satisfied and artificial light is provided capable of producing an average illumination of 6 footcandles (65 lux) over the area of the room at a height of 30 inches (762 mm) above the floor level.
- Use of sunroom additions and patio covers, as defined in Section R202, shall be permitted for 3. natural ventilation if in excess of 40 percent of the exterior sunroom walls are open, or are enclosed only by insect screening.

427

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

None

R303.3 Bathrooms. Bathrooms, water closet compartments and other similar rooms shall be provided with aggregate glazing area in windows of not less than 3 square feet (0.3 m2), one-half of which must be openable.

Exception: The glazed areas shall not be required where artificial light and a local exhaust system are provided. The minimum local exhaust rates shall be determined in accordance with Section M1507.4 Exhaust air from the space shall be exhausted directly to the outdoors.

M1507.1 General. Where local exhaust or whole-house mechanical ventilation is provided, the equipment shall be designed in accordance with this section.

M1507.3 Whole-house mechanical ventilation system. Whole-house mechanical ventilation systems shall be designed in accordance with Sections M1507.3.1 through M1507.3.3.

M1507.3.1 System design. The whole-house ventilation system shall consist of one or more supply or exhaust fans or a combination of such and associated ducts and controls. Where local supply or exhaust fans are used as part of such a system, they shall be tested and rated in accordance with HVI 916, and the fans' rated flow at 0.25 in w.c. static pressure shall equal or exceed the required ventilation rate determined by Section M1507.3.3. Local exhaust or supply fans are permitted to serve as such a system. Outdoor air ducts connected to the return side of an air handler shall be considered to provide supply ventilation.

M1507.3.2 System Controls. The whole-house mechanical ventilation system shall be provided with controls that enable manual override.

M1507.3.3 Mechanical ventilation rate. The whole-house mechanical ventilation system shall provide outdoor air at a continuous rate not less than that determined in accordance with Table M1507.3.3(1).

Exception: The whole-house mechanical ventilation system is permitted to operate intermittently where the system has controls that enable operation for not less than 25% of each 4 hour segment and the ventilation rate prescribed in Table M1507.3.3(1) is multiplied by the factor determined in accordance with Table M1507.3.3(2).

TABLE M1507.3.3(1)			
CONTINUOUS WH	IOLE-HOUSE MECHANICAL VENTILATION SYSTEM AIRFLOW RATE REQUIREMENTS		
	Number of Deductors		

Dwalling Unit	Number of Bedrooms					
Floor Area (square feet)	0-1 2-3		4-5	6-7	>7	
	Airflow in CFM					
<1500	30 45		60 75 90			
1501-3000	45 60		75 90		105	
3001-4500 60		75	90	105	120	
4501-6000	75	90	105 120 135			
6001-7500	90	105	120 135 150			
>7500	105 120		135 150 165			

TABLE M1507.3.3(2)

INTERMITTENT WHOLE-HOUSE MECHANICAL VENTILATION RATE FACTORS^{a, b}

Run-Time Percentage In Each 4 Hour Segment	25% 33	%	50%	66%	75%	100%
Factor ^a 4		3	2	1.5	1.3	1.0

a. For ventilation system run time values between those given, the factors are permitted to be determined by interpolation.

b. Extrapolation beyond the table is prohibited.

4 Revise as follows:

M1507.4 Local exhaust rates. Local exhaust systems shall be designed to have the capacity to exhaust the minimum air flow rate determined in accordance with Table M1507.4.

TABLE M1507.4		
MINIMUM REQUIRED LOCAL EXHAUST RATES FOR		
ONE- AND TWO-FAMILY DWELLINGS		

AREA TO BE EXHAUSTED	EXHAUST RATES
Kitchens	100 cfm intermittent or 25 cfm continuous
Bathrooms—Toilet Rooms	Mechanical exhaust capacity of 50 cfm intermittent or 20 cfm continuous

For SI: 1 cubic foot per minute = 0.4719 L/s.

Committee Reason: The current ventilation rate of 0.35 ACH is overkill and the proposed text provides more realistic rates and options. The proposal is consistent with the IECC.

Assembly Action:

RM18-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section (3.6.3.2)

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproval is based upon the proponent's request so that the proposal could be revised and brought back in a public comment at the final action hearings.

Assembly Action:

RM19-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: No justification w as provided demonstrating that the 2 fo ot dimension is improper. Consistency with the IMC is not sufficient justification.

Assembly Action:

RM20-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed standard may not apply to residential construction.

Assembly Action:

RM21-09/10

Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed revision would elimin	nate a product line that has no apparent problems.
Assembly Action:	None
RM22-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the propon	ent's printed reason.
Assembly Action:	None

RM23-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee did not have the opportunity to review the proposed new standards. It is not clear what standard is being referenced.

Assembly Action:

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

RM24-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based on the proposed text, air tightness might not be achieved.

Assembly Action:

RM25-09/10

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:

Committee Reason: Duct leakage in the garage cannot be distinguished from duct leakage elsewhere in the system. It is not clear which doors are to be open during the test where there are multiple doors.

Assembly Action:

RM26-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

RM27-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section (3.6.3.2)

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

RM28-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed text is redundant with current Section R1005.1.

Assembly Action:

RM29-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

None

None

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

RM30-09/10

Committee Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's pr inted reason. The proposal colle cts various provisions and locates them conveniently.

Assembly Action:

RM31-09/10

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 UL 1026-07 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria. UL 737-07 and UL 858-05 are currently referenced standards and were not reviewed by staff.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

RM32-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed text is alread y covered in C hapter 24 and the proposed text in RM31-09/10.

Assembly Action:

RM33-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: The proposed new standard is currently referenced in the IMC and was not reviewed by staff

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

RM34-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action:

RM35-09/10

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Withdraw by proponent

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

RM36-09/10

Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed	d reason.
Assembly Action:	None
RM37-09/10	
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed	d reason.
Assembly Action:	None

RM38-09/10

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 UL 1703-02 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria. Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard UL 1741-99 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section (3.6.3.2)

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal adds coverage for PV solar systems and provides the needed standards.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Approved as Submitted

None

432

Approved as Submitted

Committee Action:

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL FIRE/WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE COMMITTEE

John Mueller, Chair

Rep: National Assoc. of State Fire Marshals Deputy State Fire Administrator NY State Office of Fire Prevention & Control Albany, NY

Robert Geislinger, Vice Chair

Fire Marshal South Metro Fire Rescue Authority Centennial, CO

Frank Castelvecchi, III, PE

Senior Plans Review Engineer County of Henrico, Building Inspections Henrico, VA

Larry Christy

Fire Marshal Butler Township Butler, PA

Rolland Crawford

Principal The Crawford Specialty Group Loma Linda, CA

Sean DeCrane

Battalion Chief Cleveland (OH) Fire Department Cleveland, OH

Tonya Hoover

Assistant State Fire Marshal CALFIRE - Office of the State Fire Marshal Sacramento, CA

Angie Leitner, EIT

Fire Protection Engineer City of Saint Paul Department of Safety and Inspections Saint Paul, MN

Michael Love

Rep: International Association of Fire Chiefs Division Chief Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service Rockville, MD

Joe McElvaney, Jr.

Fire Protection Engineer City of Phoenix Phoenix, AZ

Peter Merrill

Rep: National Association of Home Builders President & CEO, Construction Dispute Resolution Construction Dispute Resolution Services, LLC Santa Fe, NM

Richard Soltis, Jr.

Fire Sub Code Official Lawrence Township Lawrence, NJ 08648

Mark S. Wassom, PE

Rep: National Association of State Fire Marshals Fire Protection Engineer/Fire Prevention Section State of Colorado - Division of Fire Safety Centennial, CO

Gilbert Watt

Assistant Fire Marshal City of San Marcos, TX New Braunfels, TX

Staff Secretariat:

Bill Rehr Senior Technical Staff International Code Council

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE CODE HEARING RESULTS

WUIC1-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee did not f eel that the pr oposal accomplished its stated objectives, especially with respect to sign mounting height.

Assembly Action:

WUIC2-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standards ASTM E119-2008a and UL 263-03 indicated that the standards are currently referenced in the IBC and IRC.

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee agreed with the proponent 's reason statement and felt that it w as a needed and logical addition to the code since several refe rences to fire-resistance-rated construction are made in the code but are currently without a testing standard reference.

Assembly Action:

WUIC3-09/10

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 FM 4470 (1986) indicated that it is currently referenced in the IBC.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee did not feel that there is sufficient loss history to justify the proposal and felt that it would be inappropriate to approve a change that would eliminate a wide variety of products that are currently acceptable.

Assembly Action:

WUIC4-09/10

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 ASTM E 1354-09 indicated that it is currently referenced in the IBC.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal does not achieve its intent, is inconsistent with the definition of ignit ion resistant material and is the wrong test pro posed for the wrong chapter. The lack of an appropriate radiant heat flux incidence was also noted.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Committee Reason: The proposal is inconsistent with Section 504.2 which regulates roof assemblies, not the individual components of an assembly. The proposal could also exclude the use of othe r materials that are currently acceptable. Disapproval is also consistent with the action taken on code change WUIC3-09/10.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

WUIC6-09/10

go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

Note: This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal has merit but appears to be still in the dr aft stages. Areas that, in the committee's o pinion, are in need of additional clarification included: 1) the scope of the occupancy list in Section I102.1 should be more inclusive of occupancies having similar characteristics to those listed; 2) it is unclear w hat would trigger the implement ation of the plans; 3) it is unclear as to whether the requirements would apply to new or existing neighborhoods, or both; 4) the sco pe should be e xpanded to include ty pes of facilitie s that are not buildings and, theref ore, are n ot assigned an occup ancy group designation, such as campgr ounds, etc. and 5) it was felt that s pecific employees should be des ignated in Section I106.1.

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 FM 4470 (1986) indicated that it is currently referenced in the IBC.

Note: This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website on October 19, 2009. Please

WUIC5-09/10

435

CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS FOR FINAL ACTION:

October 28 – November 1, 2010 CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA

The following group of code change proposals will be considered for Final Action during the Final Action Hearings at the **Charlotte Convention Center in Charlotte, North Carolina October 28 – November 1, 2010**.

The deadline for public comments is July 1, 2010.

Code changes that will be placed on the agenda for *individual consideration* include:

- 1. Proposed changes that receive a public comment by **July 1, 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.)

- ICC Administrative Code Provisions[®] (ADM)
- International Energy Conservation Code[®] (ÉC)
- International Property Maintenance Code[®] (PM)
- International Residential Code[®] Energy (RE)
- International Zoning Code[®] (Z)

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL ICC ADMINISTRATIVE CODE COMMITTEE

Rebecca Baker, CBO - Chair

Director of Building Safety Jefferson County Golden, CO

Richard Thomson – Vice Chair

Code Compliance Specialist New York State Department of State Rose, NY

David Adams

Fire Protection Engineer Sandy Springs Fire Rescue Sandy Springs, GA

Mark Berg, CBO Building Official City of Norco

Norco, CA

Charles Bloomberg

Plans Examiner City of Southlake, TX Southlake, TX

Lawrence Brown, CBO

Director, Codes and Standards National Association of Home Builders Washington, DC

James Burton

Manager - Compliance Services FRA Engineering - A TY LIN International Company Henrietta, NY

Dale Engebretson, CBO

Building Commissioner Village of Round Lake Carol Stream, IL

John Hitch, AIA Partner Smith Sinnett Architecture, PA Raleigh, NC

Craig Johnson

Building Official Culver City Building Safety Division Culver City, CA

Dennis Martinelli

Supervising Combination Inspector Fairfax County Government Fairfax, VA

Roxanne Michael, CBO, AICP

Instructor & Sr. Plans Examiner Whatcom County Bellingham, WA

Michael O'Brian

Fire Marshal Brighton Area Fire Authority Brighton, MI

Andrea Lanier Papageorge, JD

Specialist, Codes and Standards AGL Resources Atlanta, GA

Wilma Jean Stanley

Inspections Supervisor Chesterfield County Chesterfield, VA

Committee Secretary

David Bowman, PE Manager of Codes International Code Council

ADM1-09/10

Committee Action:

PART I-IBC

Committee Reason: The proponent's intent was to pull provisions from all codes to create a uniform chapter 1 for all codes. In doing so, the proponent included provisions in all codes that appeared in only a single code. These single provisions are somewhat controversial and require more discussion and technical justification for inclusion in all of the codes.

Assembly Action:

*Note: Subsequent to committee action on Parts I and XII, the proponent withdrew all parts of this code change proposal.

PART II- IEBC	Withdrawn by Proponent
PART III-IECC	Withdrawn by Proponent
PART IV-IFC	Withdrawn by Proponent
PART V-IFGC	Withdrawn by Proponent
PART VI- IMC	Withdrawn by Proponent
PART VII-IPC	Withdrawn by Proponent
PART VIII-IPMC	Withdrawn by Proponent
PART IX-IPSDC	Withdrawn by Proponent
PART X-IWUIC	Withdrawn by Proponent
PART XI-IZC	Withdrawn by Proponent
PART XII-IRC B/E	Withdrawn by Proponent
Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proponent has re-organized the administrative provisions of chapter 1 in a logical manner that will prevent the loss of provisions if the local authority having jurisdiction makes modifications to the administrative provisions of the IRC. In addition, the proposed re-organization provides a more uniform set of administrative provisions for all of the I-Codes.

Assembly Action:

*Note: Subsequent to committee actions on Parts I and XII, the proponent withdrew all parts of this code change proposal.

ADM2-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Relocation of buildings are certainly a construction activity with the scope of the IBC and IEBC; therefore, it is appropriate to include this term in the scope statement.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Withdrawn by Proponent

Disapproved*

None

None

ADM3-09/10

PART I-IBC, IMC; IFGC; IPC; IPSDC; IECC; IEBC; IPMC; IWUIC; IZC

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee's disapproval is based upon the portion that would add sustainability to the intent statement of all I-Codes. The committee disapproved this code change proposal because at the present time, sustainability is not within the purview of the I-Codes. Further, sustainability is not yet clearly understood or established, so it would be a vague provision that could cause confusion in understanding the I-Codes.

Assembly Action: PART II-IRC B/E Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There are several terms undefined such as "durability" and "sustainable practices". The committee feels the issue of sustainability would be more appropriately addressed in other standards or codes. The ICC Sustainable Building Technology Committee (SBTC) is working on this and the development of the *International Green Building Code* is in process.

