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INTRODUCTION


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 Where this report indicates Withdrawn by Proponent the proposed change was withdrawn by the proponent and is not subject to any further consideration.


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

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

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

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

Send to:
Chicago District Office
4051 West Flossmoor Road
Country Club Hills, IL 60478-5795
Fax: 708/799-0320
publiccomments@icc safe.org
Acronym   ICC Code Name (Code change number prefix)

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

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

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

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

ICC WEBSITE - WWW.ICCSAFE.ORG

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

REFERENCED STANDARDS UPDATES

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

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

MODIFICATIONS BY PUBLIC COMMENT

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

FINAL ACTION CONSIDERATION

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

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

CALL FOR ADOPTION INFORMATION

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

1.1 Purpose: The purpose of this Council Policy is to prescribe the Rules of Procedure utilized in the continued development and maintenance of the International Codes (Codes).

1.2 Objectives: The ICC Code Development Process has the following objectives:

1.2.1 The timely evaluation and recognition of technological developments pertaining to construction regulations.
1.2.2 The open discussion of proposals by all parties desiring to participate.
1.2.3 The final determination of Code text by officials representing code enforcement and regulatory agencies and by honorary members.

1.3 Code Publication: The ICC Board of Directors (ICC Board) shall determine the title and the general purpose and scope of each Code published by the ICC.

1.3.1 Code Correlation: The provisions of all Codes shall be consistent with one another so that conflicts between the Codes do not occur. Where a given subject matter or code text could appear in more than one Code, the ICC Board shall determine which Code shall be the primary document, and therefore which code development committee shall be responsible for review and maintenance of the code text. Duplication of content or text between Codes shall be limited to the minimum extent necessary for practical usability of the Codes, as determined in accordance with Section 4.4.

1.4 Process Maintenance: The review and maintenance of the Code Development Process and these Rules of Procedure shall be by the ICC Board. The manner in which ICC codes are developed embodies core principles of the organization. One of those principles is that the final content of ICC codes is determined by a majority vote of the governmental and honorary members. It is the policy of the Board that there shall be no change to this principle without the affirmation of two-thirds of the governmental and honorary members responding.

1.5 Secretariat: The Chief Executive Officer shall assign a Secretariat for each of the Codes. All correspondence relating to code change proposals and public comments shall be addressed to the Secretariat.

1.6 Video Taping: Individuals requesting permission to video tape any meeting, or portion thereof, shall be required to provide the ICC with a release of responsibility disclaimer and shall acknowledge that they have insurance coverage for liability and misuse of video tape materials. Equipment and the process used to video tape shall, in the judgment of the ICC Secretariat, be conducted in a manner that is not disruptive to the meeting. The ICC shall not be responsible for equipment, personnel or any other provision necessary to accomplish the videotaping. An unedited copy of the video tape shall be forwarded to ICC within 30 days of the meeting.

2.0 Code Development Cycle

2.1 Intent: The code development cycle shall consist of the complete consideration of code change proposals in accordance with the procedures herein specified, commencing with
the deadline for submission of code change proposals (see Section 3.5) and ending with publication of final action on the code change proposals (see Section 7.6).

2.2 **New Editions:** The ICC Board shall determine the schedule for publishing new editions of the Codes. Each new edition shall incorporate the results of the code development activity since the last edition.

2.3 **Supplements:** The results of code development activity between editions may be published.

2.4 **Emergency Procedures:** In the event that the ICC Board determines that an emergency amendment to any Code is warranted, the same may be adopted by the ICC Board. Such action shall require an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the ICC Board.

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

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

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

3.0 **Submittal of Code Change Proposals**

3.1 **Intent:** Any interested person, persons or group may submit a code change proposal which will be duly considered when in conformance to these Rules of Procedure.

3.2 **Withdrawal of Proposal:** A code change proposal may be withdrawn by the proponent (WP) at any time prior to Final Action Consideration of that proposal. A withdrawn code change proposal shall not be subject to a public hearing, motions, or Final Action Consideration.

3.3 **Form and Content of Code Change Submittals:** Each code change proposal shall be submitted separately and shall be complete in itself. Each submittal shall contain the following information:

3.3.1 **Proponent:** Each code change proposal shall include the name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address of the proponent.

- **3.3.1.1** If a group, organization or committee submits a code change proposal, an individual with prime responsibility shall be indicated.
- **3.3.1.2** If a proponent submits a code change on behalf of a client, group, organization or committee, the name and mailing address of the client, group, organization or committee shall be indicated.

3.3.2 **Code Reference:** Each code change proposal shall relate to the applicable code sections(s) in the latest edition of the Code.

- **3.3.2.1** If more than one section in the Code is affected by a code change proposal, appropriate proposals shall be included for all such affected sections.
- **3.3.2.2** If more than one Code is affected by a code change proposal, appropriate proposals shall be included for all such affected Codes and appropriate cross referencing shall be included in the supporting information.
3.3.3 **Multiple code change proposals to a code section.** A proponent shall not submit multiple code change proposals to the same code section. When a proponent submits multiple code change proposals to the same section, the proposals shall be considered as incomplete proposals and processed in accordance with Section 4.3. This restriction shall not apply to code change proposals that attempt to address differing subject matter within a code section.

3.3.4 **Text Presentation:** The text proposal shall be presented in the specific wording desired with deletions shown struck out with a single line and additions shown underlined with a single line.

3.3.4.1 A charging statement shall indicate the referenced code section(s) and whether the proposal is intended to be an addition, a deletion or a revision to existing Code text.

3.3.4.2 Whenever practical, the existing wording of the text shall be preserved with only such deletions and additions as necessary to accomplish the desired change.

3.3.4.3 Each proposal shall be in proper code format and terminology.

3.3.4.4 Each proposal shall be complete and specific in the text to eliminate unnecessary confusion or misinterpretation.

3.3.4.5 The proposed text shall be in mandatory terms.

3.3.5 **Supporting Information:** Each code change proposal shall include sufficient supporting information to indicate how the proposal is intended to affect the intent and application of the Code.

3.3.5.1 **Purpose:** The proponent shall clearly state the purpose of the proposed code change (e.g. clarify the Code; revise outdated material; substitute new or revised material for current provisions of the Code; add new requirements to the Code; delete current requirements, etc.)

3.3.5.2 **Reasons:** The proponent shall justify changing the current Code provisions, stating why the proposal is superior to the current provisions of the Code. Proposals which add or delete requirements shall be supported by a logical explanation which clearly shows why the current Code provisions are inadequate or overly restrictive, specifies the shortcomings of the current Code provisions and explains how such proposals will improve the Code.

3.3.5.3 **Substantiation:** The proponent shall substantiate the proposed code change based on technical information and substantiation. Substantiation provided which is reviewed in accordance with Section 4.2 and determined as not germane to the technical issues addressed in the proposed code change shall be identified as such. The proponent shall be notified that the proposal is considered an incomplete proposal in accordance with Section 4.3 and the proposal shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected. The proponent shall have the right to appeal this action in accordance with the policy of the ICC Board. The burden of providing substantiating material lies with the proponent of the code change proposal.

3.3.5.4 **Bibliography:** The proponent shall submit a bibliography of any substantiating material submitted with the code change proposal. The bibliography shall be published with the code change and the proponent shall make the substantiating materials available for review at the appropriate ICC office and during the public hearing.

3.3.5.5 **Copyright Release:** The proponent of code change proposals, floor modifications and public comments shall sign a copyright release reading: “I hereby grant and assign to ICC all rights in copyright I may have in any authorship contributions I make to ICC in connection with any proposal and public comment, in its original form submitted or revised form, including written and verbal modifications submitted in accordance Section 5.5.2. I understand that I will have no rights in any ICC publications that use such contributions in the form submitted by me or another similar form..."
and certify that such contributions are not protected by the copyright of any other person or entity.

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

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

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

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

3.6.1 Code References:

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

3.6.2 Standard Content:

3.6.2.1 A standard or portions of a standard intended to be enforced shall be written in mandatory language.
3.6.2.2 The standard shall be appropriate for the subject covered.
3.6.2.3 All terms shall be defined when they deviate from an ordinarily accepted meaning or a dictionary definition.
3.6.2.4 The scope or application of a standard shall be clearly described.
3.6.2.5 The standard shall not have the effect of requiring proprietary materials.
3.6.2.6 The standard shall not prescribe a proprietary agency for quality control or testing.
3.6.2.7 The test standard shall describe, in detail, preparation of the test sample, sample selection or both.
3.6.2.8 The test standard shall prescribe the reporting format for the test results. The format shall identify the key performance criteria for the element(s) tested.
3.6.2.9 The measure of performance for which the test is conducted shall be clearly defined in either the test standard or in Code text.
3.6.2.10 The standard shall not state that its provisions shall govern whenever the referenced standard is in conflict with the requirements of the referencing Code.
3.6.2.11 The preface to the standard shall announce that the standard is promulgated according to a consensus procedure.

3.6.3 Standard Promulgation:

3.6.3.1 Code change proposals with corresponding changes to the code text which include a reference to a proposed new standard or a proposed update of an existing referenced shall comply with this section. The standard shall be completed and readily available prior to Final Action Consideration based on the cycle of code development which includes the proposed code change proposal. In order for a new standard to be considered for reference by the Code, such standard shall be submitted in at least a consensus draft form in accordance with Section 3.4. Updating of standards without corresponding
code text changes shall be accomplished administratively in accordance with Section 4.5.

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

4.0 Processing of Proposals

4.1 Intent: The processing of code change proposals is intended to ensure that each proposal complies with these Rules of Procedure and that the resulting published proposal accurately reflects that proponent’s intent.

4.2 Review: Upon receipt in the Secretariat’s office, the code change proposals will be checked for compliance with these Rules of Procedure as to division, separation, number of copies, form, language, terminology, supporting statements and substantiating data. Where a code change proposal consists of multiple parts which fall under the maintenance responsibilities of different code committees, the Secretariat shall determine the code committee responsible for determining the committee action in accordance with Section 5.6.

4.3 Incomplete Proposals: When a code change proposal is submitted with incorrect format, without the required information or judged as not in compliance with these Rules of Procedure, the Secretariat shall notify the proponent of the specific deficiencies and the proposal shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected, with a final date set for receipt of a corrected submittal. If the Secretariat receives the corrected proposal after the final date, the proposal shall be held over until the next code development cycle. Where there are otherwise no deficiencies addressed by this section, a proposal that incorporates a new referenced standard shall be processed with an analysis of referenced standard’s compliance with the criteria set forth in Section 3.6.

4.4 Editorial: The Chief Executive Officer shall have the authority at all times to make editorial and format changes to the Code text, or any approved changes, consistent with the intent, provisions and style of the Code. An editorial or format change is a text change that does not affect the scope or application of the code requirements.

4.5 Updating Standards:

4.5.1 Standards referenced in the 2012 Edition of the I-Codes: The updating of standards referenced by the Codes shall be accomplished administratively by the Administrative code development committee in accordance with these full procedures except that the deadline for availability of the updated standard and receipt by the Secretariat shall be December 1, 2011. The published version of the 2012 Code which references the standard will refer to the updated edition of the standard. If the standard is not available by the deadline, the edition of the standard as referenced by the newly published Code shall revert back to the reference contained in the previous edition and an errata to the Code issued Multiple standards to be updated may be included in a single proposal.

4.5.2 Standards referenced in the 2015 Edition and following Editions of the I-Codes: The updating of standards referenced by the Codes shall be accomplished administratively by the Administrative code development committee in accordance with these full procedures except that multiple standards to be updated may be included in a single proposal. The standard shall be completed and readily available prior to Final Action Consideration of the Administrative code change proposal which includes the proposed update.

4.6 Preparation: All code change proposals in compliance with these procedures shall be prepared in a standard manner by the Secretariat and be assigned separate, distinct and consecutive numbers. The Secretariat shall coordinate related proposals submitted in accordance with Section 3.3.2 to facilitate the hearing process.

4.7 Publication: All code change proposals shall be posted on the ICC website at least 30 days prior to the public hearing on those proposals and shall constitute the agenda for the public hearing. Code change proposals which have not been published shall not be considered.
5.0 Public Hearing

5.1 Intent: The intent of the public hearing is to permit interested parties to present their views including the cost and benefits on the code change proposals on the published agenda. The code development committee will consider such comments as may be presented in the development of their action on the disposition of such proposals. At the conclusion of the code development committee deliberations, the committee action on each code change proposal shall be placed before the hearing assembly for consideration in accordance with Section 5.7.

5.2 Committee: The Code Development Committees shall be appointed by the applicable ICC Council.

5.2.1 Chairman/Moderator: The Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall be appointed by the Steering Committee on Councils from the appointed members of the committee. The ICC President shall appoint one or more Moderators who shall act as presiding officer for the public hearing.

5.2.2 Conflict of Interest: A committee member shall withdraw from and take no part in those matters with which the committee member has an undisclosed financial, business or property interest. The committee member shall not participate in any committee discussion on the matter or any committee vote. Violation thereof shall result in the immediate removal of the committee member from the committee. A committee member who is a proponent of a proposal shall not participate in any committee discussion on the matter or any committee vote. Such committee member shall be permitted to participate in the floor discussion in accordance with Section 5.5 by stepping down from the dais.

5.2.3 Representation of Interest: Committee members shall not represent themselves as official or unofficial representatives of the ICC except at regularly convened meetings of the committee.

5.2.4 Committee Composition: The committee may consist of representation from multiple interests. A minimum of thirty-three and one-third percent (33.3%) of the committee members shall be regulators.

5.3 Date and Location: The date and location of each public hearing shall be announced not less than 60 days prior to the date of the public hearing.

5.4 General Procedures: The Robert’s Rules of Order shall be the formal procedure for the conduct of the public hearing except as a specific provision of these Rules of Procedure may otherwise dictate. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting members of the committee.

5.4.1 Chair Voting: The Chairman of the committee shall vote only when the vote cast will break a tie vote of the committee.

5.4.2 Open Meetings: Public hearings of the Code Development Committees are open meetings. Any interested person may attend and participate in the Floor Discussion and Assembly Consideration portions of the hearing. Only eligible voters (see Section 5.7.4) are permitted to vote on Assembly Considerations. Only Code Development Committee members may participate in the Committee Action portion of the hearings (see Section 5.6).

5.4.3 Presentation of Material at the Public Hearing: Information to be provided at the hearing shall be limited to verbal presentations and modifications submitted in accordance with Section 5.5.2. Audio-visual presentations are not permitted. Substantiating material submitted in accordance with Section 3.3.4.4 and other material submitted in response to a code change proposal shall be located in a designated area in the hearing room and shall not be distributed to the code development committee at the public hearing.

5.4.4 Agenda Order: The Secretariat shall publish an agenda for each public hearing, placing individual code change proposals in a logical order to facilitate the hearing. Any public hearing attendee may move to revise the agenda order as the first order of business at the public hearing, or at any time during the hearing except while another proposal is being discussed. Preference shall be given to grouping like subjects together, and for moving items back to a later position on
the agenda as opposed to moving items forward to an earlier position. A motion to revise the agenda order is subject to a 2/3 vote of those present and voting.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. is not legible, unless not required to be written in accordance with Section 5.5.2.1; or
2. changes the scope of the original proposal; or
3. is not readily understood to allow a proper assessment of its impact on the original proposal or the code.
The ruling of the Chairman on whether or not the modification is in or out of order shall be final and is not subject to a point of order in accordance with Section 5.4.7.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5.7.3 Assembly Action: The assembly action shall be in accordance with the following majorities based on the number of votes cast by eligible voters (See 5.7.4).
5.7.4 **Eligible Voters:** All members of ICC in attendance at the public hearing shall be eligible to vote on floor motions. Only one vote authorized for each eligible attendee. Code Development Committee members shall be eligible to vote on floor motions. Application, whether new or updated, for ICC membership must be received by the Code Council ten days prior to the commencement of the first day of the public hearing.

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

6.0 **Public Comments**

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

6.1.1 Consideration of items for which a public comment has been submitted; and

6.1.2 Consideration of items which received a successful assembly action at the public hearing.

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

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

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

6.4.1 **Public comment:** Each public comment shall include the name, title, mailing address, telephone number and email address of the public commenter. If group, organization, or committee submits a public comment, an individual with prime responsibility shall be indicated. If a public comment is submitted on behalf a client, group, organization or committee, the name and mailing address of the client, group, organization or committee shall be indicated. The scope of the public comment shall be consistent with the scope of the original code change proposal, committee action or successful assembly action. Public comments which are determined as not within the scope of the code change proposal, committee action or successful assembly action shall be identified as such. The public commenter shall be notified that the public comment is considered an incomplete public comment in accordance with Section 6.5.1 and the public comment shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected. A copyright
release in accordance with Section 3.3.4.5 shall be provided with the public comment.

6.4.2 **Code Reference**: Each public comment shall include the code change proposal number and the results of the public hearing, including successful assembly actions, on the code change proposal to which the public comment is directed.

6.4.3 **Multiple public comments to a code change proposal**: A proponent shall not submit multiple public comments to the same code change proposal. When a proponent submits multiple public comments to the same code change proposal, the public comments shall be considered as incomplete public comments and processed in accordance with Section 6.5.1. This restriction shall not apply to public comments that attempt to address differing subject matter within a code section.

6.4.4 **Desired Final Action**: The public comment shall indicate the desired final action as one of the following:
1. Approve the code change proposal as submitted (AS), or
2. Approve the code change proposal as modified (AM) by one or more specific modifications published in the Results of the Public Hearing or published in a public comment, or
3. Disapprove the code change proposal (D)

6.4.5 **Supporting Information**: The public comment shall include in a statement containing a reason and justification for the desired final action on the code change proposal. Reasons and justification which are reviewed in accordance with Section 6.4 and determined as not germane to the technical issues addressed in the code change proposal or committee action shall be identified as such. The public commenter shall be notified that the public comment is considered an incomplete public comment in accordance with Section 6.5.1 and the public comment shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected. The public commenter shall have the right to appeal this action in accordance with the policy of the ICC Board. A bibliography of any substantiating material submitted with a public comment shall be published with the public comment and the substantiating material shall be made available at the Final Action Hearing.

6.4.6 **Number**: One copy of each public comment and one copy of all substantiating information shall be submitted. Additional copies may be requested when determined necessary by the Secretariat. A copy of the public comment in electronic form is preferred.

6.5 **Review**: The Secretariat shall be responsible for reviewing all submitted public comments from an editorial and technical viewpoint similar to the review of code change proposals (See Section 4.2).

6.5.1 **Incomplete Public Comment**: When a public comment is submitted with incorrect format, without the required information or judged as not in compliance with these Rules of Procedure, the public comment shall not be processed. The Secretariat shall notify the public commenter of the specific deficiencies and the public comment shall be held until the deficiencies are corrected, or the public comment shall be returned to the public commenter with instructions to correct the deficiencies with a final date set for receipt of the corrected public comment.

6.5.2 **Duplications**: On receipt of duplicate or parallel public comments, the Secretariat may consolidate such public comments for Final Action Consideration. Each public commenter shall be notified of this action when it occurs.

6.5.3 **Deadline**: Public comments received by the Secretariat after the deadline set for receipt shall not be published and shall not be considered as part of the Final Action Consideration.

6.6 **Publication**: The public hearing results on code change proposals that have not been public commented and the code change proposals with public commented public hearing results and successful assembly actions shall constitute the Final Action Agenda. The Final Action Agenda shall be posted on the ICC website at least 30 days prior to Final Action consideration.
7.0 Final Action Consideration

7.1 Intent: The purpose of Final Action Consideration is to make a final determination of all code change proposals which have been considered in a code development cycle by a vote cast by eligible voters (see Section 7.4).

7.2 Agenda: The final action consent agenda shall be comprised of proposals which have neither an assembly action nor public comment. The agenda for public testimony and individual consideration shall be comprised of proposals which have a successful assembly action or public comment (see Sections 5.7 and 6.0).

7.3 Procedure: The Robert’s Rules of Order shall be the formal procedure for the conduct of the Final Action Consideration except as these Rules of Procedure may otherwise dictate.

7.3.1 Open Meetings: Public hearings for Final Action Consideration are open meetings. Any interested person may attend and participate in the Floor Discussion.

7.3.2 Agenda Order: The Secretariat shall publish an agenda for Final Action Consideration, placing individual code change proposals and public comments in a logical order to facilitate the hearing. The proponents or opponents of any proposal or public comment may move to revise the agenda order as the first order of business at the public hearing, or at any time during the hearing except while another proposal is being discussed. Preference shall be given to grouping like subjects together and for moving items back to a later position on the agenda as opposed to moving items forward to an earlier position. A motion to revise the agenda order is subject to a 2/3 vote of those present and voting.

7.3.3 Presentation of Material at the Public Hearing: Information to be provided at the hearing shall be limited to verbal presentations. Audio-visual presentations are not permitted. Substantiating material submitted in accordance with Section 6.4.4 and other material submitted in response to a code change proposal or public comment shall be located in a designated area in the hearing room.

7.3.4 Final Action Consent Agenda: The final action consent agenda (see Section 7.2) shall be placed before the assembly with a single motion for final action in accordance with the results of the public hearing. When the motion has been seconded, the vote shall be taken with no testimony being allowed. A simple majority (50% plus one) based on the number of votes cast by eligible voters shall decide the motion.

7.3.5 Individual Consideration Agenda: Upon completion of the final action consent vote, all proposed changes not on the final action consent agenda shall be placed before the assembly for individual consideration of each item (see Section 7.2).

7.3.6 Reconsideration: There shall be no reconsideration of a proposed code change after it has been voted on in accordance with Section 7.3.8.