Assembly Action:

ADM4-09/10

Committee	Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

102.4.1 Differences <u>Conflicts</u>. Where <u>differences</u> <u>conflicts</u> occur between provisions of this code and referenced codes and standards, the provisions of this code shall apply.

102.4.2 Conflicting provisions scopes. Where the extent of the reference to..... (Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The code change proposal provides a higher degree of specificity with regard to the code provisions for the applicability of referenced standards in the I-Codes. The modification simply uses more accurate terminology for the provision proposed.

Assembly Action:

PART II – IRC-B/E Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a needed clarification for what is required as regard to differences and conflicts between referenced standards and the code.

Assembly Action:

ADM5-09/10

Errata: For errata to this code change proposal, please see the errata posted at www.iccsafe.org

Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

104.10.1 Flood hazard areas. The building official shall not grant modifications to any provision required in flood hazard areas as established by Section 1612.2 without the granting of a variance to such provision by the board of appeals. <u>unless a determination has been made that:</u>

- 1. A showing of good and sufficient cause that the unique characteristics of the size, configuration or topography of the site render the elevation standards of Section 1612 inappropriate.
- 2. A determination that failure to grant the variance would result in exceptional hardship by rendering the lot undevelopable.

Disapproved

None Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

- A determination that the granting of a variance will not result in increased flood heights, additional 3. threats to public safety, extraordinary public expense, cause fraud on or victimization of the public, or conflict with existing laws or ordinances.
- A determination that the variance is the minimum necessary to afford relief, considering the flood 4. hazard.
- <u>5.</u> Submission to the applicant of written notice specifying the difference between the design flood elevation and the elevation to which the building is to be built, stating that the cost of flood insurance will be commensurate with the increased risk resulting from the reduced floor elevation, and stating that construction below the design flood elevation increases risks to life and property.

113.2.1 Criteria for issuance of a variance for flood hazard areas. If an application for a modification to a provision required in flood hazard areas is received, the board of appeals shall issue a variance only upon:

- A showing of good and sufficient cause that the unique characteristics of the size, configuration or 1 topography of the site render the elevation standards of Section 1612 inappropriate.
- 2. A determination that failure to grant the variance would result in exceptional hardship by rendering the lot undevelopable.
- 3 A determination that the granting of a variance will not result in increased flood heights, additional threats to public safety, extraordinary public expense, cause fraud on or victimization of the public, or conflict with existing laws or ordinances.
- 4 A determination that the variance is the minimum necessary to afford relief, considering the flood hazard.
- 5. Submission to the applicant of written notice specifying the difference between the design flood elevation and the elevation to which the building is to be built, stating that the cost of flood insurance will be commensurate with the increased risk resulting from the reduced floor elevation, and stating that construction below the design flood elevation increases risks to life and property.

Committee Reason: The granting of modifications to the code in relation to flood hazard areas have some significant ramifications, as reflected in the National Flood Insurance Program. The NFIP provides specific criteria for the building official to use in consideration of such modifications. In addition, the authority having jurisdiction can grant modifications without consulting a board of appeals. The modification simply utilizes the format and organization of the IEBC. The modification is a reformat of the provisions that places the criteria in Section 104.10.1 rather than later in the code, and eliminates the unnecessary step of referral to a board of appeals.

Assembly Action:

ADM6-09/10

PART I-IBC **Committee Action:**

Modify proposal as follows:

2. Fences not over 7 feet (2134 mm) high. 6 foot (1829 mm) fences with no parts more than 7 feet (2134 mm) above grade.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's point about the practical matter of building a 6 foot fence with dimensions commonly higher than 6 feet. The modification addresses the issue in terms of height of the fence above grade, which is the true intent of the code, to limit the height of the fence above grade.

Assembly Action:

PART II – IRC-B/E Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change provides a more reasonable fence height that reflects what is actually being built as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action:

ADM7-09/10

PART I-IBC; IEBC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The code addresses moved buildings. There is no justification for singling out modular buildings except for the practical matter of modular construction site office buildings. The proposal would also include modular buildings use for other purposes, such as for school classrooms. This would also give an exception for modular buildings moved to areas with higher snow loads or wind loads that would require some

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee feels that there is no reason or justification provided that this is needed. Also, it is not in the appropriate section even if it were needed. It would be more appropriate in Section R102.

Assembly Action:

ADM8-09/10

PART I- IMC; IPC; IFGC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Putting a hard limit on the amount of time to conduct an inspection could place an unnecessary hardship on some communities. In all communities it is important to be responsive to contractors and provide timely inspection services. However, the amount of time needed could vary greatly in different communities.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IBC Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Putting a hard limit on the amount of time to conduct an inspection could place an unnecessary hardship on some communities. In all communities it is important to be responsive to contractors and provide timely inspection services. However, the amount of time needed could vary greatly in different communities.

PART III - IRC Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee feels this change would cause undue delay in construction. This change would significantly increase cost and time in construction.

Assom	hlv	Action.
ASSEIII	DIY	ACTION.

Assembly Action:

ADM9-09/10

PART I-IBC; IEBC; IECC; IFC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The code already allows the use of electronic documents.

Assembly Action:

PART II – IRC-B/E Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The electronic media is already addressed in the code. The added list of information is all energy related and does not cover other items.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

tion This show

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

ADM10-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This is vague, unenforceable language. The type of credentials are not defined. Normally the expectation is that drawings be provided by a registered design professional. This would subvert state laws on registered design professionals.

Assembly Action:

ADM11-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This provision would provide an emphasis on the need to make sure that the path of egress has been adequately addressed.

Assembly Action:

ADM12-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: There is no reason to single out opening protectives as items to review prior to installation. All details of construction should be provided in the construction documents for approval by the building official.

Assembly Action:

ADM13-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: A 24 month period for temporary structures permitting is too long for temporary structures. In some areas, this would allow a temporary structure to go through as many as 3 frost cycles. The proponent makes this applicable to modular buildings, which could include temporary school classrooms. The committee felt that temporary structures such as these are in need of a frequent review to ensure the safety of the occupants.

Assembly Action:

ADM14-09/10

Errata: For errata to this code change proposal, please see the errata posted at www.iccsafe.org

PART I-IBC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposal provides for a necessary as-built verification of the building floors with relation to flood elevations.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agrees that this information is needed prior to the final inspection as stated in the proponent's published reason.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

ADM15-09/10

PART I-IBC: IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The need to approve glazing goes far beyond just the need to deal with energy use.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change would effectively exempt all glazing from the glazing requirements in the code and CPSC 16 CFR 1201.

Assembly Action:

ADM16-09/10

PART I-IBC; IFC; IMC; IPC; IFGC; IWUIC; IECC; IEBC; IPMC; IZC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: This provision is an oversimplified approach tolerances. Tolerances depend upon the particular type of installation and cannot be addressed in this way, across the board.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The committee feels that this would have the effect of limiting the Building Official to allow normal construction tolerances.

Assembly Action:

ADM17-09/10

Committee Action: Committee Reason: The code intends that the code official have approval authority for building construction. Compliance with any state laws for any particular aspect of construction would be the responsibility of the permit applicant. Invoking another authority for a particular aspect of a building would cause confusion and delays in the enforcement of the adopted codes.

Assembly Action:

ADM18-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee believes that requiring a building information model would be an unnecessary expense for many communities who can ill afford additional expenses.

Assembly Action:

ADM19-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The proposed items for inclusion in the scope of the IFC are not directly within the purview of the IFC. Therefore it is not appropriate to include them.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

ADM20-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The language proposed for deletion from the IFC was language just installed by the IFC Committee in the last code change cycle. This was carefully crafted language that several groups worked out to clarify the intent of the IFC with regard to the premises of residences. It is an important clarification to allow code users to understand the relationship of the fire code to residential construction.

Assembly Action:

ADM21-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action:

ADM22-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

IPMC 102.3 Application of other codes. Repairs, additions or alterations to a structure, or changes of occupancy, shall be done in accordance with the procedures and provisions of the *International Building Code, International Energy Conservation Code, Internation Fire Code, International Residential Code, International Fuel Gas Code, International Mechanical Code, International Plumbing Code,* and NFPA 70. Nothing in this code shall be construed to cancel, modify or set aside any provision of the *International Zoning Code.*

Committee Reason: The committee agrees that the IPMC covers installations also address by the IRC and IPC. In addition, the modification acknowledges the same issue exists for the IFC and IECC.

Assembly Action:

ADM23-09/10

PART I-IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action	า:	
-----------------	----	--

PART II-IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action:

Withdrawn by Proponent

Withdrawn by Proponent

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

None

None

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

ADM24-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The energy conservation issues dealt with in this code must logically be intended to apply throughout the life of a building. Therefore, it is appropriate to amend the intent statement to make this included.

Assembly Action:

ADM25-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Presently, there is no misunderstanding in the application of the code for residential construction. This revision is unnecessary, and it could also confuse the intent of the IECC and other I-Codes, by changing the application of mixed uses that are traditionally applied and understood in the IBC.

Assembly Action:

ADM26-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The IECC is intended to regulate energy conservation, regardless of the source of the energy. This proposed change could open the door for gamesmanship in applying the code.

Assembly Action:

ADM27-09/10

This code change	proposal was heard b	v the IECC Code	Development Committee

Committee Action:

Committee Reason:. The proposed language would change the entire intent of the code, to require application of the code for lighting only.

Assembly Action:

ADM28-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed language is not necessary in understanding the intent of the code with regard to above code programs.

Assembly Action:

Э.

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

ADM29-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The standard relies upon the 2003 International Energy Conservation Code, which contains energy conservation stringency far short of the present edition of the IECC.

Assembly Action:

ADM30-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed energy usage levels are too aggressive and would severely limit the available options in building design.

Assembly Action:

ADM31-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The mandatory requirements of the IECC reflect absolute minimums for individual components of the building envelope or energy consuming elements. Any above code program should logically meet these mandatory minimums.

Assembly Action:

ADM32-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC-Structural Code Development Committee.

ERRATA:

IEBC 101.5.4.2 Compliance with reduced IBC level seismic forces. Where seismic evaluation and design is permitted to meet reduced *International Building Code* seismic force levels, the procedures used shall be in accordance with one of the following:

- 1. The *International Building Code* using 75 percent of the prescribed forces. Values of R,Ω_0 and C_d used for analysis shall be as specified in Section 101.5.4.1 of this code.
- 2. Structures or portions of structures that comply with the requirements of the applicable chapter in Appendix A as specified in Items 2.1 through 2.5 and subject to the limitations of the respective Appendix A chapters shall be deemed to comply with this section.
 - 2.1. The seismic evaluation and design of unreinforced masonry bearing wall buildings in Occupancy Category I or II are permitted to be based on the procedures specified in Appendix Chapter A1.
 - 2.2. Seismic evaluation and design of the wall anchorage system inreinforced concrete and reinforced masonry wall buildings with flexible diaphragms in Occupancy Category I or II are permitted to be based on the procedures specified in Appendix Chapter A2.
 - 2.3. Seismic evaluation and design of cripple walls and sill plate anchorage in residential buildings of light-frame wood construction in Occupancy Category Ler II are permitted to be based on the procedures specified in Chapter A3.
 - 2.4. Seismic evaluation and design of soft, weak, or open-front wall conditions in multiunit residential buildings of wood construction in Occupancy Category Lor II are permitted to be based on the procedures specified in Chapter A4.
 - 2.5. Seismic evaluation and design of concrete buildings in all occupancy categories are permitted to be based on the procedures specified in Chapter A5.

• •

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

446

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This change is necessary to all attention to the limits on applicability in each of the IEBC Appendix chapters.

Assembly Action:

ADM33-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IBC-Structural Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: At this time it is appropriate to retain Appendix Chapter A5 in the IEBC, so that jurisdictions can continue using it, before requiring them to transition to newer seismic rehabilitation standards.

Assembly Action:

ADM34-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IFC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

105.6.27 LP-gas. An operational permit is required for:

1. Storage and use of LP-gas.

Exceptions:

- 1 A permit is not required for individual containers with a 500-gallon (1893 L) water capacity or less or multiple container systems having an aggregate quantity not exceeding 500 gallons (1893) L, serving occupancies in Group R-3.
- 2. A permit is not required for LP-gas containers having a water capacity not exceeding 48 pounds [nominal 20 pounds (9 kg) LP-gas] connected to a LP-gas grill unless at a public assembly or on or serving a public way.
- 2. Operation of cargo tankers that transport LP-gas.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal provides a reasonable exception to the permit requirement for residential occupancies. The modification reflects the committee's concern over the number and type of operations that could be exempt and that the term 'public way' could even include a private driveway, which was not the intent.

Assembly Action:

ADM35-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IFC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Committee R eason: The committee felt that the proposal was unclear as to whether it would apply to all devices or only required devices. The proposal also does not take into account the requirements of other agencies that might require testing which could lead to inter-agency conflict. The committee also felt that this lack of clarity could lead to varying application throughout the jurisdiction resulting in inconsistent enforcement.

Assembly Action:

None

Approved as Modified

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

ADM36-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IMC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

IMC 102.3 Maintenance. Mechanical systems, both existing and new, and parts thereof shall be maintained in proper operating condition in accordance with the original design and in a safe and sanitary condition. The inspection for maintenance of HVAC systems shall be done in accordance with ASHRAE/ACCA/ANSI Stand 180. Devices or safeguards which are required by this code shall be maintained in compliance with the code edition under which they were installed. The owner or the owner's designated agent shall be responsible for maintenance of mechanical systems. To determine compliance with this provision, the code official shall have the authority to require a mechanical

system to be reinspected. The inspection for maintenance of HVAC systems shall be done in accordance with ASHRAE/ACCA/ANSI Standard 180.

Committee Reason: A standard practice needs to be prescribed by the code to provide consistent inspection and maintenance of HVAC systems and to improve energy efficiency, thermal comfort and indoor air quality. Current practice often allows HVAC systems to simply run until they fail or allows them to operate outside of their design performance parameters. The modification relocates the new sentence to the end of the paragraph to place it nearer to the current reinspection text.

Assembly Action:

ADM37-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IMC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Maintenance is not a code issue. Operation permits are not appropriate for this code. Jurisdictions have no manpower to perform the inspections required by the proposed text.

Assembly Action:

ADM38-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IPMC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: Although mold is a sanitary issue, referencing it in the definition is not appropriate because the code does not give any direction for the mitigation of mold. Further, the last sentence in the proposed definition of sanitary contains requirements, which is not appropriate as part of a definition.

Assembly Action:

ADM39-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

Add ANSI Standard as follows: A137.1 - 88 2008 Standard Specifications for Ceramic Tile (Referenced in IBC)

Committee Reason: The update of standards is necessary to keep the I-Codes current with industry.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

None

None

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL ENERGY CONSERVATION CODE COMMITTEE

Dale Greiner—Chair

Building Official Lake County Tavares, FL

Robert Austin—Vice Chair

Code Specialist New Jersey Dept. of Community Affairs, Division of Codes and Standards Trenton, NJ

Joseph Andre

Western Field Representative National Electrical Manufacturers Assoc. Bothell, WA

Misti Bruceri, CEM

Rep: Pacific Gas/Electric Co. Principal Misti Bruceri & Associates, LLC Napa, CA

Lynn Chamberlin Architect II Nebraska Energy Office Lincoln, NE

Medard Kopczynski

Assistant City Manager City of Keene Keene, NH

Marjorie Meares

President Meares Environmental Consulting Asheville, NC

Ron Nickson

Vice President of Building Codes National Multi Housing Council Washington, DC

Keith Peetz, PE

Engineer Supervisor City & County of Denver - Community Planning & Development Denver, CO

Gary Pringey, CBO

Plan Analyst Colorado Code Consulting LLC Denver, CO

Robert Ross

Rep: National Assoc. of Home Builders G&R Construction Services LLC Austin, TX

Deborah Taylor, AIA, LEED, AP

Chief Sustainability Officer NY City Department of Buildings New York, NY

David Weitz

Director, Applied Building Science Div. Conservation Services Group Westborough, MA

Donald White

Rep: Southern Nevada Interjurisdictional Energy Code Committee Architectural Plans Examiner City of Las Vegas Dept. of Bldg/Safety Las Vegas, NV

Howard Wiig, MA

Institutional Energy Analyst State of Hawaii Strategic Industries Div. Honolulu, HI

Staff Secretariat:

David Bowman, PE Manager of Codes International Code Council
INTERNATIONAL ENERGY CONSERVATION **CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS**

EC1-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proponent requested changes in a tech nical map based upon administra tive issues in a local state. Maps should not be changed based upon administrative issues.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proponent suggests changing a map that is based upon technical information based upon the local politics in a particular state. Maps should not be revised based upon politics.

Assembly Action:

EC2-09/10

PART I-IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposed requirements are redundant. The code already requires the installed insulated sheathing R-value to be provided.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IRC B/E

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

N1101.4.2.1 Insulated sheathing R-value mark. Where R-values for multiple sheathing thicknesses are printed on insulated sheathing, the actual R value shall be printed on the insulated sheathing board in lettering at least two times the height of any other R-value or thickness. Alternately, The installed insulated sheathing Rvalue shall be listed on the insulation certification required in section N1101.4.2.

Committee Reason: The code change proposal provides for easy verification of the insulation that is installed. This will help building inspector s, and facilitate enforcement of the code. The modification addresses the committees desire to only deal with providing information on the certificate. The requirements for lettering Rvalues on the insulation itself could create unnecessary conflicts with industry practice.

Assembly Action:

EC3-09/10 **Committee Action:**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Add new definition as follows:

VISIBLE TRANSMITTANCE (VT). The ratio of visible light entering the space through the fenestration product assembly to the incident visible light. VT includes the effects of glazing material and frame and is expressed as a number between 0 and 1.

Approved as Modified

Approved as Modified

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

2. Revise as follows:

303.1.3 Fenestration product rating. U-factors of fenestration products (windows, doors and skylights) shall be determined in accordance with NFRC 100 by an accredited, independent laboratory, and labeled and certified by the manufacturer. Products lacking such a labeled U-factor shall be assigned a default U-factor from Table 303.1.3(1) or 303.1.3(2). The solar heat gain coefficient (SHGC) and visible transmittance (VT) of glazed fenestration products (windows, glazed doors and skylights) shall be determined in accordance with NFRC 200 by an accredited, independent laboratory, and labeled and certified by the manufacturer. Products lacking such a labeled SHGC or VT shall be assigned a default SHGC or VT from Table 303.1.3(3).

Committee Reason: The change provides a useful mechanism for measuring how much light is going through the windows. It will encourage the use of daylighting in designs.

Assembly Action:

EC4-09/10 PART I-IECC

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal would add language from Federal law. This is unnecessary in the text of the code. Man ufacturers are required to meet Feder al la w. Therefore this is essentially a redundant requirement.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IRC B/E **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposal would add language from Federal law. This is unnecessary in the text of the code. Man ufacturers are required to meet Feder al la w. Therefore this is essentially a redundant requirement.

Assembly Action:

EC5-09/10

EC6-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The en ergy conservation code does not di stinguish what source of ener gy is being conserved. Therefore this change in the definition of building envelope to refer to fossil fuels is inappropriate.

Assembly Action:

EC7-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: T he definition conflicts with the IBC and there fore could cause confusion in the enforcement of the code.

Assembly Action:

EC8-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The definition excludes slabs on grade. Therefore this appears to be a d efinition that changes the scope of the code requirements, or, at best, confuses the understanding of the code requirements.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

EC9-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The code change proposal tries to close a loophole that the committee believes does not exist. The relationship of the IECC and the IRC are clear.

Assembly Action:

EC10-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal would create an inconsistency with ASHRAE 90.1 for R-2 buildings above 4 stories.

Assembly Action:

EC11-09/10

Part I – IECC

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change becaus e it needed more work to refine various elements. The committee was concerned about the overall complexity and encouraged this to be moved in the direction of the contents of EC1 3-09/10. It a ppears that some e nergy saving measures have been reduced. Finally, the standard referenced in the proposal does not comply with ICC policy for referenced documents.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IRC B/E Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal provides aggressive energy conservation measures that would limit the flexibility in the design of the building in all areas. The committee prefers the flexibility provided by EC16.

Assembly Action:

EC12-09/10

Committee Action: Committee Reason: Consistent with action taken on ADM28 and ADM31.

Assembly Action:

EC13-09/10

PART I-IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal accomplishes a needed increase in stringency. The proposal is the result of work done with man y stakeholders to accom plish a reasona ble and workable appr oach to reaching a necessary level of energy conservation.

Assembly Action:

452

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

IVECTO.

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Committee Reason: This proposal provides aggressive energy conservation measures that would limit the flexibility in the design of the building in all areas. The committee prefers the flexibility provided by EC16.

Assembly Action:

EC14-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book 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 ASHRAE 62.2-2007 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal would revise requirements in EC13 to exempt testing of duct leakage for ducts contained w ithin conditioned spaces. The committee did not agree that the testing of these ducts is unnecessary. Tight ducts are needed to ensure the efficient delivery of conditioned air to the intended space in the building.

Assembly Action:

EC15-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Blower door testing is an important aspect of energy conservation for all dwellings. The fact that the re are practical difficulties for multi-family dwellings is not a comp elling argument for providing an exception.

Assembly Action:

EC16-09/10

PART I-IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The committee prefers the approach taken in EC13. These proposed provisions would conflict with EC13.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IRC B/E **Committee Action:**

Modify proposal as follows:

First value is cavity insulation, second is continuous insulation, so "xx+yy" means R- xx cavity f. insulation plus R-yy continuous insulation insulated sheathing. "13+5" means R-13 cavity insulation plus R-5 insulated sheathing. If structural sheathing covers 25 percent or less of the exterior, insulating sheathing is not required where structural sheathing is used. If structural sheathing covers more than 25 percent of exterior, structural sheathing shall be supplemented with continuous insulation insulated sheathing of at least R-2.

(Portions of code change proposal not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Rea son: The code change proposal prov ides aggressive energy savings with 4 options that provide different trade-of fs to allow a homeo wner some flex ibility in the design of the energy conservation methods that will allow flexibility in the design of the remainder of the home.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

None

PART II-IRC B/E **Committee Action:**

None

Disapproved

EC17-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Modify proposal as follows:

INSULATED SIDING. A cladding system with integral insulating material, having a minimum thermal resistance of R-2 attached directly over a water resistive barrier and sheathing

Committee Reason: This is a type of material that requires separate attention in the code. See Code Change Proposal EC54-09/10.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Insulated siding is a unique product that requires separate attention in code text.

Assembly Action:

EC18-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Continuou sly burning pilots on gas burnin g appliances w aste energy. Technolog y is readily available for lighting fuel gas lighting systems. This is an obvious energy conservation measure.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Continuou sly burning pilots on gas burnin g appliances w aste energy. Technolog y is readily available for lighting fuel gas lighting systems. This is an obvious energy conservation measure.

Assembly Action:

EC19-09/10

PART I-IECC **Committee Action:**

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The pro posal w ould have the effect of eliminating the use of an entir e group of appliances in cold climate zones. This proposal reaches an unreasonable level of stringency. The committee prefers the approach taken in EC13.

PART II - IRC

Committee Reason: This proposal provides aggressive energy conservation measures that would limit the flexibility in the design of the building in all areas. The committee prefers the flexibility provided by EC16.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Modified

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

EC21-09/10

Assembly Action:

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposal does not contain specific information as to how the homes that need to be tested are selected. The proposed provisions could lead to unfair practices, or place the code official in a difficult situation in defending the choices made of the house that requires testing.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposed language is vague regarding the meaning of "random sam pling." This could lead to unfair application of the requirements.

Assembly Action:

EC22-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

401.3 Certificate. A permanent certificate shall be completed and posted on or in the electrical distribution panel by the builder or registered design professional. The certificate shall not cover or obstruct the visibility of the circuit directory label, service disconnect label or other required labels. The certificate shall list the predominant R-values of insulation installed in or on ceiling/roof, walls, foundation (slab, basement wall, crawlspace wall and/or floor) and ducts outside conditioned spaces; U-factors for fenestration and the solar heat gain coefficient (SHGC) of fenestration, and the results from any required duct system and building envelope air leakage testing. Where there is more than one value for each component, the certificate shall list the value covering the largest area. The certificate shall list the types and efficiencies of heating, cooling and service water heating equipment. Where a gas-fired unvented room heater, electric furnace, or baseboard electric heater is installed in the residence, the certificate shall list "gas-fired unvented room heater," "electric furnace" or "baseboard electric heater," as appropriate. An efficiency shall not be listed for gas-fired unvented room heaters, electric furnaces or electric baseboard heaters.

The cer tificate is a useful place to r Committee Rea son: ecord air leakage testing informa tion. The modification is important in that the only information that needs to be memorialized is the required testing.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Modify proposal as follows:

1101.9 Certificate. A permanent certificate shall be completed and posted on or in the electrical distribution panel by the builder or registered design professional. The certificate shall not cover or obstruct the visibility of the circuit directory label, service disconnect label or other required labels. The certificate shall list the predominant R-values of insulation installed in or on ceiling/roof, walls, foundation (slab, basement wall, crawlspace wall and/or floor) and ducts outside conditioned spaces; U-factors for fenestration and the solar heat gain coefficient (SHGC) of fenestration, and the results from any required duct system and building envelope air leakage testing . Where there is more than one value for each component, the certificate shall list the value

EC20-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This fixes an incorrect trad e-off for lighting. The lighting provisions of Sect ion 404 have always been intended to be mandatory.

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

None

Approved as Modified

None

None

covering the largest area. The certificate shall list the types and efficiencies of heating, cooling and service water heating equipment. Where a gas-fired unvented room heater, electric furnace, or baseboard electric heater is installed in the residence, the certificate shall list "gas-fired unvented room heater," "electric furnace" or "baseboard electric heater," as appropriate. An efficiency shall not be listed for gas-fired unvented room heaters, electric furnaces or electric baseboard heaters.

Committee Rea son: The cer tificate is a useful place to r ecord air leakage testing informa tion. The modification is important in that the only information that needs to be memorialized is the required testing.

Assembly Action:

EC23-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee R eason: The proposal requires to o much information to be place d on the certificate. It is impractical to require details of a II lamps installed. These could c hange quickly and often. T herefore, the information on the certificate would be cluttered with incorrect information.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee R eason: The proposal requires to o much information to be place d on the certificate. It is impractical to require details of a II lamps installed. These could c hange quickly and often. T herefore, the information on the certificate would be cluttered with incorrect information.

Assembly Action: EC24-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent that the certificate has little benefit and no impact on energy conservation.

Assembly Action:

EC25-09/10

PART I-IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposal takes an aggressive approach to increasing the stringency of the code well beyond the levels given in EC13. At the present time, EC13 provides a reas onable approach. This code change would be too restrictive and limit the options to house design. A particular concern was that the glazing values become so restrictive that an excessive amount of light is blocked.

Assembly Action:

PART II-IRC B/E **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: This proposal provides aggressive energy conservation measures that w ould limit the flexibility in the design of the building in all areas. The committee prefers the flexibility provided by EC16.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

None

EC26-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that t he additional definitions could confuse the users of the code e rather than clarify the code. T he terminology presently in the code is gene rally what code users are accustomed with.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The addition of definitions to clarify the code are not needed to fix any known problems with application of the code requirements. In addition, the definition contains technical requirements.

Assembly Action:

EC27-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

h. First value is cavity insulation, second is continuous insulation, so "13+5" means R-13 cavity insulation plus R-5 <u>continuous insulation or</u> insulating sheathing. If structural sheathing covers 25 percent or less of the exterior, <u>continuous insulation or</u> insulating sheathing is not required in the locations where structural sheathing is used. If structural sheathing covers more than 25 percent of exterior, structural sheathing sheathing sheathing of at least R-2.

Committee Reason: This is a companion chang e with EC13 that adds to the energy conservation stringency of the IECC. The modification is simply to use correct terminology in the footnote.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason:. The proposed change would be inconsistent with EC16, which the committee prefers.

Assembly Action: None EC28-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

Committee Reason: The proposal implies that some additional fastening or construction needs to be used in the circumstances noted. The code is clear in the requirements for structural sheathing.

Assembly Action:

PART I - IECC

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

EC29-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal would erode the energy conservation levels of the 2009 code.

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Nono

457

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposal would provide for a more reasonable SHGC requirement for skylights and sunrooms to allow better supply of natural light.