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

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

7.3.8 Discussion and Voting: Discussion and voting on proposals being individually considered shall be in accordance with the following procedures:

7.3.8.1 Allowable Final Action Motions: The only allowable motions for final action are Approval as Submitted, Approval as Modified by one or more modifications published in the Final Action Agenda, and Disapproval.
7.3.8.2 **Initial Motion**: The Code Development Committee action shall be the initial motion considered, unless there was a successful assembly action in accordance with Section 5.7.3. If there was a successful assembly action, it shall be the initial motion considered. If the assembly action motion fails, the code development committee action shall become the next motion considered.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Hearing Action (see note)</th>
<th>Desired Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Simple Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>$2/3$ Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>$2/3$ Majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS FOR FINAL ACTION MAY 14 – 23, 2010</th>
<th>IN DALLAS, TX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Building Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Safety</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of Egress</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Existing Building Code</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Fire Code</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Fuel Gas Code</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Mechanical Code</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Plumbing Code</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Residential Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Wildland-Urban Interface Code</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS FOR FINAL ACTION OCTOBER 28 – NOVEMBER 1, 2010 IN CHARLOTTE, NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC Administrative Code Provisions</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Energy Conservation Code</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Property Maintenance Code</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Residential Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Zoning Code</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.)
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  - Mechanical (RM)
  - Plumbing (RP)
- **International Wildland-Urban Interface Code®** (IWUIC)
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INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE
FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE
HEARING RESULTS

FS1-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

FS2-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This proposal clarifies the current intent of the code by requiring compliance with all applicable code requirements for fire assemblies that serve multiple purposes.
Assembly Action: None

FS3-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Using the term “building elements” limits the scope of the definition, based on the definition of building elements. Further, the term “linear opening” is specific and descriptive and should remain in the definition. Also, the term “linear” is consistent with terminology used in the referenced standards dealing with joints. Lastly, the term “void” is too broad.
Assembly Action: None

FS4-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that passive and active fire protection should not be used together, specific to ASTM E119 and UL263 testing. Further, code officials should not be attempting to determine if a proposed test completely meets the requirements of test methods ASTM E119 or UL263. Lastly, 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: None

FS5-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that Chapter 26 sufficiently deals with the requirements for foam plastic materials. Further, neither the proposed text nor the proposed test standard (NFPA 259) contains pass fail criteria. Therefore there is no guidance on what to do with the test results. Lastly, these requirements are in the wrong location as foam plastic materials are combustible materials.
Assembly Action: None
FS6-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that this was not needed as it was redundant with the action they took on FS4-09/10.
Assembly Action: None

FS7-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the closer spacing and larger letter height would aid in enforcement of these provisions. The modification provides for consistent letter sizing, which again will aid in enforcement of these provisions.
Assembly Action: None

FS8-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal was unclear in that penetrations through rated assemblies required by Table 601 may require protection depending on the details of the assembly. For example, penetrations through a cavity-type wall (studs and sheathing) may need to be protected in order to keep products of combustion out of the wall cavity.
Assembly Action: None

FS9-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that these provisions were confusing and should be located in charging text rather than in an exception. Further, it would be more appropriate for the provisions to be located where the code addresses heavy timber construction.
Assembly Action: None

FS10-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that change will accommodate the 6'-4" width of a pair of 36" doors in a hollow metal frame, which is consistent with common construction practice.
Assembly Action: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS11-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong> Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: None |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS12-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong> Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: None |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS13-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong> Approved as Modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modify the proposal as follows:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>705.2.3 Combustible projections.</strong> Combustible projections located where openings are not permitted, or where protection of openings is required or where a combination of protected and unprotected openings are permitted shall be of at least 1-hour fire-resistance-rated construction, Type IV construction, fire-retardant-treated wood or as required by Section 1406.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

| Assembly Action: None |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS14-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong> Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: None |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS15-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong> Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> The committee agreed that projection requirements should also be considered for buildings on the same lot that are not considered as one building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: None |
FS16-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: There was no justification provided to show the fire resistance characteristics of fire blocking as compared to gypsum board. Further, the terms “fire resistive” and “fire rating” are not consistent with terms currently used in the code.
Assembly Action: None

FS17-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that referencing only Table 601 could lead to confusion, in that Table 602 should also be considered and may result in a higher fire resistance rating.
Assembly Action: None

FS18-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt more substantiation was required to justify this sprinkler trade-off and to clarify why in some cases an NFPA 13R or NFPA 13D system are considered appropriate protection to allow the trade-off.
Assembly Action: None

FS19-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed requirement for proportional spacing of openings is too subjective and unenforceable.
Assembly Action: None

FS20-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposal is impractical to enforce based on verification of the conditions of an existing building. Further, the language is confusing in that it could be interpreted to be more restrictive for buildings on the same lot than for buildings on separate adjacent lots.
Assembly Action: None

FS21-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposal is impractical to enforce based on verification of the conditions of an existing building. Further, the language is confusing in that it could be interpreted to be more restrictive for buildings on the same lot than for buildings on separate adjacent lots. Also, Section 705.8.6.1 appears to reduce the distance between buildings from 30 feet to 15 feet without technical justification.
Assembly Action: None
**FS22-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved  

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**FS23-09/10**

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

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

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**FS24-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**FS25-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**FS26-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**FS27-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None
FS28-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: There was no technical justification to support the 20 wall length allowance. Further, the proposed language could be interpreted to allow 100 percent openings in a fire wall that is 20 feet or less in length.

Assembly Action: None

FS29-09/10
PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The disapproval is based on the request for disapproval from the proponent based on previous code change activity.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IFC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Replace the proposal as follows:

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

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

Assembly Action: None

FS30-09/10
Withdrawn by Proponent

FS31-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that high merchandise display in Group M occupancies is a fire safety concern, which warrants the 3 hour separation regardless of the display area or the presence of automatic sprinklers.

Assembly Action: None

FS32-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the term “to construct” was not clearer than the current language and therefore the additional language was not needed.

Assembly Action: None

FS33-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the same requirement to protect the joint of a fire barrier and the underside of the floor should also applies to the joint of a fire barrier and an exterior wall.

Assembly Action: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS34-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: Renumbering Chapter Section 708 to 714 would not be appropriate based on other committee actions where coordinating changes were disapproved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS35-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS36-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS37-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at <a href="http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf">http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf</a>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: The committee agreed that referencing NFPA 82-09 for refuse and laundry chutes in Group I2 occupancies was appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS38-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS39-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Approved as Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modify the proposal as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>708.3 Materials.</strong> The shaft enclosure shall be of materials permitted by the building type of construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>708.3.1 Shaft enclosure at rubbish and laundry chutes.</strong> The shaft enclosure containing a rubbish or laundry chute shall include the following provisions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>708.3.1.1 Single sided construction.</strong> 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. The open doors 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 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 Reason: The committee agreed that rubbish and laundry chute access doors should remain latched and closed in the event of failure of the self-closing mechanism (tension spring). The modification removed any changes to the identified sections based on the committees previous actions to include referenced to NFPA 82 (FS37-09/10)

Assembly Action: None

FS40-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS41-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS42-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS43-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent
FS44-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS45-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exceptions:

(Exceptions to remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action: None

FS46-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS47-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS48-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS49-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: The committee agreed that it is common practice for many elevators within highrise buildings serve only the lower floors and as such should not require enclosed elevator lobbies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS50-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: Based on the committees action taken on FS45-09/10. Also, the proposed wording seems confusing when compared to the proponents intent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS51-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS52-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: Based on the proponents request for disapproval. Also, the committee felt the substantiation was lacking and in some cases contradictory to what the proposal was trying to do. Further, not permitting stair pressurization in this case conflicts with other requirements in the code where stair pressurization is required for highrise buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS53-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS54-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FS55-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**FS56-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

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

712.1.4 Penetrations. Penetrations by pipe, tube, conduit, wire, cable and vents shall be protected in accordance with Section 714.2.4.

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**FS57-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**FS58-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**FS59-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**FS60-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None
FS61-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exceptions:

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

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

Assembly Action: None

FS62-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS63-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS64-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
FS65-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed change would conflict with Section 712.1 where you would need to go to Table 601 to determine the requirements for fire resistance. Further, Section 102.1 of the code differentiates between general and specific requirements sufficiently so coordination with 420 is not required and in fact might cause confusion instead of clarity.

Assembly Action: None

FS66-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval was to avoid conflict with previously approved proposal 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: None

FS67-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the proponent’s request.

Assembly Action: None

FS68-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The different methods of protecting the power cables should be described in the proposal for clarity. The proposal assumes that the power cables are metal clad and insulated, which may not always be the case. Lastly, the allowable voltage of the power cables should be indicated.

Assembly Action: None

FS69-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that protection of floor drains, tub drains or shower drains provided by a membrane of a horizontal assembly was appropriate.

Assembly Action: None

FS70-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that there was no technical justification for the T-rating requirement to be added for all through penetration firestop systems. The committee also felt that the exception to 713.4.1.1.2 has been well established and should not be removed.

Assembly Action: None

FS71-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the T-rating for the items described in item 4 of 713.3.2 was appropriate and was cost effective to achieve during the testing of the boxes and therefore should remain as a requirement.

Assembly Action: None
### FS72-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved  
**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that there was a concern over the availability of approved contractors to provide these installations nation-wide. Further, the term “approved agency” puts the responsibility on the code official to approve these agencies, which in many cases they are not qualified to do.  
**Assembly Action:** None

### FS73-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved  
**Committee Reason:** As with FS72-09/10, the committee felt that there should be a limitation for smaller buildings. Also, there was a concern over the availability of approved contractors to provide these installations nation-wide. Further, the term “approved agency” puts the responsibility on the code official to approve these agencies, which in many cases they are not qualified to do.  
**Assembly Action:** None

### FS74-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved  
**Committee Reason:** The committee felt some of the terms, such as “impractical” and “impossible” were too subjective and difficult to determine. Further, the phrase “calculations performed in an approve manner” is difficult to determine and perhaps unenforceable. Lastly, Section 104.11 already allows for alternative methods.  
**Assembly Action:** None

### FS75-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved  
**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the ceiling membrane should be continuous and uninterrupted; however if this proposal were to be considered it should be limited to nonfireresistance rated partitions or fire partitions.  
**Assembly Action:** None

### FS76-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved  
**Committee Reason:** Disapproval was requested by the proponent based on the committee’s action on FS56-09/10.  
**Assembly Action:** None

### FS77-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified  
**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that using the listed L rating for determining air leakage rate was appropriate. The modification aligns the definition of L rating with the industry recognized definition.  
**Assembly Action:** None
FS78-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS79-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS80-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS81-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS82-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS83-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS84-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
FS85-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that there should be a limitation for smaller buildings. Also, there was a concern over the availability of approved contractors to provide these installations nation-wide. Further, the term “approved agency” puts the responsibility on the code official to approve these agencies, which in many cases they are not qualified to do.
Assembly Action: None

FS86-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: As with FS85-09/10, the committee felt there was a concern over the availability of approved contractors to provide these installations nation-wide. Further, the term “approved agency” puts the responsibility on the code official to approve these agencies, which in many cases they are not qualified to do.
Assembly Action: None

FS87-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that since the criteria for F rating includes passage of heat and hot gasses that this change was editorial and ultimately easier to enforce.
Assembly Action: None

FS88-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:
714.4 Exterior curtain wall/floor intersection. Where fire resistance-rated floor or floor/ceiling assemblies are required, voids created at the intersection of the exterior curtain wall assemblies and such floor assemblies shall be sealed with an approved system to prevent the interior spread of fire. Such systems shall be securely installed and tested in accordance with 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 capable of preventing the passage of flame and hot gases sufficient to ignite cotton waste where subjected to ASTM E119 time-temperature fire conditions under a minimum positive pressure differential of 0.01 inch (0.254 mm) of water column (2.5 Pa) for the time period at least equal to the fire-resistance rating of the floor assembly.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal appropriately allows for assemblies that are commonly used in current building practice to be approved based on ASTM E119 time-temperature exposure conditions. The modification recognizes that the glass could extend up or down. Changing cable to capable was considered editorial.
Assembly Action: None

FS89-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent

FS90-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that these changes should be done in the development of the referenced standard rather than in the code. Further, the limit of 30 minutes in Section 714.4.2 may not be appropriate for situations where the floor fire-resistance rating is greater than this.
Assembly Action: None
FS91-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the term "perimeter fire barrier" was not needed and could cause confusion rather than clarity.
Assembly Action: None

FS92-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee concluded that since there have been no safety issues brought forth regarding joints between dissimilar materials and assemblies, this proposed language was not necessary.
Assembly Action: None

FS93-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on previous committee actions the proponent requested disapproval. Further, the committee suggested that this subject matter be brought in front of the ICC-ES Technical Committee under their process.
Assembly Action: None

FS94-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed provisions would conflict with the atrium provisions in Chapter 4 of the code related to the atrium enclosure wall requirements.
Assembly Action: None

FS95-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that listing and testing requirements for the electronic controls in horizontal sliding doors was not technically justified. Further, these requirements appear to be in the wrong location. Lastly, the committee had several unanswered questions as the proponent was not present for testimony.
Assembly Action: None

FS96-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that these provisions were not necessary to enforce the code. Elevator manufacturers have indicated that they can not achieve smoke and draft control requirements, therefore the option is to provide an enclosed elevator lobby, which are clearly provided for in the code.
Assembly Action: None
FS97-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed wording was confusing with respect to door requirements and door vision panel requirements. Further, NFPA 257 is the appropriate standard and should not be eliminated.

Assembly Action: None

FS98-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that NFPA 257 is the appropriate standard and should remain. Further, the 24 inch measurement in Section 715.4.3.2.1 is unclear and arbitrary.

Assembly Action: None

FS99-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee preferred the language in FS107-09/10. Further, the language is unclear with respect to door requirements and door vision panel requirements.

Assembly Action: None

FS100-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the presence of sprinklers in the building should not eliminate the life safety and fire spread hazard posed by unrestricted transmission of radiant heat flux through large sizes of fire protection rated glazing panels especially when those doors are protecting exit enclosures or passageways.

Assembly Action: None

FS101-09/10
PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposed glazing marking is appropriate and consistent with Section 2403.1.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: To be consistent with the committee’s action on FS101-09/10 Part I.

Assembly Action: None

FS102-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The term “assemblies” appropriately includes the frame, which makes the requirements more conservative. Further, this is consistent with the committee’s actions on FS107-09/10.

Assembly Action: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS103-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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 &amp; Glazing”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td>The following modification was considered editorial:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: | None |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS104-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>The committee felt that there was no substantiation provided to show that the 1-½ hour protection was not appropriate for openings within exterior walls with a rating greater than 1 hour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: | None |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS105-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: | None |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS106-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: | None |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS107-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: | None |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS108-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>Disapproval was based on the proponent's request.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: | None |
FS109-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS110-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS111-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS112-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS113-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS114-09/10

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

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

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

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

3.1. The duct shall not exceed 100 square inches (0.06 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 (38mm by 38mm by 1.52 mm) steel retaining angles. The retaining angles shall be secured to the sleeve and the wall with No. 10 (M5) screws. The annular space between the steel sleeve and the wall opening shall be filled with mineral wool batting on all sides.

4. Such walls are penetrated by ducted HVAC systems, have a required fire-resistance rating of 1 hour or less, and are in buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2. For the purposes of this exception, a ducted HVAC system shall be a duct system for conveying supply, return or exhaust air as part of the structure’s HVAC system. Such a duct system shall be constructed of sheet steel not less than 26 gauge thickness and shall be continuous from the air-handling appliance or equipment to the air outlet and inlet terminals.

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

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

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

Assembly Action: **None**

**FS115-09/10**

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

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

Assembly Action: **None**

**FS116-09/10**

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

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

Assembly Action: **None**

**FS117-09/10**

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

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

Assembly Action: **None**
PART I - IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify proposal as follows:

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

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

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

Assembly Action: None

FS119-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS120-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
FS121-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS122-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS123-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS124-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IPC

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART III - IRC

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS125-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
FS126-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the revised language was consistent with terminology use in the 2005 edition of the NDS.
Assembly Action: None

FS127-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on lack of supporting data (test report) to verify this assembly. Approved design can contain many details and specifications and the committee could not verify these without a test report that included a description.
Assembly Action: None

FS128-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the requirements were being decreased without justification and therefore the proposal was more than editorial.
Assembly Action: None

FS129-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Lack of substantiation to address the fire retardant relationship between the asbestos and the building paper.
Assembly Action: None

FS130-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval was based on the proponent’s request and the committee’s previous actions on FS5-09/10.
Assembly Action: None

FS131-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the critical spacing is not greater than 16 inches and therefore a spacing of less than 16 inches will be appropriate.
Assembly Action: None

FS132-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal is a correlative change between Section 721.6.2.3 and 705.5 based on previous code change activity, specifically FS16-07/08.
Assembly Action: None
FS133-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on the committee’s action on FS133-09/10 Part I.

Assembly Action: None

FS134-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt the wording was confusing in that the packaging could be tested and labeled rather than the material.

Assembly Action: None

FS135-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee felt that this proposal clarified the intent of the section with respect to the issue of thin finish materials and the construction used to fur them from the face of the wall.

Note: The following modification was considered editorial:

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

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

Assembly Action: None

FS136-09/10

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that NFPA 286 was also an appropriate test method for polypropylene based on its similarity to polyethylene with respect to fire exposure.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IFC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Based on the committee’s action on FS136-09/10 Part I.

Assembly Action: None
**FS137-09/10**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: | None |

**FS138-09/10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: | None |

**FS139-09/10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: | None |

**FS140-09/10**

**PART I - IBC FIRE SAFETY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: | None |

**PART II - IRC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: | None |

**FS141-09/10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>The committee felt that deleting defined terms from the code is not appropriate or justified in this case.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assembly Action: | None |
FS142-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS143-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS144-09/10

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

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

PART I - IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action: Approved as modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action:

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
FS145-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee was concerned about the disposition of the referenced standard, ANSI 137. Further, the committee felt the proposal should be limited to porcelain tiles only and suggests the proponent bring the change back for final action with the approved standard and the suggested revisions.
Assembly Action: None

FS146-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal clarified that cast artificial stone with minimum thickness of 1-1/2 inches is an anchored veneer rather than an adhered veneer.
Assembly Action: None

FS147-09/10
PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that there is no difference in performance between plywood, OSB, or composite panels where the use of a Class III vapor retarder is concerned and therefore the term "wood structural panel" is appropriate.
Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change appropriately groups wood structural panels into a single category.
Assembly Action: None

FS148-09/10
This code change was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee.
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Testing of anchored masonry veneer has shown that the horizontal reinforcement has no beneficial effect. This code change removes this unnecessary requirement from the code.
Assembly Action: None

FS149-09/10
This code change was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee.
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:
1405.7 Stone veneer. Stone veneer units not exceeding 10 inches (254 mm) in thickness shall be anchored directly to masonry, concrete or to stud construction by one of the following methods:
1. (No change to current text)
2. With wood stud backing, a 2-inch by 2-inch (51 by 51 mm) 0.0625-inch (1.59 mm) corrosion-resistant wire mesh with two layers of water-resistive barrier in accordance with Section 1404.2 shall be applied directly to wood studs spaced a maximum of 16 inches (406 mm) o.c. On studs, the mesh shall be attached with 2-inch-long (51 mm) corrosion-resistant steel wire furring nails at 4 inches (102
mm) o.c. providing a minimum 1.125-inch (29 mm) penetration into each stud and with 8d common nails at 8 inches (203 mm) o.c. into top and bottom plates or with equivalent wire ties. There shall be not less than a 0.1055-inch (2.68 mm) corrosion-resistant wire, or approved equal, looped through the mesh for every 2 square feet (0.2 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) corrosion-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 uncoated 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: None

FS150-09/10

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS151-09/10

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
**FS152-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**FS153-09/10**

Withdrawn by Proponent

**FS154-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**FS155-09/10**

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

PART II- IRC B/E

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**FS156-09/10**

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

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

PART II- IRC B/E

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

Add to Table R703.3.1 fourth row title “EPS” and values in first column “95 125 130”, add to Table R703.4 reference to footnote “aa” to ‘Foam plastic sheathing into stud’ column heading, delete added words to Table R703.4 footnote ‘j’, add strike out Section R703.5.1, add strike out and correct cross-reference Section R703.11.2.1.
TABLE R703.3.1
REQUIREMENTS FOR FOAM PLASTIC SHEATHING IN EXTERIOR WALL COVERING ASSEMBLIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foam Plastic Sheathing Material</th>
<th>Foam Sheathing Thickness (in)</th>
<th>Maximum Wind Speed (mph) – Exposure B*</th>
<th>Walls with Interior Finish</th>
<th>Walls without Interior Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16&quot; oc framing 24&quot; oc framing</td>
<td>16&quot; oc framing 24&quot; oc framing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16&quot; oc framing 24&quot; oc framing</td>
<td>16&quot; oc framing 24&quot; oc framing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Siding Offset from Foam Sheathing per Section R703.3.2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPS</th>
<th>¾&quot;</th>
<th>1&quot;</th>
<th>≥1-1/2&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIDING MATERIAL</th>
<th>NOMINAL THICKNESS (inches)</th>
<th>JOINT TREATMENT</th>
<th>WATER RESISTIVE BARRIER REQUIRED</th>
<th>TYPE OF SUPPORTS FOR THE SIDING MATERIAL AND FASTENERSbc,d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood or wood structural panel sheathing</td>
<td>Fiberboard sheathing into stud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

R703.11.2.1 Basic wind speed not exceeding 90 miles per hour and Exposure Category B. Where the basic wind speed does not exceed 90 miles per hour (40 m/s), the Exposure Category is B and gypsum wall board or equivalent is installed on the side of the wall opposite the foam plastic sheathing, the minimum siding fastener penetration into wood framing shall be 1 1/4 inches (32 mm) using minimum 0.120-inch diameter nail (shank) with a minimum 0.313-inch diameter head, 16 inches on center. The foam plastic sheathing minimum thickness shall comply with Section R703.3.1 and shall not exceed a maximum thickness of 1.5 inches (38 mm) 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 C1280, or 1-inch-thick (25 mm) (nominal) expanded polystyrene per ASTM C578. Vinyl siding shall be permitted to be installed on furring strips in accordance with Section R703.2.2 using the siding manufacturer’s installation instructions when foam plastic sheathing thickness complies with Section R703.3.1.

(Portions of proposal not shown, remain the unchanged)

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
FS157-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS158-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS159-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS160-09/10

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

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

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS161-09/10

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

Analysis: The standard was not received by ICC staff.

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
FS162-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Note: The following modification was considered editorial:

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

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

Assembly Action: None

FS163-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

1. MCM shall have a self-ignition temperature of 650°F (343°C) or greater when tested in accordance with ASTM D 1929.
2. MCM shall have a smoke-developed index of not more than 450 when tested in the maximum thickness intended for use in accordance with ASMT E 84 or UL 723 or a maximum average smoke density rating not greater than 75 when tested in the maximum thickness intended for use in accordance with ASTM D 2843.
3. 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.
3. MCM shall conform to one of the following combustibility classifications when tested in accordance with ASTM D 635:

   Class CC1: Materials that have a burning extent of 1 inch (25 mm) or less when tested at a nominal thickness of 0.060 inch (1.5 mm), or in the thickness intended for use.
   Class CC2: Materials that have a burning rate of 2 ½ inches per minute (1.06 mm/s) or less when tested at a nominal thickness of 0.060 inch (1.5 mm), or in the thickness intended for use.

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action: None
FS164-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that these were appropriate technical requirements for the new finish material and that suggested improvements related to referencing equivalent testing standards can be proposed in the public comment period for Final Action consideration.
Assembly Action: None

FS165-09/10
Withdrawn by Proponent

FS166-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that Section 2603.3 already has this requirement and therefore this proposal is redundant.
Assembly Action: None

FS167-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the current language was clearer than the proposal.
Assembly Action: None

FS168-09/10
PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that in current construction practices there are more conditions where there is direct communication between crawl spaces and attics and the interior of the building. As such, providing this as a limitation for allowing foam plastics to be protected only by an ignition barrier is appropriate.
Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change clarifies this section more and adds an additional layer of safety as stated in the proponent's published reason.
Assembly Action: None

FS169-09/10
PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that using inorganic coated glass mat as an ignition barrier was not justified. Further, the appropriateness of the testing threshold is unknown.
Assembly Action: None
PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS170-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS171-09/10
PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS172-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS173-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
FS174-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee felt that these requirements are appropriate to qualify a foam plastic for use in plenums.
Assembly Action: None

FS175-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on the committee’s previous action on FS174-09/10 and the proponent’s request for disapproval.
Assembly Action: None

FS176-09/10
PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on apparent conflicts with the International Energy Conservation Code and the proponent’s request for disapproval.
Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on the proponent’s request for disapproval. The proponent will work with industry and incorporate the out of order modification and bring this back to the Final Action.
Assembly Action: None

FS177-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt there was insufficient data to support this allowance and that if this was to be placed in the code it should be in a separate exception.
Assembly Action: None

FS178-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that it was appropriate to include smoke developed requirements for interior finishes qualified under the special approval requirements to provide a comparable level of safety to the provisions of Chapter 8.
Assembly Action: None

FS179-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this change clarifies and coordinates the relationship between testing performed in accordance with NFPA 285 and testing performed for special approval.
Assembly Action: None
FS180-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS181-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS182-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exceptions:

(Exception remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action: None

FS183-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS184-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
FS185-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action: None

FS186-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS187-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS188-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

FS189-09/10

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

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

Analysis: Review of proposed new standards ASTM D 7032 and D 7031 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6. Review of proposed new standard ASTM D 2017 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.2(1). Review of proposed new document AC 174 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria. Acceptance criteria are developed for use solely by ICC-ES for purposes of issuing ICC-ES evaluation reports. Acceptance criteria are not for use outside of the ICC-ES system. ICC-ES Acceptance Criteria are not intended to be code-referenced documents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Committee Action</th>
<th>Committee Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FS190-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS191-09/10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS192-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS193-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS194-09/10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The committee agreed that this proposal appropriately clarifies the intent and application of the requirements for smoke and draft control doors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS195-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Disapproval was based on the lack of technical justification for the lesser thickness of sub-duct in exception 2.1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FS195-09/10

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

PART I- IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS196-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

FS197-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the average total heat release (3 MJ/m²) 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: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Title</th>
<th>Organization/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Weed, CBO</td>
<td>Chair, Rep: City of Central Plans Analyst/Instructor</td>
<td>Colorado Code Consulting, Thornton, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Stimac, RA, CB O</td>
<td>Chair, Director of Building and Zoning City of Troy</td>
<td>Troy, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Davies</td>
<td>Chief Plans Examiner</td>
<td>Salt Lake City Corporation, Salt Lake City, UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Jamison</td>
<td>Rep: International Assoc. of Fire Chiefs Division Chief/Fire Marshal San Ramon Valley Fire Protection District San Ramon, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickie Lovell</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>InterCode Incorporated, Delray Beach, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer Maiel, PE, CBO</td>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>City of San Jose, Building Division San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Merlino</td>
<td>Construction Official</td>
<td>Village of Ridgewood, Ridgewood, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Morgan, MCP</td>
<td>Building Commissioner</td>
<td>City of Frontenac, Frontenac, MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Myers</td>
<td>Master Plans Examiner</td>
<td>State of Ohio Reynoldsburg, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Nicholls, AIA</td>
<td>Chief Building Official</td>
<td>City of Mason Mason, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Pruitt, FAIA</td>
<td>President/CEO</td>
<td>Pruitt Consulting, Inc., Keller, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Rice, CBO</td>
<td>Master Plans Examiner</td>
<td>Reynoldsburg, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Sue Rouw, AIA, LEED, AP</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager/Architect Treanor Architects</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Satula</td>
<td>Rep: ICC Upper Great Plains Region III Director of Inspection Services Village of Greendale Greendale, WI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Secretariat:</td>
<td>Kermit Robinson, CBO</td>
<td>Senior Technical Staff International Code Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agustin Mujica</td>
<td>Rep: National Assoc. of Home Builders Co-Owner &amp; Vice President of Operations Levitt Homes Corporation San Juan, PR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G1-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G2-09/10

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

PART I - IBC STRUCTURAL

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II – IRC – B/E

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G3-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

G4-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
PART I - IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

VAPOR PERMEABLE MEMBRANE. A material or covering. The property of having a moisture vapor permeance rating of 5 40 perms (2.9 5.7 x 10^{-10} kg/Pa m 2 s) 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: None

PART II – IRC – B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

VAPOR PERMEABLE MEMBRANE. A material or covering. Having a moisture vapor permeance rating of 5 40 perms (2.9 5.7 x 10^{-10} kg/Pa m 2 s) 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: None

G6-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G7-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G8-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal because there was no clear analysis of the implications of changing the time period under which a structure is considered temporary. Such a change would need to be correlated through the rest of the codes as well as its application to other structures rather than just modular structures. If a change in the length of time were to be
considered, it should be stated in days as compared to months because a month is an extended period and would not be consistently applied.

**Assembly Action:** None

**G9-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**G10-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**G11-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**G12-09/10**

Withdrawn by Proponent

**G13-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**G14-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

Assembly Action: None

G15-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

G16-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G17-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G18-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G19-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
G20-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

DETOXIFICATION FACILITIES. Facilities that provided 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 provide care or treatment for the medical, psychiatric, obstetrical, or surgical treatment of inpatients care recipients that are incapable of self-preservation.

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

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

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action: None

G21-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G22-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G23-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
G24-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The IRC has its own sprinkler requirements and the IBC should not be used to specify sprinkler requirements in buildings subject to the IRC. In addition it would set up a conflict between the sprinkler systems allowed by the IRC and those that would be required under this change.

Assembly Action: None

G25-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change because it did not clearly address how to treat multiple mercantile spaces each with an occupant load of less than 50, but located in the same building. Would the occupant load of these spaces be aggregated? The application of other code provisions were also unclear to the committee including the determination of toilet facilities. This could result in sprinklers not being required in a mercantile space that would be required under Group M. Occupants of a Group B tend to be familiar with the spaces they are using, which can not be said for occupants in a mercantile area.

Assembly Action: None

G26-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee preferred G27-09/10. While the extended lists may be helpful, there was a concern that the overlaps were not clear. Finally the committee felt that the redundant use of transient and non-transient was helpful and some of those were eliminated by this proposal.

Assembly Action: None

G27-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Committee approved the change because it provided a clear format for these provisions and shows that the extensive listing shown in G26-09/10 is not needed.

Assembly Action: None

G28-09/10
PART I- IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposal would set up a potential conflict with the already defined term of ‘sleeping unit’ and therefore the application of Chapter 11 would be unclear. There would also be a need to address this use in Chapter 29 regarding plumbing fixture requirements.

Assembly Action: None

PART II – IRC – B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a good change but it needs more work. The term “to be constructed” implies new construction and renovations need to be addressed. Also, some of the distinctions would be better suited in the Zoning Code rather than the IRC.

Assembly Action: Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exceptions:

1. Live/work units complying with the requirements of Section 419 of the International Building Code shall be permitted to be built as one- and two-family dwellings or townhouses. Fire suppression required by Section 419.5 of the International Building Code when constructed under the International Residential Code for One- and Two-family Dwellings shall conform to Section P2904.9.03.1.3 of the International Building Code.

2. Owner occupied lodging houses with five or fewer guest rooms shall be permitted to be constructed in accordance with the International Residential Code for One- and Two-family Dwellings.

(Exceptions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

G29-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G30-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G31-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G32-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
G33-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposal could create large warehouse spaces in covered mall buildings, and such space would be inappropriate. Where they were access by the exit passageways, there would be an increase of movement of goods and materials in the passageways running a higher risk that the path of egress travel would be blocked. Such spaces would not have the same relationship with the mercantile space as would a storage area at the back of a retail space would have. In the latter there would likely be more staff activity where potential problems could be more readily observed.

Assembly Action: None

G34-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposal presents a radical departure from years of determining the allowable size of buildings based on both height and area. Without area limits, any building would become an unlimited area building and the code would no longer require 60 foot wide open areas surrounding such buildings – thus eliminating the access for firefighting operations. Work in the past cycles by the CTC and others attempted to resolved height and area issues. For each such change the committee requested to see technical justification for changing the requirements in Table 503 and related sections. Like many of those past proposals, this proposal is without technical substantiation. The very brief reason does not provide any examples of the impact of eliminating area limits from the code.

Assembly Action: None

G35-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The change clarifies the provisions. The committee found that the current requirement that increased the requirements applicable to a detached parking garage located near a covered mall building to be unjustified.

Assembly Action: None

G36-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed fire barrier requirement is excessive. The concept of the proposal is flawed because you won’t have an unsprinklered condition because mall buildings are required to be sprinkler protected whether they are a covered or open mall building.

Assembly Action: None

G37-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the existing code language was sufficiently clear regarding atriums in mall buildings. If there is a need for a distinction regarding various atrium facilities in a covered mall building, revised language should clarify why the distinction is necessary and the analysis needed to determine the distinction.

Assembly Action: None
G38-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The change provides consistency with Section 402.12.1.
Assembly Action: None

G39-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee did not find that there was a good correlation between the concept of compartmentation and the proponent’s stated goal that this additional level of protection would work toward preventing collapse of building involved in catastrophic events. They found the 10,000 square foot number to be arbitrary and not technically substantiated.
Assembly Action: None

G40-09/10
This code change was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee.
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposal would require the enclosure walls to resist more than the structure, floors and the stair framing are capable of withstanding. In the event of a blast it is preferable that the walls blow out rather than the floor collapse. The determination of this proposed pressure remains unclear and seems to be arbitrary – whether it be the 2 psi as originally proposed or the 1.3 psi offered as a modification. The ability of current enclosure wall systems to resist the proposed loading is questionable and there was not enough information provided on what types of enclosure construction could satisfy this requirement. The provision should also provide some direction to designers and building officials. There are questions on the testing of 8 feet high wall panels and the extrapolation of the results to greater height walls. Before taking this step, the committee would prefer to see the ASCE/SEI blast document that is being developed. In addition, there appears to be a lack of an appropriate systems engineering approach to solving the problem. Instead there is some feeling of a preconceived notion of a solution to some vaguely specified problem. There’s concern that we may spend the time and money strengthening stair enclosures, yet the next blast event could result in the same problem or create new problems that are worse than the one that we’re attempting to solve. The reason airplanes are not designed for blasts is that there is no agreement on the size of the blast, yet that is what this proposal tries to do inside the building. There’s some concern that all this requirement would do is give a terrorist the information needed to size a bomb so that it will take out a stair enclosure.
Assembly Action: None

G41-09/10
This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety Code Development Committee.
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee’s disapproval is based on the lack of substantiating data to show that bond strength failure is not an issue for SFRM. Further, this action provides for consistency with the committees action on G42-09/10.
Assembly Action: None
G42-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G43-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

G44-09/10

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

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

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

PART I- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IFC

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G45-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
G46-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G47-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G48-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G49-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

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

Assembly Action: None
G50-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee liked the proposed reformatting of the provisions because it provided clarity to the existing requirements, however the change included some technical flaws. Therefore the committee felt that G51-09/10 better addressed the issue.
Assembly Action: None

G51-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposal provides a clear answer to the question of whether doors are allowed in the glass wall forming the separation between an atrium and adjoining spaces.
Assembly Action: None

G52-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposal sets no limit on the number of stories or travel distance. In tall buildings the atrium could potentially fill up with smoke enough that some upper floors would have the use of the exit stairway jeopardized. It is not clear how this revision will coordinate with the committee's approval of E5-09/10 for open exit access stairways and open exit stairways.
Assembly Action: None

G53-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:
SECTION 406
MOTOR-VEHICLE RELATED OCCUPANCIES
(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)
Committee Reason: The committee approved the change because it provides a clearer organization of the motor vehicle related sections found in Section 406. The committee modified the proposal to delete the references to other codes as unnecessary.
Assembly Action: None

G54-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The organization issues were resolved by approval of Item G53-09/10. The committee was uncertain that the revised definitions contained in this proposal were necessary or provided clear application to the rest of the section. In addition there was concern regarding adding a vehicle weight limit to the definition of a parking garage. The committee was concerned regarding its enforceability or that it was even necessary.
Assembly Action: None
G55-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None

G56-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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

406.1.4 Separation. Separations shall comply with the following:

1. The private garage shall be separated from the dwelling unit and its attic area by means of a minimum 1/2-inch (12.7 mm) gypsum board applied to the garage side. Garages beneath habitable rooms shall be separated from all habitable rooms above by not less than a 5/8-inch (15.9 mm) Type X gypsum board or equivalent and 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 self-closing and self-latching.

2. and 3. (no change to current text)

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II – IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G57-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G58-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
G59-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal because the open parking garage standards have been working for many years and the proponent did not provide sufficient justification to make the change. There was no clear basis for the proposed 6 foot dimension. Finally the committee found the proposed text unclear.
Assembly Action: None

G60-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee found the text confusing and it would seem to require a below grade area that would have to be wider at the bottom than at the top of the opening at grade. There was debate whether the 1 - 1/2 factor was appropriate.
Assembly Action: None

G61-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the values for height and area provided in Table 406.3.5 are sufficient for open parking garages and that additions allowed by Sections 504 and 506 would be an inappropriate expansion in the allowable size of open parking garages.
Assembly Action: None

G62-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee believes that the proposal provides a fair approach which will provide consistent ventilation for each level of a parking garage regardless of the floor to ceiling height of the particular design or the demands imposed on the design by different construction types. The 7 foot dimension correlates to the minimum required ceiling height in parking garages.
Assembly Action: None

G63-09/10
Withdrawn by Proponent

G64-09/10
Both parts of this code change proposal were heard by the General Code Development Committee.

PART I- IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that standards for automated garages eventually need to be in the code, however this proposal needs further refinement. Among the issues identified by the committee that need to be clarified are: How would sprinklers be provided; Should there be different criteria if these are in open versus enclosed garages; Egress and accessibility need to be addressed; While there may be limited occupant load, the occupancy is still a storage facility for cars, therefore a Group S occupancy. Clear provisions on structural requirements would need to be added.
Assembly Action: None

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

Assembly Action: None

G65-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action: None

G66-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G67-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
G68-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None

G69-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that the stage floor 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: None

G70-09/10

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

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

Assembly Action: None

G71-09/10

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

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

Assembly Action: None

G72-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:

[F] 414.5.3 Standby or emergency power. Where mechanical ventilation, treatment systems, temperature control, alarm, detection or other electrically operated systems are required by the International Mechanical Code, the International Fire Code or this code, such systems shall be provided with an emergency or standby power system in accordance with this code or the ICC Electrical Code.

Exceptions: (Exceptions not shown remain unchanged.)

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal as it correlates the requirements for explosion control with the IFC. Section 911.1 of the IFC would require explosion control both if the hazard exists regardless of amounts of hazardous materials or when hazardous materials listed in Table 911.1 exceed the maximum allowable quantities in Table 2703.1.1(1) of the IFC. The IBC
currently only addresses explosion control when the MAQ’s have been exceeded. The modification simply deletes the reference to the IMC in Section 414.5.3 as the IFC already contains the proper link to the requirements in the IMC.

**Assembly Action:** None

### G73-09/10

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

**Part I - IBC**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**Part II - IFC**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

### G74-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

### G75-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

**Assembly Action:** None
G76-09/10

Committee Action: 
Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: 
None

G77-09/10

Committee Action: 
Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: 
None

G78-09/10

Committee Action: 
Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: 
None

G79-09/10

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

Committee Action: 
Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: 
None

G80-09/10

Committee Action: 
Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: 
None

G81-09/10

Committee Action: 
Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposed change because it appeared by be addressing concerns of property protection and not life safety of the occupants of such buildings. Fire statistics cited were concentrating on buildings under construction, not those completed with required
systems in place and occupied by residents. The committee concluded that the safeguards are adequate to continue to allow Group R occupancies to be located in buildings of combustible construction.

Assembly Action: None

G82-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G83-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G84-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G85-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G86-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal is written too broadly and would have a greater impact than the issues discussed by the proponent. At the same time the proposal doesn’t really resolve the issues raised. Chapter 9 requires floors below an assembly occupancy to be sprinkler protected, such would
not be guaranteed by this proposal. Reference to the means of egress requirements is redundant. This might be more acceptable if it specifically addressed the height and area issues and didn't try to redefine an occupancy.

**Committee Action:**

**Committee Reason:**

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

**Assembly Action:**

None

---

**G87-09/10**

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

---

**G88-09/10**

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

---

**G89-09/10**

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

---

**G90-09/10**

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

---

**G91-09/10**

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

---

**G92-09/10**

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent provided no new data or information to provide technical justification for this change. The committee felt that the issues of height and area have been more than adequately reviewed both during the original drafting of the code and through the subsequent
studies of the CTC. This proposal provided no information that distinguished it from past proposals that were disapproved in the past code development cycles.

Assembly Action: None

G93-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action: None

G94-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent

G95-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

G96-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the change because it provides clarity to the measurement of open areas and public ways in two key areas of the code. It reflects the application of these provisions that the measurement includes all adjoining yards/open areas as well as public ways. Measurement differs from fire separation distance. It clarifies the measurement of open space next to building facades for calculation of allowable area increases in Section 506.2.1 and for measurement of open area surrounding unlimited area buildings in Section 507. This amendment is compatible with those contained in G97-09/10 and G98-09/10.

Assembly Action: None
G97-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The change, with those of G96 and G98-09/10 bring clarification to the measure of W for determining allowable area increases. This revision clarifies the application to multiple building sites.
Assembly Action: None

G98-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Providing a formula makes the code clear and easier to apply. This change was approved by the committee because the formula provides a 'definition' for the term weighted average and clearly shows the code user how to calculate it. This change with G96 and G97-09/10 work together to clarify Section 506.2.1.
Assembly Action: None

G99-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that while the code often has provisions different than, and superseding of, referenced standards, the departure from the NFPA standard contained in this proposal would be better reviewed by NFPA in the context of revising the sprinkler standard. While the proposal concentrated on the make-up of the roof sheathing, the committee noted the presence of other combustible materials in attics, especially structural framing supporting the roof, that would be unprotected.
Assembly Action: None

G100-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Although the committee thought the concept included in the proposal may be an appropriate option to add to the code, it found the language of the proposal unclear and misleading. The committee expressed concern that the resulting building would potentially have first stories approaching unlimited area scale without any provision to improve firefighter access surrounding the building. Significantly smaller upper stories could also be set back a significant distance from the walls of lower story, again providing a challenging firefighter access issue. There appeared to be a potential that under a mixed occupancy scenario that an even larger building than intended could be achieved.
Assembly Action: None

G101-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee understood the concept of the proposal, but felt it needed to be more specific as to the accessory occupancies of concern or how they be applicable in the various unlimited area building scenarios. The use of the term 'listed' is not as the term is defined. The committee speculated that because 10% of an unlimited area building could be quite a large area whether a limit to the tabular value of Table 503 might not be appropriate.
Assembly Action: None
### G102-09/10
**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted  
**Committee Reason:** The change was approved because it provides clarity regarding the relationship between the occupancies allowed in a Section 507.3 building and the construction type or types associated with the group of occupancies.  
**Assembly Action:** None

### G103-09/10
**Committee Action:** Disapproved  
**Committee Reason:** The committee concluded that retaining this exception was not in conflict with the general limitations of Chapter 9 of the IBC and IFC because it was a specific provision that would take precedence over the general. The concerns expressed by supporters of the code change that these facilities get used for activities other than those listed were felt to be enforcement issues and should not be the basis of a code change. The listed activities are clearly those which have very limited fuel load on the sporting surface. The committee acknowledged that an amendment that would clarify that the exception applies to just the sporting area and not surrounding support functions such as spectator seating, locker or dressing facilities or concession areas would be appropriate.  
**Assembly Action:** None

### G104-09/10
**Committee Action:** Disapproved  
**Committee Reason:** The committee found the format of the proposal very appealing in the clarity it would bring to these provisions, however it appeared that the reformat includes a technical change in the relationship of the hazardous material area located at the building perimeter and the measurement of that perimeter.  
**Assembly Action:** None

### G105-09/10
**Committee Action:** Disapproved  
**Committee Reason:** The proponent did not provide sufficient technical support to justify reducing the allowed Type IIIA allowed unlimited area building to the unrated Type IIIB. This could result in a significant increase in combustible materials in the building construction that would not be protected by one hour assemblies.  
**Assembly Action:** None

### G106-09/10
**Committee Action:** Disapproved  
**Committee Reason:** The committee disapproved this change because there was not justification that allowing motion picture theaters of unlimited size in a combustible building construction type where they are now only allows in non-combustible construction types.  
**Assembly Action:** None

### G107-09/10
**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted  
**Committee Reason:** The committee found the code change appropriate because it clarifies that the activities and facilities listed in Table 508.2.5 present a special hazard regardless whether the building is a single occupancy or a mixed occupancy. The change would make sure that these standards are met regardless of the approach taken to address mixed occupancies. These things are uses or building support facilities and not occupancies unto themselves. The committee expressed
concern that divorcing these provisions from the accessory use provisions would allow these features to exceed the 10% area limitation of accessory occupancy. While this part of the provision could be refined by public comment, the committee was comfortable that the term incidental was sufficiently clear that were such features/uses to become the primary or only use of a building, that it would judged to be not 'incidental'.

Assembly Action: None

G108-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G109-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G110-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G111-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G112-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
G113-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee approved this change to provide consistency in application of these provisions between Group I-2 and in Ambulatory care facilities. Both occupancies are treating patients who may not be able to respond to emergency situations. The protection of the waste and linen rooms will reduce potential hazards to the patients of ambulatory care facilities.

Assembly Action: None

G114-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The intent of the proposal that all parking garages present a hazard in combination with other occupancies is an implication that is not substantiated by fire statistics. Parking garages have a proven track record, especially open garages. The provision, if appropriate may be more appropriate located or referenced in Section 406 as well as having connection to Section 508.4.

Assembly Action: None

G115-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The term calculated is confusing. Many provisions of the code require calculation. The term separated occupancies is well understood in context of its opposing option - non-separated mixed occupancies.

Assembly Action: None

G116-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The added reference is not needed. The code is well understood that Section 402 takes precedence over the occupancy separation provisions of Section 508. The committee could not support commencing another 'list' of exceptions or references when they are not needed.

Assembly Action: None

G117-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change because it did not feel that it clarified the application of the section. The language could be construed to require separation between different uses contained on the same list under a single type of occupancy such as between a restaurant and a tavern.