Assembly Action:

EC30-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposed revised footnote appropriately addresses the original intent of the code to require that the actual R-Value such as the R-Value of compressed insulation, is the R-Value required to meet the code. Presently, the code only add resses R-19 insulation. This could also occur with other types of insulation.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The revised footnote confuses the issue more, as it does not specifically describe what it means by "actual" r-values.

Assembly Action:

EC31-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: As stated, glazing is an inferior performer to opaque walls as a thermal building envelope element. Therefore, it makes sense to limit the amount of glazing.

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: No technical just ification was provided to support the choice of 20% for the limit on glazing. Therefore, the proposal is providing an arbitrary number.

Assembly Action:

EC32-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The trad e-off of a high S HGC rating for glazing with a low U-Factor could have the unintended consequence of causing peak demand problems in summer. This creates an undesirable situation of inefficient energy production. In addition, the committee felt that the limitations on available product and the cost was too high a price for this aggressive change in stringency.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

Committee Reason: There is no data supplied on return on investment to justify this code change proposal.

Assembly Action: EC33-09/10 **Committee Action:** Disapproved Committee Reason: The proposed decrease in Fenestration U-Factor in Climate Zone 1 is not cost effective. **Assembly Action:** None EC34-09/10 PART I - IECC **Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted Committee Reason: This proposal represents an increase in stringency and therefore energy savings that is reasonably easy and cost effective to achieve.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This pro posal is not supported by cost data to demonstrate r easonable return on investment for such an aggressive change in stringency.

Assembly Action: None EC35-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: More product is a vailable that can meet impact requirement s and still have the low E values desired. The market will only advance to provide more products.

PART II - IRC

Committee Reason: The committee believes that availability of low E products with minimum required impact resistance is limited, and therefore this is still a necessary exception.

Assembly Action:

EC36-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal erodes the energy conservation level of the c ode. This would represent a rollback from the 2009 levels.

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: This is a reasonable exception to allow skylights to function to supply natural light.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

EC37-09/10

Errata: Revise table to reflect the proponent's intention to change Skylight SHGC values only.

	F	FENES	TRATION			WOOD				SLABd	CRAWL
	WINDOW	N AND DR SKY	LIGHT	b	CEILING	FRAME WALL	MASS WALL	FLOOR	BASEMENTc	R- VALUE	SPACE [°] WALL
CLIMATE	U-		U-		R-	R-	R-	R-	WALL R-	&	R-
ZONE	FACTOR	SHGC°	FACTOR	SHGC°	VALUE	VALUE	VALUE	VALUE	VALUE	DEPTH	VALUE
1	1.2	0.30	0.75	0.30 0.35	30	13	3/4	13	0	0	0
				0.30							
2	0.65 ^j 0	30	0.75	<u>0.35</u>	30	13	4/6	13	0	0	0
				0.30							
3	0.50 ^j	0.30	0.65	0.35	30	13	5/8	19	5/13f	0	5/13
4 except Marine	0.35	NR	0.60	NR	38	13	5/10	19	10/13	10, 2 ft	10/13
5 and Marine 4	0.35	NR	0.60	NR	38	20 or 13+5 ^h	13/17 3	30 ^g	10/13	10, 2 ft	10/13
						20 or					
6	0.35	NR	0.60	NR	49	13+5 ^h ′	15/19	30 ⁹	15/19	10, 4 ft	10/13
7 and 8	0.35	NR	0.60	NR	49	21	19/21	38 ⁹	15/19	10, 4 ft	10/13

TABLE 402.1.1 INSULATION AND FENESTRATION REQUIREMENTS BY COMPONENT^a

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal erodes the energy conservation level of the code. This would represent a rollback from the 2009 levels.

Assembly Action:

EC38-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: This could have the impact of lowering energy conservation in some circumstances. The committee was also concerned over the claims that Energy Star stated that this is not cost effective without a tax credit.

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The committee was persuaded by the fact that Energy Star admits that this is not cost effective without tax credits. Therefore this has limited utility for energy conservation.

Assembly Action:

EC39-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: This is compatible with EC13 and provi des a reasonably achievable level of energy conservation.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal would be inconsistent with EC16.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

EC43-09/10

PART I - IECC	
Committee Action:	

Committee Reason: The use of SHGC rating as a standard for glazing in the north is not approp riate, given that in summer, this could cause an increase in p eak demand during cooling days. Also, the propo sal makes no reference to orientation of the walls with glazing; therefore, the high SHGC glazing could cause a problem for rooms with south facing windows.

Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: This proposal would have the effect of pro hibiting the very cold areas where they are needed.	best low E windows available for
Assembly Action:	None
EC44-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The code change proponent requested disapproval.	
Assembly Action:	None
EC45-09/10	
PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: This is not a cost effective change to insulation values. that the return on investment would be 40 to 50 years.	Opponents provided specific data
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The prop osal does not provide a cost effective change this would be inconsistent with EC16.	e to insulation values. In addition,
Assembly Action:	None
EC46-09/10	
PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee believes that ther e might be unintended consequences related to this proposal that were not considere d. First, extra protection will need to be pr ovided for the insulation to allow storage in the attics. Second, this could result in a greater amount of snow accumulation on roofs.

Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The values would be inconsistent with the approach taken in EC16.	
Assembly Action:	None

Disapproved

EC47-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Modify proposal as follows:

First value is cavity insulation, second is continuous insulation, so "13+5" means R-13 cavity insulation h plus R-5 continuous insulation or insulating sheathing. If structural sheathing covers 25 percent or less of the exterior, continuous insulation or insulating sheathing is not required in the locations where structural sheathing is used. If structural sheathing covers more than 25 percent of exterior, structural sheathing shall be supplemented with continous insulation or insulating sheathing of at least R-2.

Committee Reason: This represents a reasonable level of energy conservation. The modification is to provide correct terminology in the footnote.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: This is not a cost effective requirement for other than electrically heated homes. Also, the provisions would be inconsistent with EC16.

Assembly Action:

EC48-09/10

Errata: The intended U-Factor for Frame Wall U-Factor is .048 in Zones 7 and 8.

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Modify proposal as follows:

h First value is cavity insulation, second is continuous insulation, so "13+5" means R-13 cavity insulation plus R-5 continuous insulation or insulating sheathing. If structural sheathing covers 25 percent or less of the exterior, continuous insulation or insulating sheathing is not required in the locations where structural sheathing is used. If structural sheathing covers more than 25 percent of exterior, structural sheathing shall be supplemented with continous insulation or insulating sheathing of at least R-2.

Committee Reason: This will provide for energy conservation levels consistent with EC13. The modification is intended to provide corrections to terminology in the footnote.

Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: This would be inconsistent with the approach taken in EC16.	
Assembly Action:	None
EC49-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval.	
Assembly Action:	None

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

None

EC50-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Actio	on: Approved	as Submitted
Committee Reason: northern climates.	This is an achievable increase in stringency that will provide significant	nt energy savings in
Assembly Action	n:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Actio	on:	Disapproved
Committee Reason:	The proposal would not be cost effective for all types of fuel sources.	
Assembly Action	n:	None
EC51-09/1	0	
Committee Actio	on:	Disapproved
Committee Reason:	The proponent requested disapproval.	
Assembly Action	n:	None
EC52-09/1	0	
Committee Actio	on:	Disapproved
Committee Reason:	The values would be inconsistent with the values in EC13.	
Assembly Action	n:	None
EC53-09/1	0	
PART I - IECC Committee Actio Committee Reason:	on: This proposal would have the effect of increasing energy use.	Disapproved
Assembly Action	n:	None
PART II - IBC Committee Actio	on:	Disapproved
Committee Reason:	See Part I.	
Assembly Action	n:	None
PART III - IRC Committee Actio	on:	Disapproved
Committee Reason:	There was no technical justification provided to allow increase in the a	amount of glazing.
Assembly Action	n:	None

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

EC54-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: This provides builders with additional options to achieve the insulation values required by the code.

Assembly Action: PART II - IRC **Committee Action:** Approved as Modified Modify proposal as follows: First value is cavity insulation, second is continuous insulation, so "13+5" means R-13 cavity insulation h. plus R-5 insulating sheathing, or insulated siding, or other continuous insulation. If structural sheathing covers less 25 percent or less of the exterior, insulated sheathing continuous insulation is not required where structural sheathing is used. If structural sheathing covers more than 25 percent of exterior, structural sheathing shall be supplemented with insulating sheathing, or insulated siding, or other continuous insulation of at least R-2. Committee Reason: This provides builders with additional options to achieve the insulation values required by the code. The modification simply clarifies the footnote by succinctly stating the meaning of "13 + 5." **Assembly Action:** None EC55-09/10 PART I - IECC **Committee Action:** Disapproved Committee Reason: This has the effect of reducing the stringency of the code. **Assembly Action:** None PART II - IRC Committee Action: Approved as Submitted Committee Reason: This is an appropriate correlation for mass wall values with R-Values in Table N1102.1. **Assembly Action:** None EC56-09/10 PART I-IECC **Committee Action:** Disapproved Committee Reason: The proposal provides alternative load paths that, in some cases, represent a possible regression in stringency. In addition, the committee was unsure whether this could be compatible with EC13. **Assembly Action:** None PART II-IRC B/E **Committee Action:** Disapproved Committee R eason: The prop osal will conflict with the provisions of the code proposed in E C16. The committee prefers EC16. Assembly Action: None

Approved as Submitted

EC57-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Rea son: This information does not need to be included in the code. commentary, some type of design guide, or in an informational appendix.	It could be provided i n
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: This information does not need to be included in the code. The clear. It could be provided in commentary, some type of design guide, or in an information of the clear	ne proper application is not national appendix.
Assembly Action:	None
EC58-09/10	
PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval.	
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: This would provide an unenforceable requirement.	
Assembly Action:	None
EC59-09/10	
PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Re ason: Winter de sign conditions are not defined , so , as w ritten the different testing in every jurisdiction. In addition, this deals exclusively with one type that similar problems do not exist with other types of insulation.	is proposal w ould require of insulation and assumes
Assembly Action:	None
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The intent of the proponent was to deal with the issue of insulation on very cold days. The opponents provided information that this is only a p days that occur over a short time in northern climate zones.	changes in performance of problem on very cold winter
Assembly Action:	None
EC60-09/10	
PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: These proposed changes in R-Values and U-Factors are not cost effective.

Assembly Action: EC61-09/10 Disapproved Committee Action: Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval.

EC62-09/10

Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: This would increase a loophole in the code. For very small houses, 500 sq. ft. is a significant percentage of the ceiling area.

Assembly Action:

EC63-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Baffles s erve to keep vents open, insulati on in place, a nd keep wind fr om blow ing through the insulation and reducing the effectiveness.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Modify the proposal as follows:

N1102.2.3 Wind wash Eave baffle. For air permeable insulations in vented attics, a baffle shall be installed adjacent to soffit and eave vents. Baffles shall maintain an opening equal or greater than the size of the vent. The baffle shall extend over the top of the attic insulation inward until it is at least 4 inches vertically above the insulation at full height. The baffle shall be permitted to be any solid material such as cardboard or thin rigid insulating sheathing.

Committee Reason: Baffles serve to keep vents open, insulation in place, and keep wind from blowing through the insulation and reducing the effectiveness. The modification removes unnecessary and technically unsupported restrictions on dimensional characteristics.

Assembly Action:

EC64-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Re ason: The committee was concerned t hat the app roach would not cor rectly add ress condensation problems as intended.

Assembly Action:

None

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The committee was concerned t hat t he app roach would not cor rectly add ress condensation problems as intended.

Assembly Action:

EC65-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: T he proposed code change would allow ICC400 to be us ed for energy conservation in log homes. Since ICC400 r eferences the 2003 IECC, this would allow lowering of stringency for log homes. Based upon the statements made b y pro ponent represent atives, the UA altern ative in the 2009 code is available as a way to allow compliance of log buildings.

Assembly Action:

EC66-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The committee was concerned that t he proposal would a ctually resolve conflicts w ith ASHRAE 90.1 as it appears that there would still be conflicts.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The committee was concerned that t he proposal would a ctually resolve conflicts w ith ASHRAE 90.1 as it appears that there would still be conflicts.

Assembly Action:

EC67-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Definitions in the I-C odes should be consistent in the I-Codes. In this context, consistency with ASHRAE 90.1 is not a concern.

Assembly Action:

EC68-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

402.2.11 Thermally isolated Sunroom insulation. All sunrooms shall meet the insulation requirements of this code.

Exception: For *sunrooms* with *thermal isolation*, the following exceptions to the insulation *requirements* of this code shall apply: (1) The minimum ceiling insulation R-values shall be <u>R-1924</u> in Zones 1 through 4 and <u>R-2430</u> in Zones 5 through 8.; and (2) The minimum wall R-value shall be R-13 in all zones. New wall(s) separating a *sunroom* with *thermal isolation* from *conditioned space* shall meet the *building thermal envelope* requirements of this code.

402.3.5 Thermally isolated Sunroom U-factor. All sunrooms shall meet the fenestration requirements of this code.

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

onflicto y i

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

Exception: For *sunrooms* with *thermal isolation* in Zones 4 through 8, the following exceptions to the fenestration requirements of this code shall apply: (1) the maximum fenestration U-factor shall be 0.50 0.45; and (2) the maximum skylight U-factor shall be 0.705. New fenestration separating the *sunroom* with *thermal isolation* from *conditioned space* shall meet the *building thermal envelope* requirements of this code.

Committee Reason: The code change revises the language to accura tely reflect the code requirements an d therefore eliminate confusion. The modification revises the R values in the exception back to the present code values.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The proposal raises the R values for thermally isolated sunrooms without any cost justification, or technical justification. For thermally isolated sunrooms the committee questions whether raising R-values would have a significant impact on energy usage.

Assembly Action:

EC69-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The language is confusing in that the location of the required insulation is not clear. In addition, this does not consider the impact or correlation with IBC requirements for fireblocking at fire walls.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proponent failed to consider the possible impact this could have on o ther code requirements for fire resistance rated assemblies.

Assembly Action:

EC70-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This pro posal would provide consistency in terminolog y with ASH RAE 90.1. In this context, for the application of the energy code, consistency with ASHRAE is useful.

Assembly Action:

EC71-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Rea son: The logical construct of the language to a llow determination of solar absorptance is confusing. The proposed language is not consistent and not enforceable.

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The definition of "white" in the default table is unknown. The default t ables should contain more options.

Assembly Action:

None

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

- -

None

Disapproved

EC72-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal would create confusion in enforcement. Each building would be a distinctly separate entity require a customized approach. The low SHGC values tend to come along with low U factors. Therefore, o ne would also be using windows with higher U factors. This is an undesirable unintended consequence. Finally, the reliability of this approach depends upon variables related to climate and day-to-day conditions that could cause considerably different energy conservation results than anticipated and desired.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: There is no information provided that correlates the SHGC equivalent values to the orientation of the building.

Assembly Action:

EC73-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Using a minimum SHGC rating for south facing walls in northern climate zones could possibly create a problem with peak cooling load demands in summer. This would increase energy consumption during those periods. There is not any data to substantiate whether this would be a net loss or gain in energy consumption.

Assembly Action: PART II - IRC Committee Action: D

Committee Reason: This would have the unintended consequence of preventing the use of triple glazed windows in parts of homes in northern climates, therefore discouraging the best low-E window. The code allows adjustment to U-factors in those cases where a homeowner desires to take advantage of a southern exposure. It is undesirable to regulate this further.

Assembly Action:

EC74-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The use of projection factors are not as reliable as SHGC values given variables in the local climate. In addition, the te chnical support for projection factors ignore the impact of reflectance of light from the ground.

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is similar to the approach taken in Chapter 5. The committee felt that there is no reason why this should not be able to be applied for residential construction.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

EC75-09/10

Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Re ason: The p roposal would p rovide exemption for present.	or more d oors than intended b y the code at
Assembly Action:	None
EC76-09/10	
PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: This would decrease the energy conservation	n levels of the code.
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Re ason: The committee was concerned over "assemblies". Does that inclu de sidelights? Also, the propose exemption, which makes the cod e open en ded, and could I ead to thermal envelope.	the intention of the propone nt regardin g sal elim inates the area restrict ion on this o significant reductions in the integrit y of the
Assembly Action:	None
EC77-09/10	
PART I - IECC	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval.	
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Rea son: This pr oposal would a dd a undesirable dangerous precedent for future code development. The scope of i not sustainability. At th is time, the committee would be remiss ir conservation in favor of green trade-offs given that the true equival has not been established.	dimension to the code that would set a the code is energy conservation for buildings, n introducing oppor tunities to reduce energ y ency and true impact on energy conservation
Assembly Action:	None
EC78-09/10	
PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Re ason: The proposal will create problems with fle have an impact on property values.	x ibility in development design, and possibly
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal would put limitations on townhouses that could be a disadvantage to the desirability of middle units facing west. This would also reduce flexibility in deve lopment design and house design.

Assembly Action:

EC79-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This prop osal is consistent with EC1 3. The energy performance of a building is enhanced by tightening air leakage rates.
Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal is inconsistent with portions of EC16. The language of the pro posal uses the phrase "du rably sealed"; ho wever, that phr ase is not easily defined. This would create an additional expense that is not necessary.

Assembly Action:

EC80-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposed provision would be difficult to apply in situations where sampling is used. The committee believes that this would also be inconsistent with EC13.
Assembly Action: None

PART II – IRC PART II Removed. See Errata posted at <u>www.iccsafe.org</u>.

EC81-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The approach taken and language used in EC13 is preferred. For instance EC13 uses the ACH metric rather than SLA. EC13 takes a different approach for sampling that is preferred. This proposal would allow air permeable insulation outside of the air barrier, which is undesirable.

Assembly Action: PART II - IRC

Committee Reason: The code change proposal regarding sampling would require some discretion on the part of the building official that could lead to accusations of impartial application of the code. Terminology changes (SLA instead of ACH) could cause confusion.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

EC82-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval, given that the issue is covered in EC79.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal reorganizes the code but the committee did not see any advantage to doing so. In addition, the terminology SLA instead of ACH will confuse users of the IECC who are accustomed to working with the concept of ACH.

Assembly Action:

EC83-09/10

PART I - IECC

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: Proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action:

EC84-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: This would eliminate the use of certain types of heating products. If this is a n issue that needs to be dealt with, the issue should be dealt with in the mechanical code by people that have the expertise to provide input regarding safety issues.

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:** Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed change would require fireplaces to be place d in separate rooms, rather than the room in which it is to be used. This should be dealt with in the mechanical chapters of the code.

Assembly Action:

EC85-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The need for an air barrier in common walls between dwelling units is questionable. This is a reasonable change to omit unnecessary expense to buildings.

Assembly Action:

EC86-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: See the proponent's reason statement. The pres ent code text contains a provision that limits how to use an air barrier that was really never intended.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: See the proponent's reason statement. The present code text contains a provision that limits how to use an air barrier that was really never intended.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

None

None

None

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

None

EC87-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book 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 ASHRAE 62.2-2007 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposal relates to minimum ventilation requirements that should be a mechanical code issue. Fu rther, the provisions are n ot clear on what would be done when sampling is used for ai r tightness.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposal relates to minimum ventilation requirements that should be a mechanical code issue. Fur other, the provisions are n ot clear on what would be done when sampling is used for air tightness.

Assembly Action:

EC88-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

In addition, inspection of log walls structures shall be in accordance with the a. provisions of ICC-400.

Committee Reason: Log walls have unique construction that require attention to assure that the construction is tight and the building thermal envelope is prop erly constructed. Therefore, it is appropriate to remind the code use that a separate standard exists for these buildings. The modification simply changes the footnote to state that the inspection provisions of the IECC must also apply.

Assembly Action:

EC89-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposed provision would be difficult to apply in situations where sampling is used. The committee believes that this would also be inconsistent with EC13.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Re ason: The proposal could create potential conflic ts with safety i ssues that the mechanical provisions of the code deal with.

Assembly Action:



Disapproved

Approved as Modified

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

474

None

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Rea son: The existing standards referenced adeq uately provide necessary information for application of the code requirements.

Assembly Action:

EC91-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The code presently uses the correct termi nology (air leaka ge), consistent with the test standard

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: T he fact that a pr oduct is listed has no bearing on t he te chnical requirements of the code. In addition this will clean up inconsistent terminology.

Assembly Action:

EC92-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proposed change reor ganizes the sect ion appropriately and logically to make the code easier to understand.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Re ason: The proposed change reor ganizes the sect ion appropriately and logically to make the code easier to understand.

Assembly Action:

EC93-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The present requirements are not applicable to interior luminaires as the proponent claims. The provisions apply only to luminaires installed in the building thermal envelope.

Assembly Action:

EC94-09/10

Note: EC94 and 97 are duplicate code change proposals that were inadvertently installed in this monograph. Proponent of EC94 will be listed as a co-proponent on EC97. The reason statement supplied by the proponent will be installed with the reason statement from proponent for EC97.

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

Withdrawn by Proponent

None

Disapproved

None

PART I - IECC

475

EC96-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

	-	-
Committee Reason: The proposal makes the area weighted average approach unnecessarily restricte	1. T	his
imits the flexibility of the code. The technical support provided is insufficient to allow a positive action.		

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The provisions are unnecessarily restrictive.

Assembly Action:

EC97-09/10

Errata: Add Craig Conner as a co-proponent for EC97. Mr. Conner's reason statement for EC94 applies. See note on EC94.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The provisions given in this section are artificial constraints on design flexibility. Tradeoffs are limited. The p roponents claim that the building occupants w ill alwa ys t urn up t he the rmostat are overstated.

Assembly Action:

EC98-09/10

Part I IECC

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Based o n its approval o f EC147-09/1 0, and at the request of the proponent, the committee disapproved this proposal.

Assembly Action: None
PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: It is undesirable code format to include technical requirements in the definition.

Assembly Action:

EC99-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

None

Disapproved

Modify proposal as follows:

WHOLE HOUSE MECHANICAL VENTILATION SYSTEM. An exhaust system, supply system, or combination thereof that is designed to mechanically exchange indoor air with outdoor air for the purpose of diluting and removing indoor air contaminants. The system shall be designed to provide ventilation air when operating continuously or through a programmed intermittent schedule to satisfy the whole house ventilation rates. required for the whole house. Local exhaust or supply fans are permitted to serve as such a system.

(Portions of code change not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent's reason statement, this proposal will bring significant energy savings.

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: This provides for controls on fans when installed as whole house ventilators. The committee felt that this was limiting. Control of fans that are not installed for whole house ventilation could be controlled as well. In addition, the definition contains technical requirements.

Assembly Action:

Assembly Action:

EC100-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: There is no evidence provided that heati ng and cooling zones save energ y. This provision would be too far reaching in regulating building heating and cooling system design.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: T here is no evidence pro vided that heat ing and cooling zones save energ y. This provisions would be too far reaching in regulating building heating and cooling system design.

Assembly Action:

EC101-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The thermostat settings do not rep resent any significant energy savings. We have different lifestyles, with widely varying times that we need the thermostat settings at different levels. This do es not address that, and seems to assume that we all sleep, eat, play, and work at the same times.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: It is unrea sonable to assume that certain temperature set back setting will help save energy given the fact that people have var ying life st yles and theref ore different ne eds for setting the thermostat. In a ddition, the definition of heat pump recovery is vague and the refore does not p rovide useful information as to what the code really requires.

Assembly Action:

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

EC102-09/10

Committee Reason: The committee agrees with the proponent t hat factoring in t he ground for the basement wall U-Factor provides confusion to those using this table for prescriptive applications.
Assembly Action:
None

PART II - IRC Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Committee Reason: The committee disagreed that this code change would be less confusing. Quite to the contrary, the committee believes that the application of the table is more often needed for the UA alternative and therefore the interpretation of the code is more confusing with the proposed change.

Assembly Action:

EC103-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: There is no standard for the particular test proposed. In addition, this could conflict with the mechanical code by not allowing building cavities to be used as ducts. Finally, it is impractical to conduct a test such as this after completion of the building.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: It is impractical to wait until the completion of the building to perform the leakage test. In addition, there is no test standard. Finally, no technical justification was provided for increasing insulation to R-4.

Assembly Action:

EC104-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed referenced standard is not available.	
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed referenced standard is not available.

Assembly Action:

EC105-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved Committee Reason: The proposed referenced standard does not comply with ICC criteria.

Assembly Action:

EC106-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Rea son: Proponent requested disapproval given that the reference d standard prop osed is not available.

Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC	
Committee Action:	Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Assembly Action:

EC107-09/10

Committee Action:

PART I - IECC

Committee Reason: The proposed revisions are compatible with (and included in) EC13.

Assembly Action: PART II - IRC

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The tighter leakage rate for testing a rough-in is not supported by any statistics regarding expected differences in performance and is therefore arbitrary.

Assembly Action:	

EC108-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee had some concerns with technical issues in ACCA Manual J.

Assembly Action:

EC109-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: This rep resents good practice to deal w ith air leakage. The return air should be regulated the same way as supply air.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This type of requirement dealing with plenums is better placed in the mechanical section of the I RC. In addition, the committee was concerned that this t ext could be interpreted to mean that cra wl spaces cannot be used for supply air.

Assembly Action:

EC110-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

403.3.1 Protection of piping insulation. Piping insulation exposed to weather shall be protected from damage, including that due to sunlight, moisture, equipment maintenance, and wind, by means including, aluminum, sheet metal, painted canvas, or plastic cover or other protection suitable for outdoor service. Cellular foam insulation shall be protected as above or painted with a coating that is water retardant and <u>shall</u> provide shielding from solar radiation that can cause degradation of the material. Adhesives tape shall not be permitted.

Committee Reason: Protection of outside piping insulation is n ecessary to assure durable mate rials to meet the energy code requirements. The modification simply removes the laundry list of possible protections, as the committee felt this was unnecessary.

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

EC111-09/10

Committee Action	on:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: nomenclature.	Prefer other code change proposals that better address this, and use	e more appropriat e
Assembly Action	n:	None
EC112-09/	10	
PART I - IECC Committee Actic	on: Approved	as Submitted
Committee Reason:	This proposal is consistent with EC13.	
Assembly Action	n:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Actic	on:	Disapproved
Committee Reason:	The proposed text should be in the plumbing section of the IRC.	
Assembly Action	ו:	None
EC113-09/	10	
Committee Actio	on:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Propone nt requested disapproval. In addition the committee believes that action on EC112 and EC110 deal with most of the issues in this code change proposal.		
Assembly Action	1:	None
EC114-09/	10	
PART I - IECC Committee Actic	on:	Disapproved
Committee Reason:	The issues in this proposal have already been dealt with in EC112 an	d EC13.
Assembly Action	n:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Actic	on:	Disapproved
Committee Reason:	This is an issue that should be dealt with in the plumbing section of the	ne IRC.
Assembly Action	n:	None
EC115-09/	10	
PART I - IECC		
Committee Actio	on:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: not sure that, given E	Insulation of circulating service hot water piping is covered in EC13. C13, this proposed increase is necessary.	The committee was

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: See the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action:	None
EC116-09/10	
PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Insulation of circulating service hot water piping is covered in EC13. not sure that, given EC13, this proposed increase is necessary.	The committee was
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: See action taken on EC1 15. The committee agrees with the inc maintains that the section should be applicable to circulating hot water systems.	rease in R value but
Assembly Action:	None
EC117-09/10	
PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: This change is already covered by previous actions. See EC112.	
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The change is already covered in previous actions. See EC115.	
Assembly Action:	None
EC118-09/10	
PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The code contains requirements for insula tion on hot w ater piping water piping. T he need for a 1 " thick insulation is not supported by technical data. This level exclusivity for certain types of insulation, without justification as to why others cannot be a supported by the support of the support	g and cir culating hot could provide som e be used.
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IPC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: See part I.	
Assembly Action:	None
PART III - IRC Building & Energy Committee Action:	Disapproved

Committee Reason: The installation in some cases will look like an electrical installation. This could become a safety issue for repairs.

Assembly Action:	None
Committee Reason: See part III.	
PART IV - IRC Plumbing Committee Action:	Disapproved
Assembly Action:	None

EC119-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book 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 AHRI 470-06 ndicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Proponent requested disapproval to allow him to clean up t he language and work with industry on the requirements.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Propo nent requested disapproval to allo w him to clean up t he language and work with industry on the requirements.

Assembly Action:	None

EC120-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee preferred the approach taken in EC99.	
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The language is such that the requirements for testing a In addition, requirement for listing is unnecessary.	and listing are not really stated.