Assembly Action: None
## 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 | A-3 | A-4 | A-5 | B′ | E | F-1 | F-2 | H-1 | H-2 | H-3 | H-4 | H-5 | I-1 | I-2 | I-3 | I-4 | M′ | R-1 | R-2 | R-3, R-4 | S-1 | S-2 | U |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| A-1 | --  | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2  | 3  | 2   | NP  | 4   | 3   | 2   | 4   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 1   |
| A-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-3  | --  | 2   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 2  | NP  | 4   | 3   | 2   | 4   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 1   |
| A-4  | --  | 2   | 2   | 3   | 2   | NP  | 4   | 3   | 2   | 4   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 1   |
| A-5  | --  | 2   | 3   | 2   | NP  | 4   | 3   | 2   | 4   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 1   |
| B′   | --  | 2   | 3   | 2   | NP  | 4   | 3   | 2   | 4   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 1   |
| E    | --  | 3   | NP  | 4   | 3   | 2   | 4   | 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   | 3   |
| F-2  | --  | NP  | 2   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 1   |
| H-1  | --  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  | NP  |
| H-2  | --  | 1   | 2   | 2   | 4   | 4   | 4   | 4   | 2   | 4   | 4   | 4   | 4   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   |
| H-3  | --  | 1   | 1   | 4   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   |
| H-4  | --  | 1   | 4   | 4   | 4   | 4   | 4   | 4   | 1   | 4   | 4   | 4   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   |
| H-5  | --  | 4   | 4   | 4   | 3   | 1   | 4   | 4   | 4   | 4   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 3   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   |
| I-1  | --  | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 4   | 3   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   |
| I-2  | --  | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   |
| I-3  | --  | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   |
| I-4  | --  | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   |
| M′   | --  | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   |
| R-1  | --  | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   |
| R-2  | --  | 2   | 3   | 2   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   |
| R-3  | --  | 3   | 2   | 1   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   |
| R-4  | --  | 3   | 3   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   |
| S-1  | --  | 3   | 3   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   |
| S-2  | --  | 3   | 3   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 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:**
None
## TABLE 508.4
REQUIRED SEPARATION OF OCCUPANCIES (HOURS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1, I-3, I-4</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-2, S-2, U</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, F-1, M, S-1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-3, H-4, H-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Assembly Action: None

## G120-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

(Portions of table not shown are unchanged)

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

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

Assembly Action: None
G121-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproved based on the preferred action taken on G120-09/10.
Assembly Action: None

G122-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Deleting the footnote and adding provisions to only Group A-2 would leave in questions the application to kitchens serving schools, places of religious worship and fire houses. A definition of commercial kitchen would need to be provided; and would be helpful in clarifying this activity in this and other situations such as catering kitchens.
Assembly Action: None

G123-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee concluded that the issues were not one of building or occupant safety but of proper plan review. The listing of possible separation construction options was confusing. There was no technical substantiation provided for always requiring an actual separation.
Assembly Action: None

G124-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes approved under G118-09/10 and this change would be unnecessary.
Assembly Action: None

G125-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes approved under G118-09/10 and this change would be unnecessary.
Assembly Action: None

G126-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes approved under G118-09/10 and this change would be unnecessary.
Assembly Action: None
G127-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes approved under G118-09/10 and this change would be unnecessary.
Assembly Action: None

G128-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes approved under G118-09/10 and this change would be unnecessary.
Assembly Action: None

G129-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes approved under G118-09/10 and this change would be unnecessary.
Assembly Action: None

G130-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee preferred the changes approved under G118-09/10 and this change would be unnecessary.
Assembly Action: None

G131-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee was uncomfortable that the apparent effect of the change would be to allow a 5 story shaft which would only be rated as a one hour enclosure for four stories.
Assembly Action: None

G132-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: This is another version of G131-09/10 and was disapproved to be consistent with the previous action.
Assembly Action: None

G133-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The change was approved as it was a simple and appropriate editorial clarification to the provision.
Assembly Action: None

G134-09/10
Withdrawn by Proponent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G135-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> While the committee understood the issue raised by the proponent, they were not convinced that the change actually clarified the application of the code. There was specific concern regarding the term 'outer perimeter' and how that might be interpreted differently in each jurisdiction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong> None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G136-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong> None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G137-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong> None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G138-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> No technical substantiation was provided to justify reducing the protection of Type IIIIB construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong> None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G139-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong> None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G140-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong> None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G141-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The text of the proposal was dependent on the approval of a related change to Chapter 7. That proposal heard by the Fire Safety Code Development Committee was disapproved.

Assembly Action: None

G142-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposal would allow too much combustible materials into non-combustible construction types. This change is more than just sheathing, but gets to the structural elements of a building. It is not appropriate to allow wood floors to be constructed in high-rise buildings where the concept is to defend people in place during a fire incident.

Assembly Action: None

G143-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proponent did not provide technical justification to restrict use of standard wood for simply blocking purposes. It was questioned whether there were fire retardant products available for all typical blocking situations. There was no information presented of a loss history because blocking materials were wood other than FRTW.

Assembly Action: None

G144-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee found the concept embodied in the proposal intriguing but found the proposed text unclear and confusing. The technique may work for typical residential construction methods and designs but probably not for typical commercial buildings. Section 1203.2 requires that cross ventilation be provided in attic spaces. This proposed section hangs there with no connection from Section 1203.2.

Assembly Action: None

G145-09/10
PART I- IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The change resolves issues imposed by the current text. It puts the incentive in correct format to direct the code user to provide better ventilation. It also allows flat roof situations to be addressed where a 3 foot vertical distance between upper and lower vents can not be achieved. It also eliminates the ability to interpret the section to allow all ventilation openings on the ridge of a roof.

Assembly Action: None

PART II – IRC- B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee feels that the language of proposal RB158-09/10 more adequately addresses this issue.

Assembly Action: None
G146-09/10

PART I - IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G147-09/10

PART I - IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G148-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

Assembly Action: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G149-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G150-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G151-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: The requirement is not needed because it is adequately addressed in the referenced NFPA 70. The proposed discretion for the building official and fire code official would result in inconsistent application of the system. The installation of a system to complete shut down a building would be expensive and difficult.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G152-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: At the request of the proponent, the committee disapproved the proposal because the proposed referenced standard does not comply with ICC standards for referenced documents. The committee also questioned whether this equipment needed to be regulated by the building code as it does not convey people from floor to floor but is used for material conveyance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G153-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal because they felt that the requirement is adequately covered by the standard and the requirement doesn't need to be repeated in the code. In addition, the proposed language is poorly crafted, and would seem to prohibit inspection by qualified inspectors employed by the jurisdiction. The proponent did not clarify why this language was necessary in the code.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assembly Action: None

PART II- IFC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproved for consistency with the action taken on Part I.

Assembly Action: None

PART III- IPMC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproved for consistency with the action taken on Parts I and II.

Assembly Action: None

G154-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: This language needs to be provided in the code and not force building officials or designers to consult the standard for 10 simple words.

Assembly Action: None

G155-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The lighting is only needed for the use of firefighters. It has no relationship to the use of any elevator for accessible means of egress or for occupant self evacuation.

Assembly Action: None

G156-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: While the committee was supportive of the concept intended by the proposal, they disapproved the proposal as written. The proposal was unclear regarding what would be required, where the identification would be placed, how the designation would be made. Numbered elevators if posted on the frame of the hoistway door could be confused with floor numbers.

Assembly Action: None

G157-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.

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

Assembly Action: None
G158-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This clarifies that the same exemptions for sprinklers installed in the elevator machine room and shaft and the installation for shunt trips permitted for Occupant Evacuation Elevators in Section 3008.6 should also be permitted in Fire Service Access Elevators.

Assembly Action: None

G159-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Committee Reason: The modification to the proposal is to coordinate with what is required in ASME A17.1 and will require activation of the fire recall from all three locations listed. The proposal provides the fire service a standardized way to initiate the fire recall process.

Assembly Action: None

G160-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: With the reference to Section 403.2.3, it is not clear if the requirement for hardened shaft would be applicable for all Fire Service Access elevators (starting at 120 feet), or just those in Seismic Category III and IV or only at buildings taller than 420 feet. The intent of the proponent is for all Fire Service Access elevators to be hardened at 120 feet regardless of seismic category. The correct placement for this requirement is in Section 402.3.2. Justification for the additional costs must be provided.

Assembly Action: None

G161-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.
Committee Action: Disapproved
**Committee Reason:** Sufficient justification was not provided for additional costs and problems in dealing with pressurization requirements in 120 foot tall buildings. G164-09/10 will address the issue of possible smoke infiltration when the fire department is running the fire hose from the stand pipe and out of the stairway door.

**Assembly Action:** None

### G162-09/10

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

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

### G163-09/10

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

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

### G164-09/10

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

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

### G165-09/10

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

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Committee Action</th>
<th>Committee Reason</th>
<th>Assembly Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G166-09/10</td>
<td>This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G167-09/10</td>
<td>This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G168-09/10</td>
<td>This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G169-09/10</td>
<td>This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G170-09/10</td>
<td>This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Means of Egress Code Development Committee.</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Reason: This reference to Section 1003.7 could be perceived as the Fire Service Access Elevators and Occupant Evacuation Elevator being a trade off for means of egress requirements. These elevators are aids for means of egress, and not a replacement.

Assembly Action: None

G171-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

G172-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

1. The operation of an automatic sprinkler system complying with Section 3008.6;
2. Smoke detectors required by another provision of the code; or required as an alternative standard complying with Section 3008.1.1.
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: None

G173-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G174-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This coordinates with the committee’s decision in G162-09/10. The performance language for this requirement will allow a wide variety of design options and provides
protection for the hoistway from possible water infiltration. Water does cause problems for elevators during a fire event, so this protection is needed. The requirements do clarify that protection is not needed from sprinklers activated within the lobby since the elevators will go into fire department recall if there is smoke/fire in the elevator lobbies.

Assembly Action: None

G175-09/10
Withdrawn by Proponent

G176-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

G177-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G178-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee expressed 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: None

G179-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
G180-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal because it was found not to be clear in its wording or how it would be applied. The committee was not made aware of any entrance ‘requirement’ that needed to be addressed by this proposed text.
Assembly Action: None

G181-09/10
This code change was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee.
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This code change closes a loophole in the design of communication towers under the referenced standard, TIA-222, by excluding exceptions related to seismic design. It is more appropriate that the design of these structures consider seismic loading.
Assembly Action: None

G182-09/10
Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:
Analysis: Review of the proposed new standards indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standards do not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section Sections 3.6.2.1 and 3.6.2.4, Mandatory language.
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed standards did not comply with the ICC policy regarding referenced standards. In addition, the proposal was disapproved at the request of the proponent in order to allow the work on the new ICC swimming pool code to proceed.
Assembly Action: None

G183-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proponent did not provide substantiation that the current provisions are causing significant problems nor that the revisions would eliminate the hazard. The committee speculated whether any allowance for steps or handrails should be made to permit projection into a public way.
Assembly Action: None

G184-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change because they found the proposed language very unclear and confusing. In addition there was no technical justification for constructing a 1 hour rated barrier between building areas being remodeled and portions of building where occupancy continues.
Assembly Action: None
G185-09/10

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

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IFC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: During construction there are hazards that need to be addressed. The committee approved this change for consistency with Part I and provide needed options to manage hazardous situations.

Assembly Action: None

G186-09/10

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

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

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

Assembly Action: None

G187-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None

G188-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Assembly Action: None

G189-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G190-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

G191-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

G192-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

G193-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G194-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Wind loads for this evaluation shall be those prescribed in Section 1609. Earthquake loads for this evaluation, if required, shall be permitted to be seventy-five percent of those prescribed in Section 1613. Where the existing seismic force-resisting system is a type that can be designated ordinary, values of \( R \), \( \Omega_0 \), 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: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

G196-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

G197-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
G198-09/10

PART I- IBC GENERAL  Withdrawn by Proponent
PART II- IEBC  Withdrawn by Proponent

G199-09/10

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

Assembly Action:  None

G200-09/10

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

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

Assembly Action:  None

G201-09/10

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

Assembly Action:  None

G202-09/10

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

Assembly Action:  None

G203-09/10

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

Assembly Action:  None
G204-09/10
PART I- IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Adoption of a fee schedule is a jurisdictional responsibility during the adoption process of this, or any, code. The code could not provide a fee schedule that could address the distinct operations requirements of thousands of different jurisdictions.

Assembly Action: None

PART II – IRC –B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee agrees the table needs updating, but the values may be low. There is no substantiation provided for the values and more data is needed.

Assembly Action: None

G205-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent

G206-09/10
PART I- IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee was supportive of the concept of moving the IBC closer to being recognized as providing compliance with Federal standards for the construction of medical facilities, however the proposed inclusion of the CMS forms is inappropriate. Even if the forms are not included but only referenced, the proposed appendix text reads more like commentary than it does code. Appendices need to be written so that they can be adopted and enforced as part of the code. This proposal also has an uncomfortable mixture of ICC phrasing and that of the NFPA. The IBC can not provide a vehicle for enforcing both codes.

Assembly Action: None

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

Assembly Action: None

G207-09/10
Note: This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

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

Assembly Action: None

G208-09/10
Note: This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed footnote is so complex with so many references out of the
section that this revisions would not make this provision simpler, but definitely more confusing. What happens to the framing needs to be addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Action:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### G209-09/10

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART I- IBC GENERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART II- IEBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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E1-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This proposal would provide uniformity throughout the codes. 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: None

E2-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The 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: None

E3-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The list of components in the definition is necessary for understanding 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: None

E4-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

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: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The revisions 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
PART II- IFC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

E6-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The term “transition point” would add travel distance measurements at open stairway; however, it would be confusing for situations were there is a door on a stairway enclosure.

Assembly Action: None

E7-09/10
Withdrawn by Proponent

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: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed definition for projected tread 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: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This is a good definition and it clarifies the meaning of “riser” as it relates 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: None

E9-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Expanding the requirement to include all three parts of the means of egress would clarify that no steps or elevation changes could be permitted in the exit access route as well as at horizontal exits, or in the path for exit discharge. By leaving “throughout a story”, it is clear that it is not intended to eliminate exit stairways that provide access between stories.

Assembly Action: None

E10-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Committee Reason: 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
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.

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

### TABLE 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 address egress issues in spaces where occupants from different areas are level will merge.

Assembly Action: None

E11-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This is a good editorial cleanup that meets the intent of the code when determining occupant load and will make the text consistent with the headings in Table 1004.1.1.

Assembly Action: None

E12-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The change in the heading for the Table will be consistent with the terms used throughout the code.

Assembly Action: None

E13-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Section 1004 already allows for code officials to approve the actual occupant load in large spaces with minimal occupants. There was no technical justification to support this occupant load across the industry: for example, is this consistent with small airplane manufacturers.

Assembly Action: None

E14-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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 table when looking for occupant load for these types of exhibit 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: None

E15-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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 load in the circulation spaces and toilet rooms. The proposal does not deal with queuing areas in corridors in such facilities as multiplex theaters. There could be confusion when there are corridors that area already covered by gross floor area requirements.

Assembly Action: None

E16-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Editorial correction. Modify the proposal as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION OF SPACE</th>
<th>FLOOR AREA IN SQ. FT. PER OCCUPANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mall Buildings - Covered mall building, and Open air mall building</td>
<td>See Section 402.4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(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 reference will direct code users to the appropriate occupant load information for malls.

Assembly Action: None

E17-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The requirement needs stroke width of visible requirements. The proposal does not indicate what should be posted for multi-purpose rooms. The occupant load indicated should be approved by the code official/fire official.

Assembly Action: None

E18-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

E19-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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, and the area 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.
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.

2. 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 should allow for egress back through the building from areas 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: None

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: Disapproved

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 clarified that the official finding 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: None

PART II - IFC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: With the disapproval of Part I, the text in the IFC needs to remain for corridor width in existing buildings.

Assembly Action: None

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: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Studies have shown that most people do not react to an initial alarm, therefore, 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 fire service access elevators, and occupant evacuation elevators, highrise buildings will be much safer. One 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 justification for the increased width for means of egress was provided in the original change in the last cycle. The additional width requirements for all buildings went too far. This is a good compromise.

Assembly Action: None

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
E22-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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 means of egress width. This is consistent with the committee approval of E10-09/10.

Assembly Action: None

E23-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is not the correct location for this requirement. A better place for this might be Section 1008. Other provisions of the code already cover the width of doorways, so this item is not needed.

Assembly Action: None

E24-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

E25-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

E26-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E27-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

E28-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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

1. **Aisles** and unenclosed egress **stairs** in rooms and spaces that require two or more **means of 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**.
4. Interior **exit discharge** elements, as permitted in Section 1027.1, in buildings required to have two or more **exits**.
5. Exterior landings as required by Section 1008.1.6 for **exit discharge** doorways in buildings required to 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 Reason:** The modification will parallel the title to Section 1006.2. The revisions in title and movement of Section 1006.4 to 1006.3.1 will clarify the purpose of the requirements and separate emergency lighting from general means of egress illumination.

**Assembly Action:** None

**E29-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** There was no technical justification for the reduction in lighting levels. The greatest activation of emergency lighting is loss of power, not fire, and the rational does not address these. In a fire 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:** None

**E30-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The current 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:** None

**E31-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The term “other accessible elements” is too broad for consistent interpretation and enforcement. Without the additional explanation from the proponent during the testimony the term was not understandable as intended. This could be interpreted to require accessible means of egress from all levels that included the car route to and from the accessible parking spaces, not just the level with the accessible spaces.

**Assembly Action:** None
E32-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

E33-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: An elevator that is part of an accessible means of egress must have standby power. This proposal could send you to any elevator. The committee prefers E34-09/10 for addressing the travel distance issue.
Assembly Action: None

E34-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Travel distance should be met for all accessible means of egress, not just to those that contain areas of refuge.
Assembly Action: None

E35-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The additional pointers do not clarify what can be part of an accessible means of egress.
Assembly Action: None

E36-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The addition of exit access stairways is consistent with the current text for two story office buildings with open stairways.
Assembly Action: None

E37-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The revisions to the separation requirements provide additional options and clarify requirements for the exterior area of assisted rescue. The current text could be confusing 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: None
E38-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

E39-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E40-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E41-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E42-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E43-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E44-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
E45-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E46-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E47-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E48-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E49-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E50-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E51-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E52-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: The current exceptions already address this option, therefore, this text is not needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E53-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E54-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E55-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E56-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at <a href="http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf">http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf</a>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errata to modify the proposal as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL – Underwriters Laboratories, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSI / UL 294-1999 – Access Control System Units with revisions through August 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E57-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: As it is acknowledged that this section needs work, the committee would like the proponent to come back with a public comment to address this obvious tripping hazard issue. The redundancy of the paragraphs regarding thresholds is too repetitive. In one of the three 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: None

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: Approved as Submitted

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. This will help with consistent enforcement.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

E59-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

E60-09/10

This is a 3 part code change. Part I & II was 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: Disapproved

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: None

PART II- IPMC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
PART III- IRC B/E

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E61-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The reference to Section 1008.1.9.2 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: None

E62-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: It is not clear which side of the door (i.e., inside or outside) the signage should be located on. The reference to Section 1008.1.9.2 could include yards and courts where egress may be directly provided without going through the building. There were questions about the two-way communication system: Who would it go to? What is the purpose? This could be problematic with smaller facilities or with multiple balconies.

Assembly Action: None

E63-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

E64-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Any door that looks like a means of egress must meet means of egress door requirements. The correct enforcement at doors where they are intended for the movement of equipment and not for a means of egress would be to prohibit hardware on the door so it is obvious that it is not normally operational – the proposal would allow hardware on the inactive leaf.

Assembly Action: None

E65-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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:

1. The listed hardware that is affixed to the door leaf has an obvious method of operation that is readily operated under all lighting conditions.
2. The listed hardware is capable of being operated with one hand.
3. Operation of the listed hardware directly releases the electromagnetic lock and unlocks the door immediately.
4. Loss of power to the listed hardware automatically unlocks the door.
5. Where panic or fire exit hardware is required by Section 1008.1.10 operation of the listed panic or fire exit hardware also releases the electromagnetic lock.

Committee Reason: Panic hardware should be permitted where electromagnetic locks are utilized. The modification to Items 3 and 5 clarifies that the release of the lock must be automatic with the operation of the panic bar.

Assembly Action: None

E66-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E67-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

E68-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Technical justification was not provided for this increased width for stairways in Educational occupancies. The corridor width for Educational is based on students with bi-directional flow during passing periods based on there 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 increased width not considering the 30 inch reach for handrails.

Assembly Action: None

E69-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

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: Disapproved

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.
PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved

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: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

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: Disapproved

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: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None
E73-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposal is mainly editorial and uses defined terms.

Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved
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: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

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: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: By breaking the current text into smaller sections the proposal clarifies the requirements for stair nosings and risers.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

E76-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies the line of travel measurement along landings.

Assembly Action: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Committee Action</th>
<th>Assembly Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E77-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason: The term “continuous radius” is not clear and will lead to inconsistent interpretations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E78-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason: The additional language does not clarify the code and is not needed. The committee prefers E79-09/10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E79-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies how the treads are measured for alternating tread device stairways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E80-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies where the handrail requirements differ for ramps and stairways in assembly seating areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E81-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E82-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason: The current exception allows for an alternative for sidewalks that move up with grade that should not be removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E83-09/10</td>
<td>Withdrawn by proponent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E84-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Committee Action</td>
<td>Committee Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E85-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>While ladder access may be a viable alternative for roof access, requirements for what type of ladder would be permitted are needed (i.e., fixed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E86-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>While this safety 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 would be better located in the International Mechanical Code or International Plumbing Code since this deals with unoccupied roofs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E87-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>This is a design issue for the accessible level. There are concerns for the cross slope and lack of landings for an accessible means of egress route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E88-09/10</td>
<td>Withdrawn by proponent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E89-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>The supporting reason does not include a consumption analysis for energy used by exit signs. There is an issue for how a 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E90-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>This would be a conflict in industrial facilities where high ceilings are needed to move equipment or to signs are located high in order to see them over obstructions. The proponent may choose to narrow this down to certain occupancies where high ceilings are found but clearances are needed (i.e., restaurants).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E91-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

E92-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

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: Disapproved
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: None

PART II- IFC
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

E94-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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 (864 mm).

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.
**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:** None

**E95-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**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:** None

**E96-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**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:** None

**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:** Disapproved

**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:** None

**PART II- IRC B/E**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**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:** None

**E98-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** A minimum cross section width of 1 inch for a Type I handrail is needed for graspability.

**Assembly Action:** None
E99-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposed revision from ‘handrail’ to ‘side’ clarifies what that projection means and allows for the supports for handrails.
Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved
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: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

E101-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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:

1. For occupancy Group R-3 not more than three stories above grade in height and within 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, or adjacent fixed seating or the line connecting the leading edges of the treads.
2. 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.
5. 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.
Committee Reason: The modification to take out the option along the leading edge of treads was because 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: None

E102-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Children are in many other occupancies than Group E, therefore the proposed limitation is not broad enough. There is no technical justification provided to justify the reduction in height of the guard. 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: None

E103-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: No technical support was provided that identified this as a problem. The proposed text is not needed. The concern of egress through several rooms is already addressed in Item 1. These types of Assembly and Educational spaces should not be required to egress through corridors if there are 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 circulation routes behind the seating. There was no justification for additional requirements for the split at 500 and 1000 occupants.

Assembly Action: None

E104-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The revisions clarifies that these requirements are specific to care suites in hospitals, not anything that could be called a suite. The rearrangement of requirements clarifies requirements for egress within the different types of care suites.

Assembly Action: None

E105-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

E106-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The occupants of a dwelling unit are familiar 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: None
E107-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: No technical justification was provided for the 25 feet separation requirement. Highrise provisions are already addressed in Section 403, and this is requirement may be too restrictive for very small buildings. The term ‘exit access’ door is not applicable to exit enclosures.

Assembly Action: None

E108-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The revised text loses the allowance for fully sprinklered buildings to have two open exit stairways. It is not clear if the stairways in Section 1022.1 Exception 1 are interior or exterior stairways, or if the are exit or exit access stairways. Technical 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 accepted in E5-09/10. This proposal seems to be taking protection away from stairways.

Assembly Action: None

E109-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Boeing should be commended for their fire model analysis on this issue, however, there are concerns about the assumptions in the model; for example what is the technical basis for the size of the fire; what are the tenability 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 does have standards for performance 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 result in fire size should be provided – this is important as the industry moves to using more composite materials that may increase fuel loads. The technical data is applicable for large 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: None

E110-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Aisle widths are not currently addressed in the code. The proposed requirements for aisles are consistent with corridors widths and are a reasonable width for Group B and M as well as Group A where fixed seating is not provided.

Assembly Action: None

E111-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The ratio 2.5:1 is commonly used for elevator 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: 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:

1. 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.
5. Corridors adjacent to the exterior walls of buildings shall be permitted to have unprotected openings on the unrated exterior wall where unrated walls are permitted by Table 602 and unprotected openings are permitted by Table 705.8 and Table 602.