Assembly Action:

EC121-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: ACCA Manual J is not the correct standard for the purpose intended in the code change proposal.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Assembly Action:

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

EC123-09/10

Modify proposal as follows:

403.7 Space heating equipment (Mandatory). Electric resistance heating shall not be used for space heating. This includes but is not limited to: electric space heaters, electric furnaces, electric baseboard heaters, electric wall heaters, and electric thermal storage.

Exceptions:

2. Where electric resistance heating is used for ground source or air-to-air heat pump supplementary heat.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Rea son: This prop osal would limit the use of the inefficient resistant heating products and therefore save energy. The modification is t o res pond to c oncerns from the HVAC industr y r egarding supplementary heating for heat pumps.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

Committee Reason: This proposal would limit a product that is used often in home additions.

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

EC124-09/10

Committee Reason: The present code intends that hot tubs be regulated by this code section. Therefore, this is essentially an editorial fix to the code that will prevent abuse of the code requirements.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC-P

Committee Reason: The 8 foot distance would be impossible to comply with in the majority of homes.

PART II - IRC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proponent seeks to reference ACCA Manual J; however, Manual S is the

appropriate standard.

Assembly Action: None

Committee Re ason: This would put an unre asonable burden on the design of plumbing for multi-family housing, with minimal returns on energy savings.

Assembly Action:

EC122-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

483

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: This proposal makes the code clearer in specifying its original intent that hot tubs are part of the products that need to be regulated.

Assembly Action: EC125-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: At this time, there are sufficient products a vailable to allow the code to require pilotless lighters for fireplace systems.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Rea son: The com mittee was concerned that, in so me cases, pilots are safety de vices, and therefore the pro posal would severely hurt some product manufacturers. In addition, this represents minima I savings.

Assembly Action:

EC126-09/10

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal would provide a conflict with EC13. The energy recovery ventilator would not be cost effective in cold climates.

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The structure of the code would be confusing, given that there are exceptions to other exceptions. The reference to specific leakage area is confusing, as it is not an accepted term in the IECC vernacular.

Assembly Action:

EC127-09/10

PART I - IECC **Committee Action:**

Committee Reason: The proponent has misinterpreted the intent of the code, which is to require 50 percent of lighting fixtures to use high efficiency lamps, not to limit the type of luminaire. By doing this, the proposal limits the opportunity to provide energy savings with all types of fixtures and therefore drives up the cost of providing high-efficiency lighting. **Assembly Action:**

PART II - IRC **Committee Action:**

Committee Rea son: T he committee believe s that energy s avings could actually be reduced by only specifying that luminaires be required to be high efficiency type.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

EC128-09/10

Committee Action:

Assembly Action:

the code when this provision was installed.

EC129-09/10	
PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Rea son: The prop osed change in percentag e of provisions of EC13.	high e fficiency lamps is consist ent with the
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This is a reasonable step toward energy save	rings.
Assembly Action:	None
EC130-09/10	
PART I - IECC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on prior actions on EC128 and EC12	9.
Assembly Action:	None
PART II - IRC Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based upon prior action on EC129.	
Assembly Action:	None
EC131-09/10	

Committee Reason: Changing the requirement from Prescriptive to Mandatory reflects the origin al intent of

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book 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 AHRI 470-06 ndicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I - IECC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Bans unvented gas heating appliances in northern climates. In addit ion the proposal would be in violation of Federal law by specifying higher efficiency appliances in building codes.

Assembly Action: PART II - IRC Committee Action: Disap

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proponent requested disapproval based on Federal laws that have not yet changed as given in the proponents reason statement.

Assembly Action: None EC132-09/10 **Committee Action:** Disapproved Committee Reason: See EC140. **Assembly Action:** None EC133-09/10 **Committee Action:** which will lead to more accurate application of energy conservation requirements. Assembly Action: None EC134-09/10 **Committee Action:** Disapproved Committee Reason: The use of carbon emissions as a basis for comparison of energy conservation in the performance path needs detailed study before it can be incorporated into this code. While this seems to be a logical approach, there needs to be a determination that using this option will truly be coordinated with Assembly Action: None EC135-09/10 **Committee Action:** Committee Reason: Site energy was removed from the code as an option in the 2007/2008 Cod e Change Cycle because it does not provide a meaningful comparison when more than one fuel source is used in a building. The committee does not w ant to re-introduce site energy into the code for the same reas ons it was removed. Assembly Action: None EC136-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent

EC137-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proponent provided compelling data t hat showed that the impact of sh ade on the SHGC of the fenestration is dependent on the type of glazing used. Therefore, this code change makes sense in relating the two.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The code change will provide better data regarding relative cost of different fuel sources,

Approved as Submitted

None

486

Disapproved

EC138-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify proposal as follows:

Footnote i:

For a proposed design without a proposed heating system, a heating system with the prevailing federal i. minimum efficiency shall be assumed for both the standard reference design and the proposed design. For electric resistance heating systems, the prevailing federal minimum efficiency air source heat pump shall be used for the standard reference design.

(Portions of code change proposal not shown do not change.)

Committee Reason: The committee agrees that this was an inadvertent deletion in the last code change process, and restoring the reference to electric heating resistance systems will improve the use of the performance path. The modification is simply to remove the same reference from footnote I, as it is not needed in footnotes.

Assembly Action:	None

EC139-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This is a simple clarification of the performance table, to place duct insulation reference in the proposed design.

Assembly Action:

EC140-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: T his proposed change could possibly reduce the energy conservation levels using the performance pat h. High efficien cy ap pliances a re the nor m. T herefore, to take a credit for these in the performance path as an improvement would lower the bar of the standard design.

Assembly Action:

EC141-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: For the same reasons that the committee disapproved EC140.

Assembly Action:

EC142-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: This is an unnecessary complication to the determination of the requirements that will yield very little difference in stringency.

Assembly Action:

EC143-09/10

EC144-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Approved as Modified

EC145-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee dealt with this issue in their action on EC137.

Assembly Action:

EC146-09/10

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:

Committee Reason: Although also a comprehensive approach to increasing the energy conservation in commercial and highrise residential construction as regulated by Chapter 5, EC 147-09/10 was preferred by the committee. The committee was also concerned that portions of the proposal may violate the copyright of other publications.

Assembly Action:

EC147-09/10

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:

Committee Reason: The proposal is a broad revision to Chapter 5 addressing all systems of a building including the building envelop, HVAC systems and lighting and power systems. The change will provide a significant increase in energy savings estimated to be approaching 30 percent over energy usage resulting in buildings built under the 2009 IECC. Although the committee acknowledged many provisions of the proposal could be improved, it was hoped that those deficiencies will be improved through the public comment process.

Assembly Action:

EC148-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proponent's concern with the stand and should be resolved through the working with ASHRAE to revise the standard.

Assembly Action:

EC149-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The referenced standards provide an avenue for alternative to compliance with Chapter 5 and the balance of the IECC. The committee felt that the options should be retained for use by designers as well as the code official.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

488

EC150-09/10

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

489

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: For consistency with the action taken to disapprove EC 149-09/10.

Assembly Action:

EC151-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Change is unnecessary as the space by space method is already allowed as part of the existing reference to the complete standard.

Assembly Action:

EC152-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal becaus e it would have eliminated the option of designing a building to comply with ASHRAE 90.1. The committee believes both options should be retained.

Assembly Action:

EC153-09/1

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the ASME standard should address t he allowing escalators and moving walkways to discontinue operation when people are not present. This requirement may be out of places in the IECC.

Assembly Action:

EC154-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The c hange will improve the code 's pr ovisions, encouraging more consistent understanding and interpretation.

Assembly Action:

EC155-09/10

EC156-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee R eason: The prop osal contained er rors and it was inconsistent w ith EC157-09/10 which was preferred by the committee. Any technical merit contained in this change could be incorporated into EC 157 by public comment.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Withdrawn by Proponent

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

EC157-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee R eason: The chan ge will significantly improve the energy efficiency of the building envelop requirements for commercial buildings. The standards provided are easy to comply with and can be built. The changes are consistent with ASHRAE standards.

Assembly Action:

EC158-09/10

Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Rea son: The proposal was disapproved because it was based on a prelimina which has already been revised.	ar y ASHRAE draft
Assembly Action:	None
EC159-09/10	
Committee Action: Approved	as Submitted
Committee Reason: The change allows for better installation practices for multi-layer insula	ation.
Assembly Action:	None
EC160-09/10 Withdrawn	by Proponent
EC161-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee R eason: The committee disapproved the change at the p roponent's requere approving EC157-09/10 was preferred.	est. Th e action of
Assembly Action:	None
EC162-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval in order to work on improving the	e proposal.
Assembly Action:	None
EC163-09/10	
Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee concluded that this chang e was not mate rial neutral increases in U-factors, thus lessening the energy savings found in the current edition of the committee o	l. It inc ludes some code.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

EC164-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal would result in the exclusion of too many materials that would be needed in order for the windows to meet structural standards. The proposal needs to be balanced with requirements of other codes for window installation.

Assembly Action:

EC165-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The change provides a good increase in energy savings from improved fe nestration standards. More savings can be easily achieved. The committee felt this change would encourage the use of daylighting controls.

Assembly Action:

EC166-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee disapproved the code change because they felt that it put too many restrictions on d esign flex ibility, that the U-values were to o one rous; and that the projection re quirement particularly difficult to understand and implement.

Assembly Action:

EC167-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the change represented by EC165 at this time.

Assembly Action:

EC168-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee was unconvinced that the weighted average included in the table would achieve the same level of energy savings across the various materials contained in the table.

Assembly Action:

EC169-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the reduction is SGC factors were not acceptable . ASHRAE studies and information do not support the values in the proposal.

Assembly Action:

EC170-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee preferred change approved by the committee in EC174-09/10.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

None

EC171-09/10

Note: EC171 and 172 are duplicate code change proposals that were inadvertently installed in this monograph. Proponent of EC171 will be listed as a co-proponent on EC172. The reason statement supplied by the proponent will be installed with the reason statement from proponent for EC172.

EC172-09/10

Errata: Add Craig Conner as a co-proponent for EC172. Mr. Conner's reason statement for EC171 applies. See note on EC171.

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:

Committee Reason: The provisions of Section 303.1.3 on the labeling of fenest ration products do not allow the procedure in cluded in this proposal. The propos al may be headed in a good direction to increase the number of fenestration rating agencies and this would appear to be setting up an alternative process, however the proposal still needs improvements. Of concern is determining the appropriat e person or prof essional who would be able to sign the proposed certificates.

Assembly Action:

EC173-09/10

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 Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

502.3.2 Minimum Skylight Fenestration Area. In enclosed spaces greater than 10,000 square feet, (900 m²), directly under a roof with ceiling heights greater than 15 feet (4.6 m), and used as an office, lobby, atrium, concourse, corridor, storage, gymnasium/exercise center, convention center, automotive service, manufacturing, non-refrigerated warehouse, retail store, distribution/sorting area, transportation, or workshop, the total daylight zone under skylights shall be a minimum of half the floor area and provide a minimum skylight area to daylight zone under skylights of 3 percent with a skylight VLT of at least 0.40 or provide a minimum skylight effective aperture (net translucent skylight area) of at least 1 percent.

Skylights shall have a glazing material or diffuser with a measured haze value greater than 90% when tested according to ASTM D1003. General lighting in the daylight area shall be controlled as described in Section 505.2.2.3.

Exceptions:

- 1. In climate zones 6 through 8.
- 2. Where the designed general lighting power densities less than 0.5 W/ft2 (5.4 W/m2)
- Areas where it is documented that existing structures or natural objects block direct beam 3. sunlight on at least half of the roof over the enclosed area for more than 1,500 daytime hours per year between 8 am and 4 pm.
- Where the daylight area under rooftop monitors is greater than 50% of the enclosed space floor area.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged).

Committee Reason: The change coordinates with progress in the ASHRAE standard as contained in Addenda AL. It provides a great opportunity to save energy by using skylights in these types of facilities.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

EC174-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved the change becau se they felt it was a reasonable a pproach to incorporating projection factors into the envelop design.

Assembly Action:

EC175-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change because it move a prescriptive standard over to being predominately a performance standard. A prescriptive standard is important to maintain.

Assembly Action:

EC176-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: T he committee felt the p roposal clarified determination of energy equivalency and corrected an oversight in previous changes to the code.

Assembly Action:

EC177-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The pro posal conflicts with the building code and it is likely to impinge on p roperty line setback requirements. As written it w ill discriminate against certain existing properties which will be unable to meet the prescriptive requirements.

Assembly Action:

EC178-09/10

EC179-09/10

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:

Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Add new definitions as follows:

GENERAL LIGHTING: Lighting that provides a uniform level of illumination throughout an area. General lighting shall not include emergency lighting; decorative lighting or lighting that provides a dissimilar level of illumination to serve a specialized application or feature within such area.

MULTI-LEVEL LIGHTING CONTROLS. Systems that automatically reduce the lighting power draw in a series of at least two levels or by continuous dimming in response to availability of daylight within the interior space (sometimes referred to as "photo control").

HAZE VALUE. The ratio of diffusely transmitted light to total light transmitted.

502.3.3 Minimum daylighting. In spaces enclosed by walls or floor to ceiling partitions that are greater than 25,000 square feet (2000 m2) in area and directly under a roof with ceiling heights greater than 15 feet (4.6 m),

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

None

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

in single story buildings of Group E, F. 1, F-2, M, S-1 or S-2 occupancies, a minimum of 50 percent of the floor area shall be in a daylight zone. The maximum percentage of gross roof assembly area that is permitted to be roof mounted fenestration (including but not limited to skylights, tubular daylighting devices, light transmitting smoke vents, and roof windows) in these spaces shall be 6 percent. All lighting in this daylight zone shall be controlled by multi-level lighting controls that comply with Section 505.2.5.

Roof mounted fenestration in these spaces shall meet the following criteria:

- The haze value of the combined glazing materials or diffuser in the assembly shall be identified by a manufacturer's designation that indicates manufacturer, testing laboratory, haze value and test method used. The haze shall be 90 percent or greater when tested according to ASTM D1003.
- The minimum fenestration VT shall be 0.60 when determined in accordance with ASTM E972 or NFRC 200.
- The maximum U factor of the fenestration shall meet the requirements of Table 502.3. The maximum SHGC shall be 0.60.

Exceptions:

- 1. Spaces in climate zones 6 through 8.
- 2. Auditoriums, theaters, museums, places of worship, and refrigerated
- w arehouses.
 - 3. Spaces with general lighting power densities less than 0.5 W/ft2 (5.4 W/m2).

505.2.5 Multi-level lighting controls. When multi-level lighting controls are required by this code, the general lighting in the daylight zone shall be separately controlled by at least one multi-level lighting control that reduces the lighting power in response to daylight available in the space. When the daylit illuminance in the space is greater than the rated illuminance of the general lighting of daylight zones, the general lighting shall be automatically controlled so that its power draw is no greater than 35 percent of its rated power. The multi-level lighting control shall be located so that calibration and set point adjustment controls are readily accessible and separate from the light sensor.

3. Add new standards to Chapter 6 as follows:

ASTM

D1003-00 Standard Test Method for Haze and Luminous Transmittance of Transparent Plastics E972-96(2002) Standard Test Method for Solar Photometric Transmittance of Sheet Materials Using Sunlight

Committee Rea son: The modi fication was to simplify the pro posal to ju st ad dress providing the controls systems; the proposed Section 502.3.3 conflicted with the approved provisions of EC173. The provision of the controls is essential to making t he energy savings in corporated in EC173 -09/10 achievable. The committee expects this approval to blend with EC 173.

Assembly Action:

EC180-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: At the request of the proponent, the committee disapproved this change based on approvals by the committee of related proposals.

Assembly Action:

EC181-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Based o n its approval o f EC147-09/1 0, and at the request of the proponent, the committee disapproved this proposal.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

EC182-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The com mittee felt the pr oposal would move the code in a good direction, but there remains too many flaws in the proposal as written. Among the concerns was the difficulty in calculating the 5 % of the energy of the building.

Assembly Action:

EC183-09/10

Committee	Action:
-----------	---------

Committee Reason: The committee approved EC147-09/10 which addresses the same issues in a different t format. The proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action:

EC184-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The cont ent of this proposal w ere n ot consistent w ith EC147-09/10. Propone nt anticipates resolving the differences by a public comment.

Assembly Action:

EC185-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

502.4.7 Vestibules. All building entrances shall be protected with an enclosed vestibule, with all doors opening into and out of the vestibule equipped with self-closing devices. Vestibules shall be designed so that in passing through the vestibule it is not necessary for the interior and exterior doors to open at the same time. The installation of one or more revolving doors in the building entrance shall not eliminate the requirement that a vestibule be provided for any doors adjacent to revolving doors.

Exceptions:

- Buildings in climate Zones 1 and 2 as indicated in Figure 301.1 and Table 301.1. 1.
- 2. Doors not intended to be used by the public, such as doors to mechanical or electrical equipment rooms or intended solely for employee use.
- 3. Doors opening directly from a sleeping unit or dwelling unit.
- Doors that open directly from a space less than 3,000 square feet (298 m2) in area. 4.
- Revolving doors.
- Doors used primarily to facilitate vehicular movement or material handling 56. and adjacent personnel doors.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged).

Committee R eason: The proposal was approved because it provides clarity to the vestibule requirement. Although the intent of the section is to not req uire a vestibule on revolving do ors, the committee felt that retaining the exception of revolving doors provid ed clar ify. The definition of building entrance will improve consistency of enforcement.

Assembly Action:

EC186-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal coordinates with EC147-09/10 and furthe r enhances energy conservation radiant heating systems.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

None

Approved as Modified

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

EC187-09/10

Committee Reason: Provides definitions of terms already used on the code.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

EC188-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The p roposal is consist ent with the approved EC147 -09/10. It p rovides similar improvements in energy savings. If EC147 proved to be fa tally flawed and were disapproved at final action hearings, this change will serve the goal of significant energy savings for the 2012 IECC.

Assembly Action:

EC189-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Ot her proposals which were approved are preferred to t his proposal. The proponent requested this change be disapproved.

Assembly Action:

EC190-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that t he proposal embodied in EC217-09/10 bette r addressed the topic of motor efficiency. Althou gh this proposal uses the NEMA standard as the context, it doesn't propose actually including it as a referenced standard. The committee believes that the NEMA standa rd does not comply with ICC policy regarding referenced standards.

Assembly Action:

EC191-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The standards referenced by the change do not comply with ICC policy regarding such references.

Assembly Action:

EC192-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal is another st ep in increasing the efficiency standards of the I ECC. The changes reflected in this item are consistent with other codes and standards.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

496

Approved as Submitted

None

None

None

Disapproved

EC193-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: T he prop osal deletes eq uipment t ypes t hat should remain included in requirements.

Assembly Action:

EC194-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.1 and 3.6.2.11.

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The stan dards refe renced in the propos al do not meet ICC policy fo r referenced documents. The action taken was consistent with the disapproval of EC191-09/ 10 and was requested by the proponent.

Assembly Action:

EC195-09/10

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:

Committee Reason: The proposal adds new categories of equip ment, although t here are few examples of such equipment being manu factured. These provisions allow the code to anti cipate the gr owth in these equipment markets.

Assembly Action:

EC196-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Revises equipment efficiencies consistent with the efficiencies found in ASHRAE 90.1.

Assembly Action:

EC197-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The concerns raised by the code change are already addressed in Section 101.3 of the code. This change is unnecessary.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

497

the IEC C

None

Disapproved

None

EC198-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Although the proposal would have been consistent with related ASHRAE standards, the text was not coordinated with the requirements of the International Mechanical Code.

Assembly Action:

EC199-09/10

Note: EC199 and 200 are duplicate code change proposals that were inadvertently installed in this monograph. Proponent of EC199 will be listed as a co-proponent on EC200. The reason statement supplied by the proponent will be installed with the reason statement from proponent for EC200.

EC200-09/10

Errata: Add Guy McMann as a co-proponent for EC200. Mr. McMann's reason statement for EC199 applies. See note on EC199.

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The code change represents an improved e fficiency and w ill use material s that are readily available on the market.

Assembly Action:

EC201-09/10

Committee Action:	Disapproved
Committee Rea son: The pro posal is not a simple editorial change to the code and committee to be less clear than the existing code.	was fo und b y th e
Assembly Action:	None

EC202-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee approved the change because it corrected the formula to be consistent with the SMACNA source document.

Assembly Action:

EC203-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee understood that the p roposal was coordinated with the IM C and would increase energy savings, but they were unconvinced that real costs of the change were not clear and may not be justified based on the savings. The committee felt this was a niche issue that didn't need to be addressed in the code at this time.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Submitted

None

EC204-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The prop osal was disapproved for a variety of reasons. The first issue was that the proposed text, including the table footnotes, was unclear which will not result in consistent enforcement. There were numerous corrections needed to clarify the text. Also of concern was the larger sizes would not fit in side many wall cavities as is now done in the market.

Assembly Action:

EC205-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: T he proposal was disapproved because it would actually reduce the energy efficiency standards already in the code an d would result in energy loss to the soils. In addition the proposa I includes permissive language which is inappropriate in the codes.

Assembly Action:

EC206-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change becaus e it represents a significant reduction in energy savings in comparison to the 2006 IECC.

Assembly Action:

EC207-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

503.2.8.1 Protection of piping insulation. Piping Insulation exposed to weather shall be protected from damage, including that due to sunlight, moisture, equipment maintenance, wind and <u>shall provide provides</u> shielding from solar radiation that can cause degradation of the material. Adhesives <u>Adhesive</u> tape shall not be permitted.

Committee Reason: The committee approved this change to be consistent with its actions on EC110-09/10. The modification was to improve the grammar of the sentences. The provision provides appropriate protection for piping insulation exposed in exterior installations.

Assembly Action:

EC208-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee disapprov ed the change because there was no technica I information provide which supported the change.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Modified

None

Disapproved

EC209-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: Consisten t with the committee action to disapprove EC206-09/10, this item w as also disapproved. It was estimated that the change would actually increase energy usage by 27%.

Assembly Action:

EC210-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee prefer red the version of this topic that is included and approved in EC147-09/10. Some of the lan guage included in this change would be more suitable to commentar y than to code requirements.

Assembly Action:

EC211-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The change expands and clarifies use of economizers. It is consistent with revisions to ASHRAE 90.1 and allows better use of 'free' cooling.

Assembly Action:

EC212-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

504.5 Pipe insulation. For automatic-circulating hot water and or heat traced systems, piping shall be insulated with 1 inch (25 mm) of insulation having a conductivity not exceeding 0.27 Btu per inch/h x ft² ' °F (1.53 W per 25 mm/m² x K). The first 8 feet (2438 mm) of piping in non-hot-water-supply temperature maintenance systems served by equipment without integral heat traps shall be insulated with 0.5 inch (12.7 mm) of material having a conductivity not exceeding 0.27 Btu per 25 mm/m² x K).

Committee Reason: The change brings under the IECC standards heat traced systems. Without the change, uninsulated heat trace systems can be installed. The modification more accurately states the intended meaning of the proponent.

Assembly Action:

EC213-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Rea son: The committee disapproved the proposal to be consistent with previous actions on EC208-09/10.

Assembly Action:

EC214-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal to be consistent with action taken on EC 206-09/10. The committee prefers that this requirement remain one based on size of the insulating material, not Rvalue. The changes do not represent a cost effective strategy.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Modified

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

500

EC215-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Consistent with the action taken to disapprove EC214-09/10 the committee disapproved this item. Change from inches of insulation to R-value not needed.

Assembly Action:

EC216-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Consistent with the action taken on EC1 24-09/10, the committee approved this change. The committee expr essed concern about the u se of r enewable energy sources and w hether any exception should be provided.

Assembly Action:

EC217-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf :

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.11 and 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the change was not clearly enforceable as currently written. In addit ion they felt that energy used for fire pumps should not be regulated by the code. Finally, the proposed referenced stan dard does not comply with IC C policy for referenced documents.

Assembly Action:

EC218-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

505.5.3 Lighting within dwelling units. (Mandatory). Lighting within dwelling units shall have a minimum of 50 75 percent of the permanently installed interior light fixtures fitted with high-efficacy lamps.

Committee Reason: The chan ge was approved because it clarif ies the code and improves the efficiency of lighting systems built to the IECC. The modification of 50 percent to 75 percent was to provide consistency with the action taken on EC 13.

Assembly Action:

EC219-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee found the proposal would be difficult to e nforce and would create a penalty of requiring significant retrofit of a lighting system when only part of it is being remodeled. The chang e would act to discourage upgrades rather the encourage them.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

None

Approved as Submitted

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

None

EC220-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The change exempts equipment rooms from having to have light reduction controls. As these rooms require ample light for staff to be a ble to adequately see the equipment they are at tending, the change exempts rooms where such reductions are rarely used for safety and operation concerns.

Assembly Action:

EC221-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The language improves the clarity of the provision. Adding the text concern having these things at read y access is a good reminder of ot her provisions in the International Mechanical Code and this code

Assembly Action:

EC222-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the action taken on EC147-09/10 which contains preferred code provisions

Assembly Action:

EC223-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: As the s ection only a pplies to larger spaces and buildings, there is going to be independent circuitry for different spaces, therefore the proposed exception should not be usable for a complete building, but just to areas which have continuous operation. While the committee expressed concern regarding the wording of the new exception, but approved the change as appropriate.

Assembly Action:

EC224-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee found the text of the proposal to be unclear. There were discrepancies in the text. T he application of the 50% reduction was not well coordinated. It would require lighting controls in inappropriate locations. The committee w as concerned that here may not be m uch equipment available that can accomplish the 10% level.

Assembly Action:

EC225-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal because it opened a series of issues, including one of safety in these areas. Parts of the prop osal included unclear text. There was a concern regarding the term 'undeveloped areas' and whether such 'areas' w ere appropriate to include in the IECC w hich addresses building construction.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

EC226-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Consistent with the decision on EC225, the committee disapproved this proposal. Many of the areas mentioned in the list of standards are not governed by the IECC. Yet, it doesn't clearly address a common exterior area which is provided with lighting: landscaping on a building site.

Assembly Action:

EC227-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: T he proposal actually reduces energy savings compared t o the e xisting IECC. T he proponent acknowledged that changes are being made to the source document of this proposal.

Assembly Action:

EC228-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change at the request of the proponent.

Assembly Action:

EC229-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code ch ange because the requirement would not be consistently applied as it is only required when a building official r equests compliance. It is also proposed for the wrong location in the code, it should be in Chapter 1.

Assembly Action:

EC230-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The pro posal references a standard without actually including a correct reference for Chapter 6 of the code. The standard was said not to comply with ICC policy regarding referenced documents.

Assembly Action:

EC231-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proposal is only presented as a definition, but within the proposed definition are technical code requirements that should be placed in the body of a regulatory chapter, not in Chapter 2.

Assembly Action:

EC232-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: While understanding of the intent and goals of the proposal, the committee disapproved the change. Among the concerns are that the values contained in the proposal would need additional vetting by a larger g roup. The goal p robably could not be achieved in an appendix for mat because the minimum

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

requirements of the code – which the appendix would 'stretch' beyond, wouldn't be finalized until the final public action hearing, at which point it is too late to t hen incorporate the final standards which the appendix would be pushing past.

Assembly Action:

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE/ZONING CODE COMMITTEE

Thomas Hall, CBO - Chair Code Administrator City of Wauseon, Ohio Wauseon, OH

Richard Lambert – Vice Chair Building Inspector City of Saco Saco, ME

Richard Crawford President Mercer Sign Consultants Doylestown, PA

Dr. Thomas Culp President Birch Point Consulting LLC La Crosse, WI

Teresa Deitz Property Maintenance Inspector City of Columbus Columbus, GA

Sean Farrell Chief Property Code Enforcement Inspector Prince William county Woodbridge, VA

Roy Fyffe Chief Building Official City of Burnet Burnet, TX **Kirk Nagle** Permit Coordinator City of Arvada Arvada, CO

Brant Pitchford Housing Supervisor City of Tulsa Tulsa, OK

Ronald Reynolds, CBO, CFO Chief Deputy, VA State Fire Marshal's Office Virginia State Fire Marshal's Office Glen Allen, VA

Peter Tantala, PE Principal Tantala Associates Philadelphia, PA

Jeffrey Tennill Building Official/Chief Code Enforcement Officer City of Shelbyville Shelbyville, KY

Staff Secretariat: Ed Wirtschoreck, LA Manager, Standards International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE **CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS- PROPERTY MAINTENACE PORTION**

PM1-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

201.3 Terms defined in other codes. Where terms are not defined in this code and are defined in the International Building Code, International Fire Code, International Existing Building Code, International Residential Code, International Fuel Gas Code, International Zoning Code, International Plumbing Code, International Mechanical Code or NFPA 70, such terms shall have the meanings ascribed to them as stated in those codes.