Committee Reason: The modification clarified the references to Table 602 and Table 705.8. The allowance for exterior walls of corridors is reasonable 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: None

E113-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: If you take away the trade off for sprinklers 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 data does not justify the significant increase in the 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 closers will be a problem for access to classrooms. This would also require rated corridors in day care facilities, which would be excessive. Information was 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 lockdown situation. If there is a concern for a fire event during a lockdown situation to be addressed with the emergency responders in the fire and safety evacuation plans, not through a corridor rating. In addition, there are other safety concerns in schools. Schools commonly have doors with vision panels and sidelights for observation of the classrooms and student/teacher interaction. Requiring rated doors at these locations would either significantly raise the costs for the opening protective and/or result in solid doors without this necessary observation feature.

Assembly Action: None

E114-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Buildings in earthquake and hurricane areas are already designed to a higher standard, therefore this rated corridor requirement is not needed. Structural robustness is not related to fire-resistance-rated corridors. Technical justification was not providing indicating that the fire incidences are higher for the specified buildings in earthquake and hurricane areas. This would 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
E115-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Placing the base requirement and exceptions in a table makes the requirements easier to understand.

Assembly Action: None

E116-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

E117-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

E118-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The code already allows this exception for exit discharge through lobbies and vestibules so the proposed text is not needed. The allowances for lobbies and vestibules is not considered a reduction of the level of protection, the option is an alternative.

Assembly Action: None

E119-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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 within and from the dwelling unit provided that 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 Section 1021.1 Item 4 and addresses stairways within a dwelling unit, not just the exit door from the whole unit. This also allows for the option of a dwelling unit opening onto a dead end corridor and extending the common path of travel allow access down that dead end to the main corridor. Adding “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 an individual dwelling unit.

Assembly Action: None
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E120-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** This proposal addresses a design issue where exits may be located wholly within tenant spaces.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

E121-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STORY</th>
<th>OCCUPANCY</th>
<th>MAXIMUM NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS PER FLOOR SERVED BY A SINGLE EXIT AND TRAVEL DISTANCE TO THE EXIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basement, first, second or third story</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>4 dwelling units and 125 feet travel distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth story and above NF</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STORY OCC</th>
<th>UPANCY</th>
<th>MAXIMUM OCCUPANTS PER STORY FLOOR AND TRAVEL DISTANCE TO THE EXIT</th>
<th>MAXIMUM EXIT ACCESS TRAVEL DISTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First story or basement</td>
<td>A, B, E, F, M, U, S</td>
<td>49 occupants and 75 feet travel distance</td>
<td>75 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-2, H-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 occupants and 25 feet travel distance</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-4, H-5, I, R-1, R-2, R-4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>10 occupants and 75 feet travel distance</td>
<td>75 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second story</td>
<td>B, F, M, S</td>
<td>29 occupants and 100 feet travel distance</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third story and above NF</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>29 occupants and 75 feet travel distance</td>
<td>75 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Reason:** 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:** None
### 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:** Approved as Submitted  
**Committee Reason:** The first sentence in Section 1021.2 is redundant with the text in Section 1021.1 and 1015.1. This should be correlated with the committee actions on E119 and E121.

**Assembly Action:** None

#### PART II- IRC B/E
**Committee Action:** Disapproved  
**Committee Reason:** The committee recognizes there is a need for this 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 two means of egress is not addressed. There is no data for deaths or injuries associated with this situation.

**Assembly Action:** None

### E123-09/10
**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted  
**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:** None

### E124-09/10
**Committee Action:** Disapproved  
**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:** None

### E125-09/10
**Committee Action:** Disapproved  
**Committee Reason:** The proponent is misinterpreting the current text. Doors between the exit stair enclosure and lobby/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:** None

### E126-09/10
**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted  
**Committee Reason:** Membrane penetration in the walls of exit enclosures is a common practice. The allowance maintains a reasonable level of safety.

**Assembly Action:** None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Committee Action</th>
<th>Assembly Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E127-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason: Clarifies the purpose, type of sign and what information is required for stairway identification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E128-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason: The proposal reduces wording and repeated requirements with a specific reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E129-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason: Exit passageways when connected to an exit stairway at the level of exit discharge or at upper levels should have a consistent level of protection throughout. The reduction of the fire resistance rating is not justified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E130-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E131-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason: While this new technology will allow greater flexibility, this proposal is not clear on electrical backup and supervision requirements. There is still the issue of maintenance of the battery system. Would ‘loss of power’ be loss of power to the building or loss of emergency power?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E132-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason: Several of the proponents and opponent brought up possible revisions to clarify the text that need to be brought forward at the public comment phase. The proposal needs to clarify if the term “assembly” includes the supporting construction or not. “Essentially open”, while it is currently in code text, leaves too much open for interpretation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E133-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal will keep the exterior exit stairway provisions together in a place that is easier to find. This proposal may need correlation with E5 revisions.

Assembly Action: None

E134-09/10

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.

Exceptions:

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 4.4.5 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.
   4.4 The exterior walls and openings adjacent to the exterior exit ramp or stairway comply with Section 1022.6.
   4.4.5 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 Reason: The proposed modification provides a better 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

E135-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 addressing the proposal does not do it his – wired glass is most often tested as having a 45 minute rating. The proposed requirements in Exception 2.3 will prohibit double doors in a 10 foot wall of the vestibule.

Assembly Action: None
E136-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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 provide 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: None

E137-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

E138-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

E139-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

E140-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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
E142-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 m$^2$) 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 any size and the 100 sq.ft. limit is only applicable to the ticket booths. The proposal identifies information that is missing in the current text to address hazards under bleachers.

Assembly Action: None

E143-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal moves the provisions for stepped aisles to a more logical location. The current location as an exception for level or ramped aisles is incorrect.

Assembly Action: None

E144-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee prefers the format for stepped aisles in E143-09/10.

Assembly Action: None

E145-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies that handrails can be on one side of the aisle in assembly seating areas.

Assembly Action: None

E146-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The current language is adequate for cross aisles. A blanket exception as proposed would conflict with the Americans with Disabilities Act/Architectural Barriers Act (ADA/ABA) Accessibility Guidelines.

Assembly Action: None

E147-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Using a walking surface measurement is appropriate to get the level of safety 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: None
E148-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 types of seats in assembly venues.

Assembly Action: None

E149-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal removes redundant text.

Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved

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 requirements 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 escape window is not warranted. There is no alert 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 they may be sleeping, intoxicated or unable to evacuate without assistance – this can cause delayed evacuation, thus the real need for the emergency escape windows. One of the opponents indicated that not having emergency escape windows in group homes may be a violation of federal 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: None

PART II IRC B/E

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change adds a reasonable exception based on an approved automatic sprinkler system in the dwelling. This creates an incentive to provide a sprinkler system. Also, this may get some retrofits for additions.

Assembly Action: None

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
each dwelling unit or sleeping unit, accessible mailboxes shall be accessible to be an Accessible unit.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged.)


Assembly Action: None

PART II-IFC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The revisions clarify the applicable technical requirements in ICC A117.1 for visible alarms in dwelling units.

Assembly Action: None

PART III-IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The revisions clarify the applicable technical requirements in ICC A117.1 for signage at toilet rooms.

Assembly Action: None

PART IV-IEBC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The selective deletions of the reference to ICC A117.1 remove redundant text.

Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The technical provisions in the 2009 edition of ICC A117.1 need to be published before these scoping provisions are included in the IBC. Some of the items in these provisions are outside the scope of the code official’s typical purview and should be located in Appendix E (i.e., golf courses, boating piers, amusement rides).

Assembly Action: None

PART II-IEBC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Part II was disapproved based on the committee’s actions to Part I of E152-09/10.

Assembly Action: None

E153-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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.
Committee Reason: The term "non-residential facilities" is unclear as to meaning. For residential, this conflicts with the Fair Housing interpretation of common 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: None

E154-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E155-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This definition would put the building official in place of enforcing state 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: None

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal is too far reaching for just visitability. 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% requirement 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 allowance 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 another type of unit is confusing. Perhaps these minimal accessibility requirements should be incorporated into the International Residential Code.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IEBC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the committee action on E156-09/10 Part I.

Assembly Action: None

PART III- IRC B/E

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee supports the need for visitability 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
there would not be a need for Type C. There are difficulties with the definitions and they contain technical requirements.

**Assembly Action:** None

**E157-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**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:** None

**E158-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**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:** None

**E159-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**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:** None

**E160-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**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:** None

**E161-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**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:** None

**E162-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The increased area would be consistent with the American’s with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG).

**Assembly Action:** None
E163-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The new term “public areas” is unclear and very 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 would be a conflict with the American with Disabilities Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG).

Assembly Action: None

E164-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed language does not clarify the intent of the route provisions and more than the current text.

Assembly Action: None

E165-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 tenants on multiple floors that also include exit stairways, but where everyone has access to a common elevator.

Assembly Action: None

E166-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The Fair Housing Accessibility Guidelines (FHAG) does not address van space with additional headroom, so the exception is not a conflict with FHAG. Technology 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: None

E167-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 interpreted too broadly. This should be in Section 1109, since mailboxes and garbage chutes can be in uses other than residential.

Assembly Action: None

E168-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This concern is an educational issue for designers – this is already covered by “serving units”. Rubbish chutes that serve non-accessible dwelling units should not be required to meet this requirement. This should be in Section 1109, since mailboxes and garbage chutes can be in uses other than residential. It is not clear how the door and disposal operation can be accomplished with only one hand as required in the last sentence.

Assembly Action: None
E169-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: No technical justification was provided for such a major reduction. This would conflict with current American's with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.

Assembly Action: None

E170-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1107.6.1.1 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 one 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.

(Exceptio n 1 in Section 1107.6.1.1.1 is consistent with the 2009 edition of A117.1 for Accessible units with two or more bathrooms.)

Assembly Action: None

E171-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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, sororities, boarding houses), removing this text would be confusing for the users by mixing transient and non-transient requirements.

Assembly Action: None

E172-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E173-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None
E174-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The reorganization will clarify when assistive listening devices are required in loose seating areas. This would be consistent with the new American’s with Disabilities Act/Architectural Barriers Act (ADA/ABA) Accessibility Guidelines.

E175-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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 was an editorial fix. The modification clarifies that there only needs to be one window with an assistive listening system at each group of windows. If different types of services are provided at different windows, 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. Most stadiums and arenas will already have this capability because of the requirements in Section 1108.2.7. While the proponent stated that he did not intend to pick up smaller facilities, such as high-schools, a public comment providing a minimum size consistent with the provisions in E176-09/10 would be helpful.

E176-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This proposal puts a specific limit of 15,000 occupants for the size of facilities where captioning will be required. These size facilities 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 Safety committee’s approval of F105-09/10.

E177-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposal clarifies these provisions apply to both drinking 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.ft. 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
E178-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 which direction the force could be applied.

Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed reference standard had not yet completed its revision to put requirements into mandatory language. The current standard is not in mandatory language.

Assembly Action: None

E180-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The term “same type” is too broad and will lead to many interpretation issues.

Assembly Action: None

E181-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

E182-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Many people with different types of disabilities still need the ‘accessible’ 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: None
E183-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed revision is confusing and does not meet the intent expressed in the reason. If the room 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: None

E184-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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 should work better. This should be moved to the A117.1 when there is the opportunity.
Assembly Action: None

E185-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: In facilities that require one drinking fountain 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: None

E186-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Adding scoping for sauna 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: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Limited Use/Limited Access (LULA) elevators and Private Residence Elevators are considered passenger elevators by ASME A17.1, so this text is not needed. ASME A17.1 should contain the limitations for use of these elevators. Repeating ASME A17.1 requirements in the IBC could lead to possible conflicts in the future.
Assembly Action: None

E188-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposed language clarifies that all amenities provided must be usable by persons with disabilities, not just coat hooks and shelves.
Assembly Action: None
E189-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E190-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E191-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 2009 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: None

E192-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

E193-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Variable message sign requirements will make essential information available for persons 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: None

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

PART I- IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The definition does not address landings at doors where a single step is provided.
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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.

**Assembly Action:** None

**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:** None

**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](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx).

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**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:** None

**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](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx).

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** This proposal will allow for security to be maintained when a stairway is within a tenant space.

**Assembly Action:** None

**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](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx).

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**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:** None

**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](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx).

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The increased travel distance in open parking garages is reasonable due to the low fuel and occupant loads.

**Assembly Action:** None
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: No technical justification was provided indicating that the current code requirements for corridors were deficient in Group I-4 occupancies.

Assembly Action: None

E200-09/10
Note: This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed footnote 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: None

E201-09/10
Note: This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website on 10/25/09. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 operable 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 operable 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.

1. 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. Standby power supplies for manual exit devices shall be capable of providing power for 10 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.
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 http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

**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:** None
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S1-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed revision to the definition of Roof Assembly is unnecessary because Chapter 16 already clarifies the design loads.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S2-09/10

Parts I and II of this code change were heard by the IPC code development committee.

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: As Submitted

Committee Reason: 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: None

PART II- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: As Submitted

Committee Reason: 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: None

PART III- IRC PLUMBING
Committee Action: As Submitted

Committee Reason: 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: None
S3-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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: None

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: Disapproved

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: None

S5-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

S6-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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
S7-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This proposal clarifies the code by listing the specific roof membrane types to which Section 1504.5 applies.
Assembly Action: None

S8-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

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: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee's disapproval was based on the status of the proposed reference standard. As a draft, it is not readily available.
Assembly Action: None

S10-09/10
This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety code development committee.
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1505.1*&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;,&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>MINIMUM ROOF COVERING CLASSIFICATION FOR TYPES OF CONSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(No change to Notes a. through c.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
S11-09/10

This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety code development committee.

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

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/2009-10cycle/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: Disapproved

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: None

S13-09/10

This code change was heard by the IBC Fire Safety code development committee.

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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: None

S14-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None
PART II- IRC B/E

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

S15-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

PART II- IRC B/E

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 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, 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 (41.25 mm) with a shank thickness 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 or 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 120 mph (54 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 mm) with a shank thickness 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 or 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 120 mph (54 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
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 mm) with a shank thickness 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 or 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. 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 mm) with a shank thickness 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 or 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.

**R905.6.3.2 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. 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 mm) with a shank thickness 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 or 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 or plastic 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.

As an alternative, adhered underlayment complying with ASTM D 1970 shall be permitted.
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. 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 mm) with a shank thickness 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 or 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.

R905.10.5.1 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. 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 mm) with a shank thickness 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 or 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.

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:** None

S16-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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.

**Assembly Action:** None

PART II- IRC B/E

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent's request for disapproval. The proposal contains requirements that are beyond the scope of the IRC.

**Assembly Action:** None
S17-09/10
PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

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: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal adds a referenced standard that is appropriate for built-up roof covering materials.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S19-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal adds a referenced standard for asphalt coatings, coordinating the IBC with the corresponding requirements in the IRC.

Assembly Action: None

S20-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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.
PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change provides clarity for the appropriate material to use for the protective coating for sprayed polyurethane foam roofing.

Assembly Action: None

S21-09/10
PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This proposal corrects terminology relating to liquid applied products that serve as a roof covering.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change clarifies the materials that can serve as liquid-applied roofing.

Assembly Action: None

PART III- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change clarifies the materials that can serve as liquid-applied roofing.

Assembly Action: None

PART I & II- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

PHOTOVOLTAIC MODULES/SHINGLES. A roof covering composed of flat-plate photovoltaic modules fabricated into 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).

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: None

PART III- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

PHOTOVOLTAIC MODULES/SHINGLES. A roof covering composed of flat-plate photovoltaic modules fabricated into sheets that resemble three-tab composite shingles.

R905.16.3 Wind 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
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 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/shingles.

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: None

S23-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There are concerns with the proposal to adapt an asphalt shingle standard to formed plastic shingles.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

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: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S26-09/10

This code change was heard by the IBC General code development committee.

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None
S27-09/10

This code change was heard by the IBC General code development committee.

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 than 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: None

S28-09/10

This code change was heard by the IBC General code development committee.

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 have the same fire classification as the roof assembly as defined by Section 1505.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Reason: 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: None

S29-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

S30-09/10

**PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL**

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

**PART II- IRC B/E**

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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.

Assembly Action: None
S31-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

S32-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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 Reason: 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: None

S33-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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.
5. 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 building structure:

1. Occupancy category.
2. Seismic importance factor, Ie.
3. Mapped spectral response accelerations parameters, Ss and Sz.
4. Site class.
5. Design spectral response coefficients acceleration parameters, SDs and SD1.
6. Seismic design category.
7. Basic seismic-force-resisting system(s).
8. Design base shear(s).
9. Seismic response coefficient(s), C. 
10. Response modification factor(s) coefficient(s), R.
11. Location of base(s) as defined in Section 11.2 of ASCE 7.
12. Analysis procedure used.

(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)
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: None

S34-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S35-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: 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: None

S36-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

S37-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 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
S38-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

S39-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

S40-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: 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: None

S41-09/10
PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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: None

PART II- IEBC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change coordinates the IEBC with the IBC and is consistent with the committee’s action on Part I.

Assembly Action: None
S42-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: 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: None

S43-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

S44-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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 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: None

S45-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

S46-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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.

Assembly Action: None
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
2. The axial and shear forces and moments from the seismic load effects including overstrength factor in accordance with Section 12.4.3.2 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; and
   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 12.4.3.2 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 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 12.4.3.2 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 12.4.3.2 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: None

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 \((D + F + T) + 1.6 (L + H) + 0.5 (L, or S or R)\)  
1.2 \((D + F) + 1.6 (L, or S or R) + 1.6 H + (f, L, or 0.8 W)\)  
1.2 \((D + F) + 1.8 W + f, L + 1.6 H + 0.5 (L, or S or R)\)  
1.2 \((D + F) + 1.0 E + f, L + 1.6 H + f, S\)  
0.9 \(D + 1.6 W + 1.6 H\)  
0.9 \((D + F) + 1.0 E + 1.6 H\)
where:
\[ f_1 = 1 \] for floors in places of public assembly, for live loads in excess of 100 pounds per square foot (4.79 kN/m\(^2\)), and for parking garage live load, and
\[ f_2 = 0.5 \] for other live loads.
\[ f_2 = 0.7 \] for roof configurations (such as saw tooth) that do not shed snow off the structure, and
\[ f_2 = 0.2 \] for other roof configurations.

Exceptions:
1. Where other factored load combinations are specifically required by other provisions of this 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:

\[ D + F \quad \text{(Equation 16-8)} \]
\[ D + H + F + L + T \quad \text{(Equation 16-9)} \]
\[ D + H + F + (L \text{ or } S \text{ or } R) \quad \text{(Equation 16-10)} \]
\[ D + H + F + 0.75 (L + T) + 0.75 (L, or S or R) \quad \text{(Equation 16-11)} \]
\[ D + H + F + (W \text{ or } 0.7 E) \quad \text{(Equation 16-12)} \]
\[ D + H + F + 0.75 W + 0.75 L + 0.75 (L, or S or R) \quad \text{(Equation 16-13)} \]
\[ D + H + F + 0.75 (0.7 E) + 0.75 L + 0.75 S \quad \text{(Equation 16-14)} \]
\[ 0.6 D + W + H \quad \text{(Equation 16-15)} \]
\[ 0.6 (D + F) + 0.7 E + H \quad \text{(Equation 16-16)} \]

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.
2. Flat roof snow loads of 30 psf (1.44 kN/m\(^2\)) 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/m\(^2\)), 20 percent shall be combined with seismic loads.
3. Where the effect of H resists the primary variable load effect, a load factor of 0.6 shall be included with H where H is permanent and H shall be set to zero for all other conditions.

Committee Reason: 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: None

S50-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

S51-09/10
Withdrawn by Proponent

S52-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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 reflects the problems associated with a single load factor on self-straining force, T.

Assembly Action: None
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:

\[ D + F \]  \hspace{1cm} (Equation 16-8)
\[ D + H + F + L + T \]  \hspace{1cm} (Equation 16-9)
\[ D + H + F + (L_r \text{ or } S \text{ or } R) \]  \hspace{1cm} (Equation 16-10)
\[ D + H + F + 0.75 (L + T) + 0.75 (L_r \text{ or } S \text{ or } R) \]  \hspace{1cm} (Equation 16-11)
\[ D + H + F + (W \text{ or } 0.7 E) \]  \hspace{1cm} (Equation 16-12)
\[ D + H + F + 0.75 (W \text{ or } 0.7 E) + 0.75 L + 0.75 (L_r \text{ or } S \text{ or } R) \]  \hspace{1cm} (Equation 16-13)
\[ 0.6 D + W + H \]  \hspace{1cm} (Equation 16-14)
\[ 0.6 D + 0.7 E + H \]  \hspace{1cm} (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.
2. Flat roof snow loads of 30 psf (1.44 kN/m^2) 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/m^2), 20 percent shall be combined with seismic loads.
3. In Equation 16-14, the wind load, \( W \), is permitted to be reduced 10 percent for design of the 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: None

S54-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S55-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

Committee Action: Disapproved*

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: None

*Note: Subsequent to committee action, the proponent withdrew this code change proposal.

S56-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent
PART I - IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE 1607.1
MINIMUM UNIFORMLY DISTRIBUTED LIVE LOADS, $L_u$, AND MINIMUM CONCENTRATED LIVE LOADS *

(No change to footnotes a through h)

i. Uninhabitable attics without storage are those where the maximum clear height between the joists and 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.

j. 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 of the following conditions are met:

i. 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. 

(No changes to footnote a)

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: None

PART II - IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

TABLE R301.5
MINIMUM UNIFORMLY DISTRIBUTED LIVE LOADS (in pounds per square foot)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE LIVE</th>
<th>LOAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uninhabitable attics without storage a</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninhabitable attics with limited storage b</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitable attics and attics served with fixed stairs</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No changes to the remaining Table not shown)

b. Uninhabitable attics without storage are those where the maximum clear height between the joists and 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)

g. Uninhabitable attics with limited 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 of the following conditions are met:

1. 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.
2. The slopes of the joists or truss bottom chords are no greater than 2 units vertical to 12 units horizontal.
3. Required insulation depth is less than the joist or bottom chord member depth.

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:** None

**S58-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

**TABLE 1607.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPANCY OR USE</th>
<th>UNIFORM (psf)</th>
<th>CONCENTRATED (lbs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Assembly areas and theaters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed seats (fastened to floor)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow spot, projections and control rooms</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbies</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable seats</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbies</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages floors</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platforms (assembly)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assembly areas</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(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:** None

**S59-09/10**

Withdrawn by Proponent

**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:** 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:

\[
1.4 (D + F) \\
1.2 (D + F + T) + 1.6 (L + H) + 0.5 (L, or S or R) \\
1.2 D + 1.6 (L, or S or R) + (f_1 L or 0.8 W) \\
1.2 D + 1.6 W + f_1 L + 0.5 (L, or S or R) \\
1.2 D + 1.0 E + f_1 L + f_2 S \\
0.9 D + 1.6 W + 1.6 H \\
0.9 D + 1.0 E + 1.6 H
\]

where:

\[f_1 = 1 \text{ for floors in places of public assembly, areas and recreational uses (see Table 1607.1), for live loads, } L, \text{ in excess of 100 pounds per square foot (4.79 kN/m}^2\text{), and for floors in passenger vehicle parking garages; and} \]

\[= 0.5 \text{ for other live loads, } L.\]
\( f_2 = 0.7 \) 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 Reason:** 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:** None

**S61-09/10**

**PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL**  
**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** Disapproval was because the committee’s action of S57-09/10 was preferred.

**Assembly Action:** None

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

**Committee Reason:** Based on the committee's previous action on S57-09/10, Part II and the proponent’s request for disapproval.