Committee Rea son: The committee agreed t hat the International Property Maintenance Code cover s installations also addressed by the International Residential Code, the International Fuel Gas Code and the International Existing Building Code and therefore the defined terms in those codes would be appropriate. The International Existing Building Code was added as a modification as it is also related to the IPMC.

Assembly Action:

PM2-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at afe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3(1), readily available.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that cod e officials are typically not qualified to determine when plants are health y or what constitutes a minimum amount of dry foliage. Further, the proposed language, such as "nominally" and " healthy" are vague and unenforc eable. Lastly, these requirements may be better placed in a green code or standard.

Assembly Action:

PM3-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that alth ough the require ments may be appropriate, the y are in the wrong section and would perhaps be better located in Section 304.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

PM4-09/10

Committee Reason: The committee felt that requiring door operator systems to be maintained was appropriate and enhanced p ublic safety. Further, this language affords great er authority to the code official to cite these conditions where maintenance is required. Lastly, this change was preferred over PM3-09/10 based on its location.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

Approved as Modified

None

Disapproved

None

PM10-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this based on their action on PM9-09/10, which put these requirements in the body of the code rather than in an appendix. Appendices are rarely adopted, so these requirements are better in the body of the code.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

PM5-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

304.19 Gates. All exterior gates, gate assemblies, operator systems if provided, and hardware shall be maintained in good condition. <u>Lecks Latches</u> at all entrances shall tightly secure the gates.

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this proposed language provided a good description of what should be inspected and maintained with respect to gates. The modification is to incorporate more appropriate code language.

Assembly Action:

PM6-09/10

PM7-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that much of the proposal was unenforceable. The committee also felt the concerns that the proponent was trying to address are currently addressed by Section 702 and 108 of the code related to egress and structural concerns. Lastly, it appears that the IRC should have been addressed in the proposal to bring in structures under the scope of that code.

Assembly Action:

PM8-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the committee preference for PM9-09/10 as it maintains the requirements for minimum living room area.

Assembly Action:

PM9-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this change was appropriate because it replaces the current ambiguous language with clear enforceable language. Further, this change was preferred to PM8-090/10 as it maintains the requirements for minimum living room area.

Assembly Action:

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

None

None

PP-----

Withdrawn by Proponent

Approved as Modified

PM11-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that addressing a single-occupant efficiency unit is logical and the proposed minimum square footage is appropriate.

Assembly Action:

PM12-09/10

This code change was heard by the IPC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Scalding is a real concern and the proposal provides reasonable options for safety.

Assembly Action:

None

PM13-09/10

This code change was heard by the IPC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action:

506.3 Grease interceptors. Grease interceptors, grease traps and automatic grease removal devices shall be maintained in accordance with this code and the manufacturer's installation instructions. Grease interceptors, grease traps and automatic grease removal devices shall be regularly serviced and cleaned to prevent the discharge of oil, grease, and other substances harmful or hazardous to the building drainage system, the public sewer, the private sewage disposal system or the sewage treatment plant or processes. All records of maintenance, cleaning and repairs shall be available for inspection by the code official.

Committee Rea son: Modification made because previous cycle committee act ion removed grease "trap" terminology from code. Proponent's reason state ment that routine on-going maintenance is required and that records of maintenance need to be available for inspection by the code official.

Assembly Action:

PM14-09/10

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

603.7 Existing HVAC systems. <u>Air conditioning units w ith a refrigerant circuit access ports locat ed outdoors</u> shall be provided with locking-type tamper-resistant caps<u>or shall be otherwise secured to prevent unauthorized</u> <u>access</u> whenever the system is <u>recharged</u> modified, serviced, or repaired.

Committee R eason: The committee argeed t hat providing safet y caps for these outdoor access ports was justified and relatively inexpensive. Further, it was felt that owners and contractors would install these items as a liability measure. The modification clarifies that t he concern is only air conditioning units with refrigerant ports and allows methods other than the safety cap to be utilized.

Assembly Action:

PM15-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal was too broad in scope and could be interpreted as including washers, dryers, dish washers, etc... Further, if these items were to be considered, they should have been listed in the exception to allow for possible repair.

Assembly Action:

2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS

Approved as Modified

Disapproved

None

Approved As Modified

None

None

Approved as Submitted

Approved As Submitted

PM16-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the added electrical requirements for outlet covers, pool an d spa luminaries and flexible cor ds ar e appr opriate and bring t his code in line with the requir ements of the National Electrical Code (NFPA 70).

Assembly Action:

PM17-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The committee felt that the provisions for emerge ncy planning should re main in the International Fire Code only. Placing them in this code could lead to ongoing coord ination issues between the two codes.

Assembly Action:

PM18-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this proposal goes far beyond the scope and intent of this code with respect to health provisions. Health departments and social services departments currently deal with many of these issues and the y should not be part of a property maintenance code. Lastly, many of the issues can be dealt with thorough the current provisions of Chapter 3.

Assembly Action:

PM19-09/10

Part II of this code change was heard by the IEBC Code Development Committee.

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

PART I- IPMC **Committee Action:**

Committee Rea son: The committee felt that typically a cod e o fficial would not have the knowledge and experience necessary to enforce the proposed requirements. Further, if testing were required to verify whether or not mold was present, the cost of these tests may fall to the jurisdiction.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that maintenance provisions did not belong in the alterations portions of this code and perhaps be loc ated in the repairs section. Further, there should be a standard p rovided to describe the remediation methods that should be followed.

Assembly Action:

PM20-09/10

Part II of this code change was heard by the IEBC Code Development Committee.

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

509

Approved as Submitted

Disapproved

None

None

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.2.11, consensus process.

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to <u>http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx</u>.

PART I- IPMC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the requirements and methods within the EPS 40 CFR 745 were appropriate and did not pla ce undue burde n on code offici als or inspectors. Further, no certifications or testing are required to enforce these provisions. Lastly, repainting projects are not affected by these provisions.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this proposal was too broad in scope and app eared to regulate labor issues, which is not in the scope of this code. Further, there were concerns that this could create a conflict with Chapter 34 of the *International Building Code*. Lastly, if these provisions are considered, the y should also be in other chapters of this code to be applicable to other than repairs.

Assembly Action:

PM21-09/10

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to <u>http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx</u>.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that t he language was not needed and t hat the de termination of the qualifications to perform pest management should remain at the state level rather than in a model code. Also, the affects related to costs and inspections, due to multiple treatments by an authorized comp any being required, should be part of the requirements.

Assembly Action:

PM22-09/10

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to <u>http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx</u>.

Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

602.2 Residential occupancies. Dwellings shall be provided with heating facilities capable of maintaining a room temperature of 68°F (20°C) in all habitable rooms, *bathrooms* and *toilet rooms* based on the winter outdoor design temperature for the locality indicated in Appendix D of the *International Plumbing Code*. Cooking appliances shall not be used, nor shall portable unvented fuel-burning space heaters be used as the primary <u>a</u> means, to provide comfort required heating.

Exception: In areas where the average monthly temperature is above $30^{\circ}F(-1^{\circ}C)$, a minimum temperature of $65^{\circ}F(18^{\circ}C)$ shall be maintained.

Committee Re ason: The committee agreed t hat space heaters should not be used for re quired heating, recognizing the hazards associat ed with the sustained use of the se appliances. The modification clarifies that the concern is that these appliances not be use for any code-required heat, rather than as the primary means.

Assembly Action:

None

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

None

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

510

PM23-09/10

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: This standard is currently referenced in the International Residential Code.

This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

PART I- IPMC Committee Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

SECTION 705 CARBON MONOXIDE ALARMS

705.1 Carbon monoxide alarms. An approved carbon monoxide alarm shall be installed outside of every separate sleeping area in the immediate vicinity of the bedrooms in dwelling units within which a fuel-fired appliance, including a portable fuel burning space heater, exists and in dwelling units that have an attached garage.

Excepti ons:

- 1. Dwelling units in which the fuel fired appliance is located outside of the dwelling unit.
- 2. Dwelling units in which the attached garage is an open parking garage complying with Section 406.3.3.1 of the International Building Code
- 3. Dwelling units in which the attached garage is ventilated in accordance with Section 406.4.2 of the *International Building Code* and Section 404 of the *International Mechanical Code*.

705.2 Alarm requirements. Single station carbon monoxide alarms shall be listed as complying with UL 2034 and shall be installed in accordance with this code and the manufacturer's installation instructions.

Committee R eason: The committee agreed that requiring car bon mono xide alar ms for e xisting residential structures was appropriate at this time and was consistent with recent provisions in the *International Residential Code*. The modification provides consistency with actions taken on a similar change to the *International Fire Code*.

Assembly Action:

PART II- IEBC Committee Action:

Committee Re ason: The committee agreed t hat requiring carb on monoxide alarms for e xisting structures undergoing alterations in the *International Existing Building Code* was appropriate at this time and was consistent with recent provisions in the *International Residential Code*. Further it was felt to be a cost effective remedy in the interest of life safety.

Assembly Action:

PM24-09/10

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:

Committee Reason: Section 108.1.5.9 already gives the code official the tools to deal with these hazards. Further, this p roposal actually puts limits on the code official's ability to take acti on on unsafe conditions by providing specific thresholds in Section 802.5. Lastly, the exception in 802.2 is permissive as it appears to allow building ow ners to repair elements or component s that may other wise have specific requirements in other codes, simply because it does not pose a threat to public health or safety.

Assembly Action:

None

None

Disapproved

Approved as Submitted

Approved as Modified

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 – ENERGY PORTION

RE1-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proponent's intent with this code change proposal is to utilize the provisions of the International Energy Conservation Code and remove the present provisions of Chapter 11 of the IRC. The committee feels that the energy provisions of the IRC should be decided upon by a committee composed of people that understand the unique characteristics of light-frame residential construction. Therefore, the provisions of Chapter 11 should stay and remain under the control of the IRC B/E Committee.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

RE2-09/10

Committee Reason: The proponent's intent with this code change proposal is to utilize the provisions of the International Energy Conservation Code and remove the present provisions of Chapter 11 of the IRC. The committee feels that the energy provisions of the IRC should be decided upon by a committee composed of people that understand the unique characteristics of light-frame residential construction. Therefore, the provisions of Chapter 11 should stay and remain under the control of the IRC B/E Committee.

Assembly Action:

RE3-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The proponent's intent with this code change proposal is to utilize the provisions of the International Energy Conservation Code and remove the present provisions of Chapter 11 of the IRC. The committee feels that the energy provisions of the IRC should be decided upon by a committee composed of people that understand the unique characteristics of light-frame residential construction. Therefore, the provisions of Chapter 11 should stay and remain under the control of the IRC B/E Committee.

Assembly Action:

Committee Action:

RE4-09/10

Committee Reason: The proponent's intent with this code change proposal is to utilize the provisions of the International Energy Conservation Code and remove the present provisions of Chapter 11 of the IRC. The committee feels that the energy provisions of the IRC should be decided upon by a committee composed of people that understand the unique characteristics of light-frame residential construction. Therefore, the provisions of Chapter 11 should stay and remain under the control of the IRC B/E Committee.

Assembly Action:

Modify the proposal as follows:

N1101.2 Re quirements. Buildings shall be designed and constructed in accordance w ith Chapter 4 of the *International Energy Conservation Code*.

Disapproved

None

Disapproved

Disapproved

Approved as Modified

513

Disapproved

None

Reason for Modification: Replacing Chapter 11 with a reference to only Chapter 4 of the IECC would make it difficult to include the provisions of Chapter 3 that should be applicable as well.

Assembly Action:

RE5-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Maximum fenestration U-factors and SHGC values are an unnecessary restriction on energy conservation design. Su ch an approach limits t he flexibility the designer should be given t hrough the UA alternative. The argument that this deals with minimum comfort levels is spurious. The home owner will remedy that issue.

Assembly Action:

RE6-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal to be consistent with action taken on EC92-09/10.

Assembly Action:

RE7-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that referen ce to a heat trace sy stem would introduce a system that has not been carefully defined.

Assembly Action:

Disapproved

Disapproved

None

None

Disapproved

None

2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE/ZONING CODE COMMITTEE

Thomas Hall, CBO - Chair Code Administrator City of Wauseon, Ohio Wauseon, OH

Richard Lambert – Vice Chair Building Inspector City of Saco Saco, ME

Richard Crawford President Mercer Sign Consultants Doylestown, PA

Dr. Thomas Culp President Birch Point Consulting LLC La Crosse, WI

Teresa Deitz Property Maintenance Inspector City of Columbus Columbus, GA

Sean Farrell Chief Property Code Enforcement Inspector Prince William county Woodbridge, VA

Roy Fyffe Chief Building Official City of Burnet Burnet, TX **Kirk Nagle** Permit Coordinator City of Arvada Arvada, CO

Brant Pitchford Housing Supervisor City of Tulsa Tulsa, OK

Ronald Reynolds, CBO, CFO Chief Deputy, VA State Fire Marshal's Office Virginia State Fire Marshal's Office Glen Allen, VA

Peter Tantala, PE Principal Tantala Associates Philadelphia, PA

Jeffrey Tennill Building Official/Chief Code Enforcement Officer City of Shelbyville Shelbyville, KY

Staff Secretariat: Ed Wirtschoreck, LA Manager, Standards International Code Council

INTERNATIONAL ZONING CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS-

IZC1-09/10

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The provisions for lot o rientation would be more appropriate in other codes such as the *International Energy Conservation Code* and *International Residential Code* in order to coo rdinate with other energy requirements.

Assembly Action:

IZC2-09/10

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at <u>http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf</u> :

Analysis ACI 330-08: Standard was not received by ICC. Analysis AI IS-181-81: Standard was not received by ICC. Analysis ASTM D1833-87 (2007): Standard was not received by ICC. Analysis ASTM D2844-07: Standard was not received by ICC. Analysis ASTM D2940-03: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Committee Reason: The committee felt that specifications on pavement design and construction were beyond the scope of this code.

Assembly Action:

516

Disapproved

Disapproved

None