**Assembly Action:** None

**S62-09/10**

**PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL**  
**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** 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.

**Assembly Action:** None

**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:** None

**S63-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposed definitions should not contain requirements. The committee encourages a public comment modifying the definitions of cornice.

**Assembly Action:** None

**S64-09/10**  
**Withdrawn by Proponent**
S65-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This code change was disapproved because the committee’s action on S57-09/10 was preferred.

Assembly Action: None

S66-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL

Committee Action: Disapproved

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.

Assembly Action: None

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: None

S67-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPANCY OR USE</th>
<th>UNIFORM (psf)</th>
<th>CONCENTRATED (lbs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Catwalks for maintenance access</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1607.1
MINIMUM UNIFORMLY DISTRIBUTED LIVE LOADS, \( L_{0.0} \) AND MINIMUM CONCENTRATED LIVE LOADS *

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).
\[ L_r = L_o R_1 R_2 \]  

(Equation 16-25)

where: \( 12 \leq L_r \leq 20 \)

For SI: \( L_r = L_o R_1 R_2 \)

where: \( 0.58 \leq L_r \leq 0.96 \)

\( L_o \) = Unreduced roof live load per square foot (\( m^2 \)) of horizontal projection supported by the member (see Table 1607.1).

\( L_r \) = Reduced roof live load per square foot (\( m^2 \)) of horizontal projection supported by the member.

The reduction factors \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \) shall be determined as follows:

\[ R_1 = 1 \text{ for } A_t \leq 200 \text{ square feet (18.58 m}^2) \]  

(Equation 16-26)

\[ R_1 = 1.2 - 0.001 A_t \text{ for } 200 \text{ square feet } < A_t < 600 \text{ square feet} \]  

(Equation 16-27)

For SI: \[ 1.2 - 0.011 A_t \text{ for } 18.58 \text{ square meters } < A_t < 55.74 \text{ square meters} \]

\[ R_1 = 0.6 \text{ for } A_t \geq 600 \text{ square feet (55.74 m}^2) \]  

(Equation 16-28)

where:

\( A_t \) = Tributary area (span length multiplied by effective width) in square feet (\( m^2 \)) supported by the member, and

\[ R_2 = 1 \text{ for } F \leq 4 \]  

(Equation 16-29)

\[ R_2 = 1.2 - 0.05 F \text{ for } 4 < F < 12 \]  

(Equation 16-30)

\[ R_2 = 0.6 \text{ for } F \geq 12 \]  

(Equation 16-31)

where:

\( F \) = For a sloped roof, the number of inches of rise per foot (for SI: \( F = 0.12 \times \text{slope} \), 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 Reason: 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: None

S68-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because the committee believes the current live load provisions for partitions are clear.

Assembly Action: None

S69-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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/m\(^2\)) 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/m\(^2\)) where the design basis helicopter has a maximum take-off weight greater than 3,000 pounds (13.35 kN).

2. 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 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
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 Reason: 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: None

S70-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

S71-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S72-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent

S73-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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
anchorages 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
S74-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: 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: None

S75-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

S76-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

S77-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPANCY OR USE</th>
<th>UNIFORM (psf)</th>
<th>CONCENTRATED (lbs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Roofs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All roof surfaces subject to maintenance workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awnings and canopies;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric construction supported by a lightweight rigid skeleton structure</td>
<td>5 nonreduceable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other construction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary flat, pitched, and curved roofs (not serving an occupancy function)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary roof members, exposed to a work floor;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single panel point of lower chord of roof trusses or any point along primary structural members supporting roofs over manufacturing, storage warehouses, and repair garages</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other occupancies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofs serving an occupancy function:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof gardens</td>
<td>60 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly areas</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other similar areas</td>
<td>Note I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Portions of Table not show, remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: 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: None
S78-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S79-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S80-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S81-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S82-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

S83-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 on which water will be impounded upon it, in whole or in part, and the secondary drainage system is functional but the primary drainage system is not functional blocked. 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)
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:

1. The building or other structure is less than or equal to 75 feet (22 860 mm) in height with a height-to-least 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, multispans 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.

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:

- \( C_{net} \) = Net-pressure coefficient based on \( K_d (G) (C_p) - (GC_{pi}) \), in accordance with Table 1609.6.2.
- \( G \) = 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.
- \( P_{net} \) = Design wind pressure to be used in determination of wind loads on buildings or other structures and their components and cladding, in psf (kN/m²).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1609.6.2 NET PRESSURE COEFFICIENTS, ( C_{net} )ab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURE OR PART THEREOF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALLS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windward Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeward Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parapet Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOFS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind perpendicular to ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeward roof or flat roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windward roof slopes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope &lt; 2:12 (10°) Condition 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope = 4:12 (18°)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope = 5:12 (23°)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope = 6:12 (27°)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope = 7:12 (30°)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope = 9:12 (37°)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope = 12:12 (45°)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wind parallel to ridge and flat roofs
-1.09 -0.79 -1.41 -0.47

Non Building Structures: Chimneys, Tanks and Similar Structures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h/D</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square (Wind normal to face)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square (Wind on diagonal)</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexagonal or Octagonal</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Signs and Lattice Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio of solid to gross area</th>
<th>&lt; 0.1</th>
<th>0.1 to 0.29</th>
<th>0.3 to 0.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Components and cladding not in areas of discontinuity – Roofs and overhangs

Gable or hipped configurations (Zone 1)

Flat < Slope < 6:12 (27°) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-11C Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>10 SF or less</th>
<th>0.58</th>
<th>0.89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overhang: Flat < Slope < 6:12 (27°) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-11B Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>10 SF or less</th>
<th>-1.45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500 SF or more</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6:12 (27°) < Slope < 12:12 (45°) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-11D Zone 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>10 SF or less</th>
<th>0.92</th>
<th>1.23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configuration</td>
<td>Slope Class</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monosloped Configurations (Zone 1)</td>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat &lt; Slope &lt; 7:12 (30°) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-14B Zone 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall flat topped roofs h&gt; 60'</td>
<td>Enclosed</td>
<td>Partially Enclosed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat &lt; Slope &lt; 2:12 (10°) (Zone 1) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-17 Zone 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 SF or more</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gable or Hipped Configurations at Ridges, Eaves and Rakes (Zone 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat &lt; Slope &lt; 6:12 (27°) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-11C Zone 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhang for Slope Flat &lt; Slope &lt; 6:12 (27°) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-11D Zone 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:12 (27°) &lt; Slope &lt; 12:12 (45°) Figure 6-11D</td>
<td>Enclosed</td>
<td>Partially Enclosed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhang for 6:12 (27°) &lt; Slope &lt; 12:12 (45°) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-11D Zone 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monosloped Configurations at Ridges, Eaves and Rakes (Zone 2)

**Flat < Slope < 7:12 (30°)** See ASCE 7 Figure 6-14B Zone 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10 SF or less</th>
<th>100 SF or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tall flat topped roofs h > 60’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>10 SF or less</th>
<th>100 SF or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enclosed</td>
<td>-2.11</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Enclosed</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tall flat topped roofs h > 60’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat &lt; Slope &lt; 2:12 (10°)</th>
<th>Enclosed</th>
<th>Partially Enclosed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>-2.53</td>
<td>-2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gable or Hipped Configurations at Corners (Zone 3)

**Flat < Slope < 6:12 (27°)** See ASCE 7 Figure 6-11C Zone 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10 SF or less</th>
<th>100 SF or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>-2.53</td>
<td>-2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overhang for Slope Flat < Slope < 6:12 (27°)** See ASCE 7 Figure 6-11C Zone 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10 SF or less</th>
<th>100 SF or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>-3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overhang for 6:12 (27°) < Slope < 12:12 (45°)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat &lt; Slope &lt; 12:12 (45°)</th>
<th>Enclosed</th>
<th>Partially Enclosed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overhang for 6:12 (27°) < Slope <**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10 SF or less</th>
<th>100 SF or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monosloped Configurations at corners (Zone 3) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-14B Zone 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat &lt; Slope &lt; 7:12 (30°)</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 SF or less</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 SF or more</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tall flat topped roofs h > 60' Enclosed Partially Enclosed

| Flat < slope < 2:12 (10°) (Zone 3) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-17 Zone 3 |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Negative                |                   |
| 10 SF or less           | -2.87             |
| 500 SF or more          | -2.11             |

### Tall flat topped roofs h > 60' Enclosed Partially Enclosed

| 4. Components and Cladding not in areas of discontinuity - Walls and parapets |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Positive                |                   |
| 10 SF or less           | 1.00              |
| 500 SF or more          | 0.75              |
| Negative                |                   |
| 10 SF or less           | -1.09             |
| 500 SF or more          | -0.83             |

### Wall Elements: h ≤ 60' (Zone 4) Figure 6-11A Enclosed Partially Enclosed

| Positive                |                   |
| 20 SF or less           | 0.92              |
| 500 SF or more          | 0.66              |
| Negative                |                   |
| 20 SF or less           | -0.92             |
| 500 SF or more          | -0.75             |

### Parapet Walls

| Positive                |                   |
| 2.87                    | 3.19              |
| Negative                |                   |
| -1.68                   | -2.00             |

### Wall Elements: h > 60' (Zone 4) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-17 Zone 4

| Positive                |                   |
| 2.87                    | 3.19              |

### Wall Elements: h > 60' (Zone 4) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-17 Zone 4

| Positive                |                   |
| 2.87                    | 3.19              |

### Wall Elements: h ≤ 60' (Zone 5) Figure 6-11A Enclosed Partially Enclosed

| Positive                |                   |
| 1.00                    | 1.32              |
| 0.75                    | 1.06              |
| Negative                |                   |
| -1.34                   | -1.66             |
| -0.83                   | -1.15             |

### Wall Elements: h > 60' (Zone 5) See ASCE 7 Figure 6-17 Zone 4

| Positive                |                   |
| 0.92                    | 1.23              |
### 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.

\[
P_{net} = 0.00256V^2K_zC_{net}K_{zt} \quad \text{(Equation 16-34)}
\]

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, \(K_z\), 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, \(K_z\) and \(K_{zt}\) shall be based on height \(z\).
2. For leeward and sidewalls, and for windward and leeward roofs, \(K_z\) and \(K_{zt}\) 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, \(C_{net}\).

1. The pressure coefficient, \(C_{net}\), for walls and roofs shall be determined from Table 1609.6.2.
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.

#### 1609.6.4.4.1 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: None

S85-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: It is appropriate to put the correction to the referenced standard in the code at this time.

Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved

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: None

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed referenced standard, TMS 404, is not yet completed.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC B/E

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

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: Disapproved

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.
Assembly Action: None

S89-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

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: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S91-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

PART II- IEBC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: See reason for disapproval of S91-09/10, Part I.

Assembly Action: None

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: Approved as Modified

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 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 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.
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: None

PART II- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 1612.4 of the International Building Code.

Exception: The following systems are permitted to be located below the elevation required by Section 1612.4 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: None

PART III- IFGC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 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 1612.4 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: None

PART IV- IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 1612.4 of the International Building Code for utilities and attendant equipment.
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 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.

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:

1. 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.
2. For other product-conveying outlets: 10 feet (3048 mm) from the property lines; 3 feet (914 mm) from exterior walls and roofs; 10 feet (3048 mm) from operable openings into buildings; 10 feet (3048 mm) above adjoining grade.
3. For all environmental air exhaust: 3 feet (914 mm) from property lines; 3 feet (914 mm) from operable 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.
4. Exhaust outlets serving structures in flood hazard areas shall be installed at or above the elevation 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, Section 1105.7
   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: None

S93-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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:

1. For construction in flood hazard areas not subject to high-velocity wave action:
   1.1. The elevation of the lowest floor, including basement, as required by the lowest floor elevation inspection in Section 110.3.3.
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 design will provide for equalization of hydrostatic flood forces in accordance with Section 2.6.2.2 of 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 Reason: 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.

L101.2 Definitions. The following words and terms shall, for the purposes of this section, 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.

L101.3 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.

L101.4 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 Reason: 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.
Assembly Action: None

S95-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval was requested by the proponent. This proposal would delete too much of the seismic criteria.

Assembly Action: None

S96-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Code change S97 – 09/10 is preferred.

Assembly Action: None

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). The most severe earthquake effects considered by this code.

(No changes to definitions not shown)

1613.5.1 Mapped Acceleration Parameters. The parameters $S_2$ and $S_1$ 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 $S_1$ is less than or equal to 0.04 and $S_2$ is less than or equal to 0.15, the structure is permitted to be assigned to Seismic Design Category A.
FIGURE 1613.5(1) MAXIMUM CONSIDERED EARTHQUAKE GROUND MOTION (MCE<sub>e</sub>) FOR THE CONTIGUOUS 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 (MCEₚ) FOR THE CONTIGUOUS 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 (MCE<sub>r</sub>) 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 (MCE\(_E\)) FOR THE CONTERMINOUS UNITED STATES OF 1 SECOND SPECTRAL RESPONSE ACCELERATION (5% OF CRITICAL DAMPING), SITE CLASS B
FIGURE 16.13.5(3) MAXIMUM CONSIDERED EARTHQUAKE GROUND MOTION (MCE)_{0.2} FOR HAWAII OF 0.2 AND 1 SECOND SPECTRAL RESPONSE ACCELERATION (5% OF CRITICAL DAMPING), SITE CLASS B
FIGURE 1613.5(4) MAXIMUM CONSIDERED EARTHQUAKE GROUND MOTION (MCE) FOR ALASKA OF 0.2 SECOND SPECTRAL RESPONSE ACCELERATION (5% OF CRITICAL DAMPING), SITE CLASS B
FIGURE 1613.5(5) MAXIMUM CONSIDERED EARTHQUAKE GROUND MOTION (MCE<sub>g</sub>) FOR ALASKA OF 1.0 SECOND SPECTRAL RESPONSE ACCELERATION (5% OF CRITICAL DAMPING).  
SITE CLASS B
Committee Reason: 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: None
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PART II- IRC B/E</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S98-09/10**

| **Committee Action:** | Approved as Submitted |
| **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:** | None |

**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](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:** | Disapproved |
| **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:** | None |

**S100-09/10**

| **Committee Action:** | Approved as Submitted |
| **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:** | None |

**S101-09/10**

| **Committee Action:** | Approved as Submitted |
| **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:** | None |

**S102-09/10**

| **Committee Action:** | Approved as Submitted |
| **Committee Reason:** | 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:** | None |
S103-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S104-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S105-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S106-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

S108-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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, $S_1$, 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
height above grade plane, regardless of floor area, shall be equipped 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: None

S109-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: 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: None

S110-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S111-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S112-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S113-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: The proposed definition is not needed since Section 1704.1 currently contains this information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S114-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S115-09/10</th>
<th>Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at <a href="http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf">http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf</a>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action: Disapproved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S116-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Approved as Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modify the proposal as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704.1 General. This section provides minimum requirements for special inspections, the statement of special inspections, contractor responsibility and structural observations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: This proposal is an editorial reorganization of current 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S117-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: This code change deletes current Exception 2 in Section 1704.1. The exception applies to &quot;building components&quot; 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S118-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

S119-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This code change will require access for special inspections, similar to that required in Section 110.1 for other inspections.

Assembly Action: None

S120-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: 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: None

S121-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: 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: None

S122-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

| TABLE 1704.4 REQUIRED VERIFICATION AND INSPECTION OF CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| VERIFICATION AND INSPECTION                      | CONTINUOUS PERIODIC C | REFERENCED STANDARD | IBC REFERENCE |
| 4. Inspection of anchors post-installed in hardened concrete members and designed in accordance with Section 1912  a  | X X | 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 |

a. 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.

b. Portions of proposal not shown are unchanged.
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:  None

S123-09/10

Committee Action:  Approved as Submitted

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:  None

S124-09/10

Committee Action:  Disapproved

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:  None

S125-09/10

Committee Action:  Disapproved

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:  None

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:  Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this change to be consistent with actions they took on S127 and S128-09/10.

Assembly Action:  None
**S127-09/10**

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](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx).

**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](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 1704.15.1 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 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 [http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx).

**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](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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Action:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S129-09/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action:</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>This code change cleans up the statement of special inspection requirements by removing redundant text and correlating with the section requiring the special inspections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S130-09/10</strong></td>
<td>Withdrawn by Proponent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S131-09/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action:</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S132-09/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action:</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S133-09/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action:</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S134-09/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action:</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S135-09/10</strong></td>
<td>Withdrawn by Proponent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S136-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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: None

S137-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S138-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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: None

S139-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee prefers retaining the provisions allowing the registered design professional (RDP) or the building official to require structural observation.

Assembly Action: None

S140-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None
S141-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproved for same reasoning as S140 – 09/10.

Assembly Action: None

S142-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This code change provides a needed reference to rolling doors in order to establish acceptance criteria.

Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

S144-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was concern with the proposed Section 1715.6 being located in the section on testing.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S145-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

S146-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL

Committee Action: Disapproved

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
structures, but even with some better wording it should be in Chapter 31.

**Assembly Action:** None

**PART II- IEBC**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposed exceptions for temporary structures in the IEBC are not appropriate in Chapter 12 which covers relocated buildings.

**Assembly Action:** None

**S147-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**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:** None

**S148-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

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.
2. 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
S149-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S150-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproved because code change S148 – 09/10 was preferred.

Assembly Action: None

S151-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed revision to the embedment depth limit on pole foundations was not adequately substantiated by the proponent.

Assembly Action: None

S152-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed explanation of units is not needed as is the case for all dimensionally consistent equations throughout the code.

Assembly Action: None

S153-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed limit on embedment depth is not consistent with the original basis of the pole foundation formula.

Assembly Action: None

S154-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the committee’s action on S162-09/10.

Assembly Action: None
S155-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: No evidence was provided to validate the proposed Factor of Safety on pile uplift capacity. Load tests and analysis are not equivalent.
Assembly Action: None

S156-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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.
Assembly Action: None

S157-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

S158-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

S159-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: see S158 – 09/10.
Assembly Action: None

S160-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: 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: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S162-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

PART II- IRC B/E

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S163-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S164-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The current requirements on intermediate precast structural wall systems are clear, making this proposal unnecessary.

Assembly Action: None

S165-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This code change adds requirements for wall pier detailing that are warranted as an ACI 318 modification.

Assembly Action: 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: None

S167-09/10

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, D.3.3.4 and D.3.3.5, 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.

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.

D.3.3.7 – For anchors installed in wood sill plates a maximum of 2½ 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, provided the anchor bolts comply with all of the following:

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 ACI 7 Standard. It also reformatting the proposal as new Exception 3 and places the sill plate anchor details in new Section 2305.1.2.

Assembly Action: None
S168-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 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

S169-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed requirement for patio cover slab/foundations does not address supporting soil conditions.

Assembly Action: None

S170-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with committee’s action on S167 – 09/10.

Assembly Action: None

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:

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: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The addition of TMS 403 as a referenced standard is valuable to the masonry industry. It will provide a prescriptive alternative to the empirical design method for masonry.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: 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: None

S172-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S173-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: This code change removes Chapter 21 definitions that are no longer used in the code.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S174-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: This proposal updates the definitions in Chapter 21 for consistency with the referenced material standard for masonry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S175-09/10</th>
<th>Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at <a href="http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf">http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf</a>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASTM C 1364 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard complies with ICC standards criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: This code change adds a material standard for architectural cast stone, a product that is currently in use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S176-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: The proposed clarification regarding load combinations and masonry allowable stress increases is not needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S177-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: This code change adds flexibility to the determination of lap splice length, allowing the MSJC requirement in addition to the IBC approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S178-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with action on S162 – 09/10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S179-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S180-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change in terminology for masonry chimneys brings consistency with the remainder of Chapter 21 as well as the IRC.

Assembly Action: None

S181-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal removes an unnecessary restriction on chimney fireblocking.

Assembly Action: None

S182-09/10
PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This code change provides needed requirements for chimney caps and rain caps.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S183-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S184-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Action:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S185-09/10</td>
<td>Withdrawn by Proponent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S186-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Action:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S187-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Action:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S188-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Action:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S189-09/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: Approved as Modified

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 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
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 $6.18 \sqrt{\frac{E}{F_y}}$.

**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.

---

2009.3.6 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, $T_a$, 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:** None

**S190-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** Adding the ACI 318 reference under the composite slab provision is inappropriate and would create a conflict with ACI 318.

**Assembly Action:** None

**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](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:** Disapproved

**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:** None

**S192-09/10**

Withdrawn by Proponent

**S193-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** Consistent with the committee’s action on S188 – 09/10.

**Assembly Action:** None
S194-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This code change removes a modification of SDI –NC1.0 that is unnecessary.

Assembly Action: None

S195-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This proposal relocates the definition of naturally durable wood to a more appropriate location in Chapter 2.

Assembly Action: None

S196-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

S197-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: 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: None

S198-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:

2303.1.2 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: None

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.
Committee Reason: It is important to update the code to include a new industry standard for performance-rated wood siding.

Assembly Action: None

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: None

S200-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S201-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Disapproved

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.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would have the effect of being exclusionary. It would provide language that appears to eliminate some products in the market. This proposal would hinder development of new products.

Assembly Action: None

S202-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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.

Assembly Action: None
PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

PART II- IRC B/E

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: No test data was presented that would support the proposal to allow mechanical galvanizing for wood screws and lag screws.

Assembly Action: None

S205-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S206-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Wood plastic composite materials are currently qualified by evaluation reports and including them in the code is not appropriate at this time. It is important to be able to verify design capacities. The proposed term, structural capacities, may not correlate with the proposed reference standard.
PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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.

S208-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 Reason: 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.

S209-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproved at the proponent’s request because the modified version of S167 – 09/10 that was accepted has addressed sill plate anchorage.

S210-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Replace Table 2306.2.1(1) illustration with the following:

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.
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.

(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: None

S212-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S213-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S214-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed revisions to cripple wall are poorly worded and would not make the code any clearer.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved


Committee Reason: 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: None

S215-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S216-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: 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: None

S217-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S218-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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:
1. Decorative glazing.
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.
4. Glazing in walls on the latch side of and perpendicular to the plane of the door in a closed position in one- and two-family dwellings or within dwelling units in Group R-2.
5. Glazing that is adjacent to the fixed panel of patio doors.

( Portions of the proposal not shown are unchanged)

Committee Reason: 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: None

PART II- IRC B/E

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

S219-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This code change clarifies the code requirements for safety glazing by making the higher performance category the default.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S220-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: No technical justification was provided for the fastener and adhesive requirements that were proposed for installing mirrors.

Assembly Action: None

S221-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

S222-09/10

PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This code change completes the update of the IBC to the consolidated material standard for gypsum wallboard.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: 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
S223-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

S224-09/10
PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This code change correlates the IBC reference to ASTM C 1325 with revisions made in the title of that standard.
Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The change corrects the terminology to be consistent with the referenced ASTM C 1325.
Assembly Action: None

S225-09/10
PART I- IBC STRUCTURAL
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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 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: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:

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 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.
Committee Reason: This change clarifies and improves the directions for installation of the 2 layer system for the water-resistant 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: None

S226-09/10

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: Approved as Modified

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 construction.

Exceptions:

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.
3. Class A roof assemblies include minimum 16 oz/ft$^2$ 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: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

S227-09/10

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.

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: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This code change adds a needed impact standard for testing louvers.

Assembly Action: None

S228-09/10

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.

Withdrawn by Proponent
S229-09/10
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.

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: Disapproved
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: None

S230-09/10
Withdrawn by Proponent
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.

S231-09/10
This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: 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: None

S232-09/10
Withdrawn by Proponent
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.

S233-09/10
This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website. Please go to http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx.

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This code change provides correlation with the seismic design requirements for structural steel in the latest edition of ASCE 7.

Assembly Action: None
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EB1-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: 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: None

EB2-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EB3-09/10

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: This proposal provides an editorial change to the definition of dangerous in the IEBC that corrects poor grammar.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal provides an editorial change to the definition of dangerous in the IBC that corrects poor grammar.

Assembly Action: None

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
considered a more reasonable threshold to require an upgrade in accordance with the IBC or IEBC Appendix.

**Assembly Action:** None

**PART II-IBC GENERAL**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**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:** None

**EB5-09/10**

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 a clarification to repairs of historic buildings by removing circular logic.

**Assembly Action:** None

**EB6-09/10**

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:** This code change provides a better rationale in the IEBC under which to evaluate buildings that have sustained substantial structural damage.

**Assembly Action:** None

**PART II-IBC GENERAL**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**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:** None

**EB7-09/10**

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

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** 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
EB8-09/10

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 action taken is consistent with EB6-09/10. An exception in the IEBC for one- and two-family dwellings that have substantial structural damage is reasonable due to their overall good performance and the fact the many are built prescriptively.

Assembly Action: None

PART II-IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The action taken is consistent with EB6-09/10. An exception in the IBC for one- and two-family dwellings that have substantial structural damage is reasonable due to their overall good performance and the fact the many are built prescriptively.

Assembly Action: None

EB9-09/10

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: 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: None

PART II-IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

EB10-09/10

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

PART I - IEBC
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

PART II – IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Disapproved
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
Assembly Action: None

PART III – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EB11-09/10

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

PART I - IEBC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

PART II – IBC General
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EB12-09/10

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
EB14-09/10
Both parts of this code change proposal were heard by the IEBC Code Development Committee

PART I- IEBC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

PART II-IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee approved Part II to be consistent with the action taken on Part I of the proposal.

Assembly Action: None

EB15-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

EB16-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

EB17-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None
EB18-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

EB19-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

EB20-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

EB21-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

EB22-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This proposal was approved 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: None
EB23-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: 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: None

EB24-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

EB25-09/10
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 takes a logical step to require the bracing of unreinforced masonry parapets under level 3 alterations.
Assembly Action: None

EB26-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

EB27-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

EB28-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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
EB29-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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 sprinkle the area where the change of occupancy actually occurs.

Assembly Action: None

EB30-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EB31-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EB32-09/10

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

PART I- IEBC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

PART II-IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The code change was disapproved to be consistent with the action on Part I of the proposal.

Assembly Action: None
EB33-09/10

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

PART I- IEBC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

PART II-IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved Part II to be consistent with the action taken on Part I of the proposal.

Assembly Action: None

EB34-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EB35-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

B36-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None
EB37-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

EB38-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

EB39-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EB40-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal was approved 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: None

EB41-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: 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
EB42-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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:

1. Unreinforced masonry walls for which height-to-thickness ratios do not exceed ratios set forth in 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-of-plane 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: None

EB43-09/10
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 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: None

EB44-09/10
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 removes an unnecessary reference to historic buildings in the Appendix in order to avoid conflicts with Chapter 11.

Assembly Action: None

EB45-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None
EB46-09/10
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 replaces the phrase “approved foundation system” with more appropriate language that will be more enforceable.

Assembly Action: None

EB47-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

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

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 or other material permitted by the building code for similar applications. 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 Standard Specification for Zinc Coating (Hot-Dip) on Iron and Steel Hardware
ASTM A 653/A 653M-08 Standard Specification for Steel Sheet, Zinc-Coated (Galvanized) or Zinc-Iron Alloy-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 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, 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: Approved as Submitted

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: None

EB51-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

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 ¼”. 10d nails shall be 0.148” x 3”. 12d nails shall be 0.148” x 3 ½”. 16d nails shall be 0.162” x 3 ½”. Nails used to attach metal framing connectors directly to wood members need only be 1
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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: None

EB53-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

EB54-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

EB55-09/10

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 cleans up the scope of Appendix A4 by removing extraneous language.

Assembly Action: None

EB56-09/10

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 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: None
EB57-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: 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: None

EB58-09/10

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 more clearly explains the extent of the load path analysis of wood-framed structures.

Assembly Action: None

EB59-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

EB60-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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, \( \Omega_0 \), 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, \( \Omega_0 \), and \( C_d \) shall be permitted to be based on the seismic force-resisting system being used to achieve the required strengthening.
2. For structures assigned to Seismic Design Category C or D, values of R, \( \Omega_0 \), and \( C_d \) shall be 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.
3. For structures assigned to Seismic Design Category E, values of R, \( \Omega_0 \), and \( C_d \) shall be 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,
respectively, as Types 1b, 5a, and 5b in ASCE 7 Table 12.3-2.

Committee Reason: 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: None

EB61-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

EB62-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This code change was approved as it deletes Section A403.8.1 on cripple walls, removing unnecessary wording from the code.

Assembly Action: None

EB63-09/10

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 deletes conflicting and unnecessary language from Section A403.11.2.1 provisions on drift limits.

Assembly Action: None

EB64-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This code change was approved as it removes unnecessary requirements on shear walls that duplicate provisions in the IBC.

Assembly Action: None
EB65-09/10
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 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: None

EB66-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This code change makes editorial improvements to various provisions of Appendix A4 which were felt to be by the committee to be appropriate. For new materials an appropriate reference to the IBC is introduced.

Assembly Action: None

EB67-09/10
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 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: None

EB68-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

EB69-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IBC Structural Code Development Committee

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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...
Committee Reason: 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing fasteners</th>
<th>Existing fastener spacing (edge or intermediate supports)</th>
<th>Wind speed greater than 100 mph and less than or equal to 110 mph or less supplemental fastening shall be no greater than</th>
<th>Wind speed greater than 110 mph supplemental fastening for interior zone locations and edge zones not covered by column to right shall be no greater than</th>
<th>Edge zone for wind speed greater than 120 mph and Exposure C, or Wind speed greater than 140 mph and Exposure B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staples or 6d</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>6&quot; o.c.&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot; o.c.&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot; o.c. at panel edges and 4&quot; o.c. at intermediate supports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8d clipped head or round head smooth shank</td>
<td>6&quot; o.c. or less</td>
<td>None necessary</td>
<td>None necessary</td>
<td>4&quot; o.c. at panel edges and 4&quot; o.c. at intermediate supports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8d clipped head or round head ring shank</td>
<td>6&quot; o.c. or less</td>
<td>None necessary</td>
<td>None necessary</td>
<td>4&quot; o.c. at panel edges and 4&quot; o.c. at intermediate supports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8d clipped head or round head smooth shank</td>
<td>Greater than 6&quot; o.c.</td>
<td>6&quot; o.c.&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot; o.c.&quot; along panel edges and 6&quot; o.c. at intermediate supports of panel</td>
<td>4&quot; o.c. at panel edges and 4&quot; o.c. at intermediate supports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8d clipped head or round head ring shank</td>
<td>Greater than 6&quot; o.c.</td>
<td>6&quot; o.c.&quot;</td>
<td>6&quot; o.c.&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot; o.c. at panel edges and 4&quot; o.c. at intermediate supports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Maximum spacing determined based on existing fasteners and supplemental fasteners.
b. Maximum spacing determined based on supplemental fasteners only.
c. Interior zone = sheathing that is not located within 4 feet of the perimeter edge of the roof or within 4 feet of 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Action</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Action</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx)

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** 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 | None |
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### F1-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted  
**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the revised format would provide a more logical reorganization that will facilitate the use, application and teaching of the code and provide for expansion into new subject areas in the future.

**Assembly Action:** None

### F2-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved  
**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:** None

### F3-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted  
**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.

**Assembly Action:** None

### F4-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted  
**Committee Reason:** The proposal removes subjective language, making the provisions more enforceable.

**Assembly Action:** None

### F5-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified  

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:** None
### F6-09/10

**Committee Action:**  Approved as Submitted  
**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal provides needed improvements to clarify the storage requirements.

**Assembly Action:**  None

### F7-09/10

**Committee Action:**  Disapproved  
**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 with the *International Building Code* which regulates the initial installations since the proposed provisions would be retroactive. The committee also felt that the phrase "...protected in a manner to prevent injury..." in the exception was vague and should be portrayed as being subject to the approval of the fire code official.

**Assembly Action:**  None

### 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 ft$^2$ (1,450 m$^2$) 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) x 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 minimum 3 ft (0.9 m) x 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) Rooftop gardens and landscaped roofs. Buildings or structures with rooftop gardens or landscaped roofs that are equipped with a standpipe shall extend the standpipe to the roof level on which the rooftop garden or landscaped roof is located.

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposal provides 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 change F238-09/10 proposing similar requirements to this proposal was Disapproved. See the Report of Hearing for these code changes.

**Assembly Action:**  None
Modify the proposal as follows:

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 and 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 will be correlated and consolidated into a single new code section.

Assembly Action: None

F10-09/10

Committee Action: 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 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: None

F11-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement that the added wording will enhance emergency planning capabilities.

Assembly Action: None

F12-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee generally felt that the current text adequately addresses occupants who might need assistance and that some occupants who need assistance might be overlooked by the limited application of the proposed text. It was also felt that it is unclear as to who is responsible to identify the specified special needs occupants and could place an undue burden on institutions to do so. Privacy issues in identifying such individuals was also noted as a concern.

Assembly Action: None
F13-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal should be more specific as to the "key emergency components" mentioned and should be more specific as to where the plans should be posted. The proposed text would also conflict with Section 404.2 which already includes Group R-2 college and university buildings and also provides a much higher threshold for Group A and B occupancies.

Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal would put the fire code official in the position of approving a federally-mandated document which the committee felt was inappropriate. It was also noted as unclear as to what action the fire code official might need to take upon notification required by Section 408.4.4 and who would be responsible for identifying any deficiencies. The classification of some materials listed in the tables were also noted as not being compatible with the material definitions in the IFC.

Assembly Action: None

F15-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 employee access widths could be substantially reduced.

Assembly Action: None

F16-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 plans and documents. The committee felt that the fire code official should have the authority 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 "laundry 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 include, but not be limited to, consideration of building construction type, wildland-urban interface areas, terrain characteristics and the specific characteristics of fire apparatus. The committee also expressed its preference for code change F17-09/10 to establish needed dialogue regarding fire apparatus road design issues versus traffic safety issues.

Assembly Action: None

F17-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that at approval of this proposal would be an important first step in establishing needed critical dialogue with urban traffic planning officials so that both fire departments and traffic planners could understand and respect one another's
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viewpoints and needs regarding the need for traffic calming devices. The committee recognized the need to provide better speed control for increased safety but emphasized that features which impede or, possibly, prevent emergency vehicle response create a serious public safety hazard. The committee also noted that the prohibitive language of this proposal (“Traffic calming devices are prohibited…”) does not lend itself to the kind of co-operation between agencies that is essential to this discussion and suggested a public comment be submitted to make the language more approval-oriented.

**Assembly Action:** None

**F18-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

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 building fire code 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.

(Provisions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

**Committee Reason:** The proposal provides for additional address identification for buildings when there are conditions that may require it such as when the building front is not facing the address side. The proposal also provides a needed requirement that address identification marking be maintained in place and legible. 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](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.
5. 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.

(Provisions 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

F20-09/10

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:

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 with a standardized fire service elevator key approved by the fire code official.

Exception: Where there is a practical difficulty to providing a standardized key. The owner shall be permitted to 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.)

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: None

PART II-IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

F21-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed requirement should apply to all fire department connections, not just those for standpipes.

Assembly Action: None

F22-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None
F23-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

F24-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

F25-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

F26-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent’s reason statement.

Assembly Action: None

F27-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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:

1. Whenever existing wired communication system cannot be repaired or is being replaced, or where 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: None
F28-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

F29-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that exempting a specific type of facility could set up a future trend toward a "laundry list" of facilities that wish to be exempt from the requirement. It also felt that the existing exceptions, reasonably applied, could remedy 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: None

F30-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee recognized the importance of the issues raised by the proposal 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 they 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 mixed occupancy building. It was also noted that walkable pathways cannot always be placed over structural members. The committee indicated some support for placing the proposal in an appendix until the issues of concern are resolved.

Assembly Action: None

F31-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the definitions were unclear and 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: None

F32-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal would result in an increase in hazard. Also, the section would apply to all buildings, not just residential. The committee also felt that any increase in storage quantity should be in outdoor storage tanks.

Assembly Action: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Committee Action</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Assembly Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F33-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Committee Reason: The committee felt that, because the requirement would apply to all shaft exhaust fans, the proposal is redundant since the subject 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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F34-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Committee Reason: The committee preferred code change F35-09/10.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F35-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>Committee Reason: The committee preferred this code change over code change 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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F36-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Committee Reason: The proposal contains vague language (e.g., &quot;...or for similar reasons...&quot;) and includes a &quot;laundry list&quot; of electrical hazards that is not exhaustive and provides no guidance as to what standards are to be used to judge 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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F37-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F38-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F39-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

F40-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

F41-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. The proposal clarifies confusing language regarding exactly which batteries are subject to the section.

Assembly Action: None

F42-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action: None

F43-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

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: None

F45-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 felt that the proposal excludes other occupancies or areas that have similar splash hazards and that this is a federal OSHA requirement that does not need to be in the IFC.

Assembly Action: None
F46-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The relabeling of existing fire 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 its own subsection.

Assembly Action: None

F47-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that it was unnecessary to make the IFC Table 803.3 dealing 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: None

F48-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal as it clarifies when NFPA 286, NFPA 265 and ASTM E84 can be used for testing textile wall and ceiling coverings. NFPA 265 is limited to walls 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: None

F49-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

F50-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the provisions adding a separate section detailing the testing requirements for expanded vinyl wall coverings to help clarify when and how the various tests apply to these materials. These provisions would apply to existing and newly introduced expanded vinyl wall or ceiling coverings. The provisions correlate with the IBC.

Assembly Action: None

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.
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

F52-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved related to concerns with enforceability. These provisions would be applicable to all occupancies which seemed too 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: None

F53-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

F54-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

F55-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Reason:</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F57-09/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F58-09/10</strong></td>
<td>Both parts of this code change proposal were heard by the IFC Code Development Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong></td>
<td>The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at <a href="http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf">http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf</a>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART I- IFC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART II-IBC GENERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>The committee approved the proposal based upon the action taken on Part I of the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F59-09/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### F60-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The committee approved this proposal as it was felt important to regulate 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:** None

### F61-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The committee approved the proposal to regulate combustible lockers in the IFC as they are essentially an interior finish that poses a substantial hazard that non-combustible lockers do not. Some concern was expressed that they should be addressed by Section 805 as they 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:** None

### F62-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** This provision to require certain size room for fire pumps and risers was felt by the committee to fit well in the general requirements of Chapter 9. This location in Chapter 9 encourages the consideration of such spaces early in the design. Additionally committee members felt comfortable that manufacturers 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:** None

### 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](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:** Approved as Submitted

**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:** None

### F64-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that it was necessary for the fire official to be notified when the alarm

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
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.

**F65-09/10**

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as the IBC already addresses the issue of fire walls creating separate buildings thoroughly and more appropriately and it is not necessary in this section of the code.

Assembly Action: None

**F66-09/10**

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

**F67-09/10**

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it would include all Group A-2 occupancies whether or not they 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: None

**F68-09/10**

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved this proposal as it felt that sprinkler protection needs to be provided not simply within the fire area but also needs to address the floor where the Group B Ambulatory Healthcare facility is located and all floors below.

Analysis: Code change G15-09/10 contains a similar revision on which was approved as submitted by the IBC General Committee.

Assembly Action: None

**F69-09/10**

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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);
2. Where a Group F-1 fire area is located more than three stories above grade plane; or
3. Where the combined area of all Group F-1 fire areas on all floors, including any mezzanines, exceeds 24,000 square feet (2230 m²).
4. Where a Group F-1 occupancy that 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
4. Where a Group M occupancy that is used for the manufacture of upholstered furniture or mattresses exceeds 5,000 square feet (464 m²).

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
3. The combined area of all Group S-1 fire areas on all floors, including any mezzanines, exceeds 24,000 square feet (2230 m²).
4. 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).
5. A Group S-1 occupancy that is used for the storage of upholstered furniture or mattresses exceeds 2,500 square feet (232 m²).

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal as they felt that Group F-1 and Group S-1 occupancies manufacturing and storing upholstered furnishings and mattresses 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 threshold that would 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: None

F70-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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 were necessary to increase the integrity of the system, therefore the proposal was approved as submitted.

Assembly Action: None

F71-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved in favor of code change F69-09/10. A threshold was felt to be necessary but the thresholds provided in the modification to code change F69-09/10 were more reasonable. Additionally the term “occupancy” versus “fire area” is preferred. More 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 strip mall is likely to be considered as a single fire area and sprinklers would be required throughout versus just in the Group M occupancy selling furniture.

Assembly Action: None

F72-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent
F73-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the exception for open parking garages as there were concerns with fighting fires in unsprinklered open parking structures. There was also a concern with the increasing combustibility of vehicles.
Assembly Action: None

F74-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This proposal to delete the exception for Group Occupancies was considered appropriate based upon other actions the committee has taken and since the code now requires all Group R occupancies to be sprinklered without exception.
Assembly Action: None

F75-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

F76-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee felt that this proposal clarified the intent of the code with 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: None

F77-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Modify proposal as follows:

903.2.11.2 Rubbish and linen 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 accordance 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 that sprinklers need to be recessed and freezing concerns are specifically addressed within NFPA 13.
Assembly Action: None
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 other Chapters 23 and 34 of this code, as applicable.

Committee Reason: The committee felt that it was necessary that the code user be notified that there are many more sections in the code that have specific sprinkler requirements addressing 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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved primarily with a concern that the proposed language did not include the 15 minute rating on the bathroom enclosure as part of the allowance to omit sprinklers.

Assembly Action: None

F80-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

F81-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this item as they 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: None
F82-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

F83-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

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:

1. Automatic sprinkler systems protecting one- and two-family dwellings installed in accordance with NFPA 13D.
2. through 7. remain unchanged.

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

F85-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

F86-09/10

Committee Action: Withdrawn by Proponent
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 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 requirement such certification will be created. The modification simply removed the phrase “an approved third party certification organization” to provide more control to the jurisdiction.

Assembly Action: None

F88-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it was felt that all fire protection systems whether newly installed or existing need to appropriately work together to avoid causing unnecessary hazards.

Assembly Action: None

F89-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the approach taken in code change F87-09/10 requiring a certification program.

Assembly Action: None

F90-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the approach taken in code change F87-09/10 requiring a certification program.

Assembly Action: None

F91-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The code change was disapproved based upon the proponents request and due to the fact that as currently written creates possible problems with existing buildings.

Assembly Action: None
F92-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 2 1/2-inch (63.5 mm) outlet on the standpipe system.

Committee Reason: The proposal refocuses the need for rooftop 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 building the provisions were applicable and makes the language in Section 905.3.6 consistent with the language in Section 1107.5.

Assembly Action: None

F93-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal as the revisions would make the provisions consistent with NFPA 14 which will now only require one standpipe connection on the roof.

Assembly Action: None

F94-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee felt that even within sprinklered buildings fire extinguishers have made a difference in fighting fires therefore the exception for quick response sprinklers in Groups 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: None

F95-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 sprinklers. In addition, it was felt that there have been many situations in Group R-2 dormitories where extinguishers have been necessary.

Assembly Action: None

F96-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Reason:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F97-09/10</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F98-09/10</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>This proposal was disapproved as it removed the ability of the fire code official to ask for more information when reviewing fire alarm designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F99-09/10</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F100-09/10</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F101-09/10</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F102-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal with concern that this approach, which was used in code change F100-09/10, is not considered appropriate due to the large occupant loads addressed by this section.
Assembly Action: None

F103-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt it was more appropriate to rely on NFPA 72 to address how public address systems interconnect with the alarm system. It is likely that solutions already exist within the code to allow the use of public address systems. Some committee members expressed interest that public address systems supplement and not replace alarm system components.
Assembly Action: None

F104-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The format of the code change proposal seemed to be awkward. More specifically, as written the language is more restrictive than the main section which would only require an alarm when the occupants in a Group A occupancy exceed 300. The new section would essentially bring that number to 100 for Group A-2 occupancies. The committee felt it was more appropriate to address the threshold found in the main Section 907.2.1.
Assembly Action: None

F105-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F106-09/10</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>The proposal which would have removed the exception allowing sprinklers in lieu of smoke detection was disapproved as it would take away the incentive for sprinklers. In addition since the section is so new it should first have a chance to be applied before be revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F107-09/10</th>
<th>Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>The committee felt that this proposal was necessary as schools are dealing with a host of threats such as fires and tornadoes and in more recent history an increase in school lockdown situations. This provides a better method of communication during emergencies than traditional fire alarm and occupant notification systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F108-09/10</th>
<th>Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART I- IFC</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>The committee disapproved the proposal 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 systems could possibly result in the loss of smoke detection and alarm through other exceptions such as that found in Section 907.2.8.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F109-09/10</th>
<th>Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART II- IRC B/E</strong></td>
<td>Withdrawn by Proponent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>The committee approved the proposal due to the unique hazards that are present in Group R-2 college and university buildings. More specifically, there are often more common areas than found in other types of Group R-2 occupancies where occupants congregate. Also it is not uncommon to have activities such as cooking in these common areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F110-09/10</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>This proposal to add an automatic smoke detection system 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**F111-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**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:** None

---

**F112-09/10**

**PART I- IFC**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The committee disapproved the code change as they felt that the standards development process should address concerns 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:** None

**PART II- IRC B/E**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposed language would only permit the photoelectric type. This change would exclude other types and would limit future technology.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

**F113-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was disapproved with concern that connection to the main fire alarm occupant notification system may create many unnecessary alarms throughout the building. These unnecessary alarms would result in occupants not reacting appropriately in a situation where evacuation is necessary.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

**F114-09/10**

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

**PART I- IFC**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**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 “dwellings not classified as Group R Occupancies” where in other locations it specifically stated Group I-1.

**Assembly Action:** None
PART II- IBC GENERAL

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved Part II based upon the action taken on Part I of this proposal. Additionally IBC Chapter 34 had not addressed this requirement which would be inconsistent with the requirements of the IFC and the IEBC.

Assembly Action: None

PART III- IEBC

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

F115-09/10

PART I- IFC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change permits wireless alarms as an alternate to wired interconnection. Also, clarity is added by placing the interconnection requirements in a separate section. This is consistent with the IFC.

Assembly Action: None

F116-09/10

PART I- IFC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

PART II- IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The electrical portion of the code already provides for protection with the arc-fault circuit-interrupter. There was no documentation provided that a product exists that will provide activation at 475°F.

Assembly Action: None
F117-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

F118-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as adding the term "visible" correlates with NFPA 72.

Assembly Action: None

F119-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

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:

1. In the main supply air duct of each air-handling system having a design capacity greater than 2,000 cubic feet per minute (cfm) (0.94 m$^3$/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 m$^3$/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 m$^3$/s),
4. At each story in return air systems having a design capacity greater than 15,000 cfm (7.1 m$^3$/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 m$^3$/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 m$^3$/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 correlated 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 "air-conditioning" to "air handling" to be consistent with the intent and the wording throughout the proposed revisions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Action:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART II- IMC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>This proposal was approved to be consistent with the action taken on Part I of this proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F121-09/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>The proposal was disapproved as the exception 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F122-09/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>The committee approved the proposal to delete the exception because it was felt that if the exception remains, early notification and alarm would be jeopardized since sprinklers react slower than smoke detectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F123-09/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>The proposal was approved as the language provides a tool for inspections and provides more direction as to the locations of manual fire alarm boxes. There were some concerns expressed with the use of the term “visible” and how it would be applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F124-09/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>The proposal was approved as the committee felt it is necessary to ensure that the two way communication for those waiting for an elevator would function as necessary. The audible notification typically provided in these areas may be too loud and make it hard for them to hear specific instructions for evacuation. This is also considered consistent with the requirements of Section 3008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F125-09/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>The committee approved the proposal to create consistency with NFPA 72 which addresses minimum sound pressure levels more appropriately and in more detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F126-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal as the provisions may be applied beyond high-rise 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: None

F127-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: This proposal was disapproved as it inappropriately limits the paging zones to interior stairways versus all stairways.

Assembly Action: None

F128-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

F129-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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.

Assembly Action: None

F130-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent
F131-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent
F132-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent

PART I- IFC Withdrawn by Proponent
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/2009-10cycle/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
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, or enclosed parking garage ventilated in accordance with Section 404 of the International Mechanical Code shall not be deemed to be an attached garage.

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 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, or enclosed parking garage ventilated in accordance with Section 404 of the International Mechanical Code shall not be deemed to be an attached garage.

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 Reason: 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 use of CO detectors and associated systems in accordance with UL 2075. Such detectors are approved by NFPA 720 and the committee felt it was appropriate to recognize both CO alarms and detectors.

Assembly Action: None
F134-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

F135-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this code change with concern that Section 909.18.8.2.1 did not include the engineer and only referenced the contractor. In addition it would be more appropriate to reference the fire code official versus the building official. Generally there was concern that allowing third party accreditation may lessen the testing requirements. It should be noted that the committee did like that the proposal coordinated the smoke control special inspection requirements between the IBC, IFC and the IMC.

Assembly Action: None

F136-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal as there was concern with the allowance in the proposed item 6.6 for “doors typically 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: None

F137-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This code change was disapproved as there was no justification provided to remove the safety factor for pressure testing of ducts when used with a smoke control system. In addition, there is no referenced standard provided by the proponent to support the proposal.

Assembly Action: None

F138-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as there needs to be confirmation that all aspects of the smoke control system are operative with confirmation of power downstream of the disconnects.

Assembly Action: None

F139-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as there was not felt a need to restrict raceways to metal as many other types are used without a problem. If the concern is survivability, then the section needs to address that concern with specific language.

Assembly Action: None
F140-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

F141-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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: None

F142-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

F143-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

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

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.
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:

1. 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 Standard for Smoke and Heat Venting

( Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal with amendments as it was felt that a major revision to this section was necessary. The proposal essentially requires mechanical 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 increases the rating of the wiring for the smoke removal system from 30 minutes to 1 hour 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 permitted by NFPA 13 to allow smoke and heat 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 reference to smoke removal more general to be inclusive of mechanical smoke removal and smoke and heat vents. The fourth modification changes the 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: None

F145-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal with concern that aisle configuration often changes and in most cases draft curtains are not required in sprinklered buildings with high-piled storage.

Assembly Action: None
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: Approved as Modified

Modify proposal as follows:

NFPA

204-2007 2010 Standard for Smoke and Heat Venting

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged.)

Committee Reason: The committee approved the proposal as it provides the necessary maintenance requirement for smoke and heat vents that the code currently lacks. The modification simply revises the standard edition of NFPA 204 to the 2010 edition.

Assembly Action: None

F147-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal 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: None

F148-09/10

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

PART I- IFC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for several reasons. More specifically it is unclear whether the intention was to require the device in all buildings or only in specific buildings. Currently the language appears to apply to all buildings and occupancies. In 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: None

PART II- IFGC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved based upon the action taken on Part I of this proposal.

Assembly Action: None
F149-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent’s reason statement.

Assembly Action: None

F150-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval in order to work with the fire service and other stakeholders in preparing a very clear definition of the term “occupied” based on the number of persons.

Assembly Action: None

F151-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1030.2 Reliability. Required exit access, 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.

(Additional 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 exit passageway language from the proposal that could have lead to inconsistent enforcement and would have made the proposed revisions more restrictive for existing buildings than for new buildings.

Assembly Action: None

F152-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. The revised requirements will be less restrictive than those required by the OSHA directive listed in the bibliography, which requires fire detection at such work stations.

Assembly Action: None

F153-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and preferred this proposal over F154-09/10, which its proponent offered to withdraw in favor of this proposal. It was felt that 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 perchlorethylene 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: None

F154-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent
F155-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee had concerns about combustible finishes being deleted 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: None

F156-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee did not feel that it had adequate information to properly evaluate 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 time-out interlock is straightforward and easy to inspect while the volume-based interlock would be difficult to inspect.
Assembly Action: None

F157-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee did not feel that it had adequate information to properly evaluate the proposal and that there was inadequate justification provided. The current stated air velocity is straightforward and easy to measure, whereas determining 25% of the LFL would require expensive equipment and it is unclear as to who would be responsible to provide such equipment.
Assembly Action: None

F158-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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 fogging technology which required heating to disperse the insecticidal vapors.
Assembly Action: None

F159-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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.
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: None

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: Approved as Modified

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:

1. An automatic gaseous fire-extinguishing local surface application system shall be allowed as an 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 approved for use without internal fire extinguishing system protection.

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: None

F161-09/10

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

PART I- IFC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval to allow additional dialogue on the subject with the fire service.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exceptions:

1. An approved automatic fire suppression system shall not be required in ducts conveying materials, fumes, mists and vapors that are nonflammable and noncombustible and where
flammable 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, or nonmetallic exhaust ducts in semiconductor fabrication facilities.

2-A. 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. 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 proponent'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: None

F162-09/10

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

PART I- IFC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: In the floor testimony, it was indicated that a revised version of ASTM E2336 which would include other than grease duct applications is not ready now nor will it be ready 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 references to ASTM E2336. The committee did not move the modification and disapproved the 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.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action taken on Part I.

Assembly Action: None

F163-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee preferred code change F164-09/10 over this proposal to avoid conflicting requirements with NFPA 318.

Assembly Action: None

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: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee preferred 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: 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: None

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

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 and exit enclosures. Transport in corridors and exit enclosures 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. 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.

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 area. 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.

Exceptions:

1. Non-production HPM is allowed to be transported in corridors if utilized for maintenance, lab 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:
      1.1. The length of the common wall of the corridor and the fabrication area; and
      1.2. For the distance along the corridor to the point of entry of HPM into the corridor serving that fabrication area.
   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: None

F168-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

F169-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

F170-09/10

Committee Action: Withdrawn by Proponent

F171-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action: None

F172-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

F173-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the code change better accommodates alcohol-blended fuels.

Assembly Action: None
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 2209.3, dispensing shall be located in accordance with the following:

1. Ten feet (3048 mm) or more from the nearest public street or sidewalk.
2. Fifty feet (15,240 mm) from the nearest rail of any railroad main track.
3. Five feet or more from the nearest enclosing wall.
4. Dispensing equipment shall be allowed under weather protection in accordance with the requirements of Section 2204.13 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 changes 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 correct terminology. The Approved as Modified action also enabled withdrawal of code changes F176- and F177-09/10.

Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The documents proposed as referenced standards are still in draft form and were not submitted to staff or the committee for review.

Assembly Action: None

F176-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent

F177-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent

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:
3704.2.10.1 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.

(Percent 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: None

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal as it would severely limit the types of pallets allowed. A more generic approach was preferred versus allowing wood pallets in all cases but limiting other types of pallet through a testing procedure. In addition, the standard FM 4996 was not submitted by staff as not complying with the CP28 and ASME MH1 as not provided for review. This proposal would also remove idle pallets from the high hazard category which created concern for some committee members.

Assembly Action: None

F180-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

F181-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved as it is common for commodities to change and commodities are often moved around. Enforcing this exception allowing no separation would be very difficult.

Assembly Action: None

F182-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: 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: Disapproved

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 standard was noted by staff as not complying with ICC CP28.

Assembly Action: None

F184-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved as it provides a necessary tool to address an ongoing problem of maintaining flue spaces in a rack configuration in high-piled storage applications.

Assembly Action: None

F185-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal with concerns related to the safety of fire fighters when operating the storage equipment and trying to manually shut down the pallet movers.

Assembly Action: None

F186-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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
F187-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal provides a reasonable clarification of the combustible dust requirements without creating a "laundry list" of conditions.

Assembly Action: None

F188-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

F189-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that relocation of the control area floor requirements to a table footnote would increase the floor fire-resistance rating requirements of shorter buildings without justification. Also, a feature as 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: None

F190-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal, while consistent with the issued committee interpretations, does not clarify the code because the interpretations themselves are a problem. 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: None

F191-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal provides needed clarity to the code.

Assembly Action: None

F192-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action: None
F193-09/10

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

PART I- IFC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IBC FIRE SAFETY
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action: None

F194-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal would introduce confusion and disrupt the correlation that currently exists between the IFC and IMC. The proposal would also introduce subjective language that could create problems with enforcement as well as introducing unwieldiness through the use of tables from the Code of Federal Regulations.

Assembly Action: None

F195-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that deletion of the entire section in favor of a reference 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 offices and similar small occupancies, the IFC should remain as currently written. Also, deletion of Section 3006.3 would sever the current reference link with Section 4004 and outdoor storage provisions.

Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved
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 resolve that inconsistency was more confusing than helpful. Also, the proposed referenced standard does not comply with ICC CP-28, Section 3.8 and was also found to be unclear and confusing by some committee members.

Assembly Action: None
F197-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action taken on code change F196-09/10.

Assembly Action: None

F198-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved for consistency with the action taken on code changes F196- and F197-09/10.

Assembly Action: None

F199-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3304.5.2(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF DISTANCES (Q-D) FOR BUILDINGS AND MAGAZINES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTAINING EXPLOSIVES—DIVISION 1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  c. Restricted to articles, including articles packaged for shipment, that are not regulated as an explosive 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: None

F200-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal represents an important public health issue and approved it based on the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action: None

F201-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None
F202-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 retroactively. The history of storing alcohol blended fuels in steel tanks has shown no problems with corrosion. Current 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: None

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 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 afforded to aboveground tanks that are not classified as protected aboveground tanks. The modification to Section 3404.2.7.3.2 adds a reference 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.

Assembly Action: None

F204-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement that the proposal will provide increased safety for protected aboveground tanks installed indoors and storing Class I liquids.

Assembly Action: None

F205-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement that the proposal will provide parity between protected aboveground tanks and non-protected aboveground tanks. The modification provides an exemption for certain tanks containing Class IIIB liquids but that are not connected to fuel-burning equipment.

Assembly Action: None
F206-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

F207-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

F208-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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.
3. From containers or tanks by an approved pump taking suction through an opening in the top of the container or tank.
4. For Class IB, IC, II and III liquids, from containers or tanks by gravity through an approved self-closing 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: None

F209-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that it was unclear as to whether the proposed standard takes into account the elevated temperatures of liquids heated up to or above their flash points as regulated by this section.

Assembly Action: None

F210-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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:
1. From safety cans with UL 30.
2. Through an approved closed piping system.
3. From containers or tanks by an approved pump taking suction through an opening in the top of the container or tank.
4. For Class IB, IC, II and III liquids, from containers or tanks by gravity through an approved self-closing 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 original shipping containers not exceeding a 5.3-gallon (20 L) or 1.3-gallon (5 L) capacity.

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed 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:** None

**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 proposed new standard UL 1204-04 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:** Approved as Submitted

**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:** None

**F212-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and that the proposal will provide increased safety.

**Assembly Action:** None

**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, the standards did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.11 and 3.6.3.2.

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and that the proposal will provide increased safety.

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

3405.5 Alcohol-based hand rubs classified as Class I 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:

1. The maximum capacity of each dispenser shall be 68 ounces (2 L).
2. The minimum separation between dispensers shall be 48 inches (1219 mm).
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 dispenser and the floor shall remain clear and unobstructed.
4. 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.
Facilities shall be permitted to install and use automatically activated “Touch Free” alcohol based handrub dispensing devices with the following requirements:

5.1. The touch free dispensing system shall be listed as being in compliance with UL/CE 60601-1 and IEC 60601-1-2 for medical devices.

5.2. 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.

5.3. 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:

5.3.1. Any activations of the dispenser shall only occur when an object is placed within four inches of the sensing device.

5.3.2. The dispenser shall not dispense more than the amount required for hand hygiene consistent with label instructions as regulated by the Food and Drug Administration.

5.3.3. An object placed within the activation zone and left in place will cause only one activation.

6. Storage and use of alcohol-based hand rubs shall be in accordance with the 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:

IEC
International Electrotechnical Commission
IEC Central Office
3, rue 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 operating mechanism. The committee also expressed some concern over accidental or mischievous/malicious activations of the dispensers and suggested a public comment to address those issues. The modification 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: None

F214-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent’s reason statement. The modification suggested by the proponent retains the current text in anticipation of the submission of a more comprehensive code change proposal in the future that will correlate the subject matter of several competing code changes.

Assembly Action: None

F215-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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
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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 limited to, storage containers, pressure regulators, pressure relief devices, vaporizers, manifolds, and piping, with a storage capacity of more than 5,000 ft³ (142 m³) of compressed flammable gas including unconnected reserves 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 compressed gas.

**BULK FLAMMABLE CRYOGENIC FLUID GAS SYSTEM.** An assembly 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 reserves 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-BULK FLAMMABLE GASES – DISTANCE TO EXPOSURES*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Entire table to be deleted)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3504.2.1.1 Weather protection canopies. Where weather protection is provided for sheltering outdoor non-bulk 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 allowed 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 CGA 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: None

F216-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal was taking too broad an approach 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 roofs under certain conditions. The committee suggested that a container size limitation might be useful and also that the proposal should clarify that it would be applicable only to permanent installations and not to DOTn cylinders used in roofing operations.

Assembly Action: Approved as Submitted

F217-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal is attempting to address a contractual issue which is outside the scope of the IFC and also felt that the attendant section is not the correct location for such a proposal.

Assembly Action: None
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. Cylinders shall be accessible only by authorized personnel or by use of an automated exchange system in accordance with Section 3809.15.1.
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. Cabinets storing cylinders shall be designed such that cylinders can only be placed inside when they are oriented in the upright position.
3. Devices operating door releases for access to stored cylinders shall be permitted to be pneumatic, mechanical or electrically powered.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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
F220-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal would create a financial hardship in these difficult economic times for existing businesses, especially small retailers, and would affect all occupancies in mixed-use buildings that house these types of businesses. The proposal should also be correlated with the action taken on code change F6 9-09/10 which established a threshold for these occupancies when new to prevent a more restrictive requirement for existing buildings.

Assembly Action: None

F221-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

4603.5.2 Existing heliports 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: None

F222-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the action taken on code change F221-09/10 adequately provides for standpipes in existing multi-story buildings. Also, the actions 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: None

F223-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement. The proposal would provide correlation with Chapter 9.

Assembly Action: None

F224-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that removing the requirement for automatic systems would be inappropriate. It was also noted that the title of the section indicates that it is applicable to Group R-4 but the text indicates Group R-2.

Assembly Action: None
F225-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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 not built under any construction code, this becomes a property maintenance issue that does not belong in the IFC. The proposed language could also be in conflict with state legislations that require retroactive smoke alarm installations.

Assembly Action: None

F226-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

F227-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent’s reason statement and felt that the proposal is needed for fire fighter safety when utilizing fire escapes during fireground operations, given the loads imposed by personnel and equipment.

Assembly Action: None

F228-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent’s reason statement and felt that the proposal provides needed correlation between the IFC and the IBC.

Assembly Action: None

F229-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that Chapter 46 should remain intact within the body of the code. Moving it to an appendix would require removal of the many “pointer” sections within the code that no longer 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 code. The committee also expressed its desire that Chapter 46, which is new to the 2009 edition of the IFC, be allowed to develop some usage history before being substantially changed. The committee also observed that jurisdictions that adopt the code always have the authority to make amendments to it in their adopting ordinance and can just as easily amend out Chapter 46 if so desired.

Assembly Action: None

F230-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent’s reason statement and felt that the proposal provides needed clarification to the code text.

Assembly Action: None
F231-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal provides needed clarification to the code text.

Assembly Action: None

F232-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Because of the action taken on code change F231-09/10, 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 text from F231-09/10 would become the new text. The modification was ruled out of order and the committee suggested that the proponent submit a public comment to resolve the issues between the two code changes.

Assembly Action: None

F233-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal provides needed clarification to the code text.

Assembly Action: None

F234-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement.

Assembly Action: None

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 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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal was vague and unenforceable and contains mostly commentary, making it difficult to determine what is required. The committee reiterated its suggestion from its action on a similar proposal in the 2007-2008 cycle that existing technology, such 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: None
F236-09/10

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

PART I- IFC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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 be correlated because, as written, the lettering side would be larger than the symbol wing space into which it must be placed.

Assembly Action: None

PART II-IBC GENERAL
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed appendix should not be placed in the IBC because it is predominantly fire department specific in much of its content (i.e., pertaining to FD training, tactics, procedures, etc.).

Assembly Action: None

F237-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that the proposal would provide a good starting point for community planning that takes into account the need for road traffic safety in fire apparatus access road design.

Assembly Action: None

F238-09/10

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 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: Disapproved

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 standard 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: None

F239-09/10

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: Approved as Submitted

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: None
### F240-09/10

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

**Committee Action:** Disapproved  
**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the issue of this proposal is a local one and need not be included in the code.

**Assembly Action:** None

### 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:** Disapproved  
**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposal would be in conflict with the action taken on code change F100-09/10 which clarifies the same requirements for new Group A occupancies and provides for Group A occupancies that are separated from one another.

**Assembly Action:** None

### 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:** Disapproved  
**Committee Reason:** This proposal was disapproved based upon the action taken on F144-09/10 which completely revised Section 910 and would specifically not require mechanical smoke removal for buildings equipped with ESFR sprinklers.

**Assembly Action:** None

### 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:** Approved as Submitted  
**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:** None
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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: None

FG2-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproval
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 cause code officials to require ASTM E136 testing of all materials commonly known to be noncombustible.

Assembly Action: Approved as Submitted

FG3-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Adding the new definition supports the action taken on FG26-09/10 which introduces code coverage for such devices.

Assembly Action: None

FG4-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The definition is not needed as the term is no longer used in the code.

Assembly Action: None

FG5-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Current Section 403.10.2. of the code recognizes such joints which are appropriately described as a type of mechanical joint.

Assembly Action: None

FG6-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The value of 18% is unenforceable and could be misconstrued as requiring field measurement.

Assembly Action: None
FG7-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

FG8-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Current Section 403.10.2 already covers the definition by reference to ANSI LC-4. The definition inappropriately contains a requirement in the last sentence.

Assembly Action: None

FG9-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: There is no text addressing water heaters in association with this definition.

Assembly Action: DF

FG10-09/10
PART I- IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Rating plate information is prescribed by the listing process or federal law, not by the code.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IFGC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on FG10-09/10 Part I.

Assembly Action: None

PART III- IRC-M
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: It is difficult or impossible for the code official to verify in the field whether a piece of equipment such as a heat pump unit or a condensing unit meets the energy efficiency rating required by the IECC. Heat pump and condensing units are typically not referred to as appliances, but need to be included in what is required to bear the prescribed nameplate information.

Assembly Action: None
FG11-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: It is too restrictive to extend the requirement for a pan to all appliances that contain or use water.
Assembly Action: None

PART II - IFGC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the 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 covered in current Section 1411.
Assembly Action: None

FG12-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed revision would not recognize gypsum board made with non-combustible facings.
Assembly Action: None

FG13-09/10
Withdrawn by proponent

FG14-09/10

PART I - IFGC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed text does not accomplish the proponent’s intent as it does not guarantee compliance with any product standard. There is no evidence of problems with fittings that do not comply with the proposed text.
Assembly Action: None

PART II - IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on FG14-09/10 Part I.
Assembly Action: None

PART III - IRC-M
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposed text provides the means by which compliance with the code referenced product standards is demonstrated and verified.
Assembly Action: None
FG15-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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 systems to make sure that they are installed as is required for other listed products.

Assembly Action: None

FG16-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Customer-owned piping would operate at 2 psi and less and such pressure would not result in significant migration of gas leakage. No documentation was provided to justify 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 proposed text is consistent with other fuel gas codes.

Assembly Action: None

FG17-09/10

PART I – IFGC

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

FG18-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The current text favors one material over others without reason. Other materials have been used successfully for many years. Other materials, besides metal, that have been tested and proven to have the structural strength necessary to support piping should be allowed.

Assembly Action: None

FG19-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed figure illustrates what the code text intends and will help assure that sediment traps are effective.

Assembly Action: None

FG20-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Seasonal use appliances shouldn’t have a problem with sediment.

Assembly Action: None
FG21-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: CSA Requirement 3-88 has been withdrawn by the promulgator in favor of ASME B16.44.
Assembly Action: None

FG22-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed revisions would eliminate, without justification, the flexibility in valve location afforded by current text. In some circumstances, it would be safer to have the valve in a remote location.
Assembly Action: None

FG23-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The current distance limit of 50 feet assures that convenient access is provided without requiring the valve to be located on the same floor level as the appliance served.
Assembly Action: None

FG24-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The current text of Section 410.1 already addresses the protection of regulators from physical damage.
Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed standard is not yet published and available.
Assembly Action: None

FG26-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None
FG27-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

FG28-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed revision is premature as gas-fired hot plates still exist.

Assembly Action: None

FG29-09/1
Withdrawn by proponent

FG30-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: CSA 8 was withdrawn without replacement. Only the control valves were listed in the past. The proposed text provides code official guidance by accurately describing these devices.

Assembly Action: None

FG31-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This section is redundant with current section 618.8 and Section 618.8 is favored because it more clearly states the intent.

Assembly Action: None

FG32-09/10
PART I - IFGC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

618.5 Prohibited sources. Outdoor or return air for a forced-air heating system shall not be taken from the following locations:

1. Closer than 10 feet (3048 mm) from 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 there is the presence of objectionable odors, fumes or flammable vapors; 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 hazardous or insanitary 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 taken from a room or space is less than or equal 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 the sole source of return air.

Exception: This shall not apply where:
1. The appliance is a direct-vent appliance or an appliance not requiring a vent in accordance with Section 501.8.

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 (9.6L/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 hood in the 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-burning appliances, provided that return-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, mechanical room, boiler room, furnace room or unconditioned attic.

Exceptions:

1. Where return air intakes are located not less than 10 feet (3048 mm) from cooking appliances and serve only the kitchen area, taking return air from a kitchen area shall not be prohibited.

2. Dedicated Forced air heating systems serving only a garage shall not be prohibited from obtaining return air from the garage.

7. A 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: Current text unintentionally prohibits the taking of return air from 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: None

PART II- IMC

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

918.6 Prohibited sources. Outdoor or return air for a forced-air heating system shall not be taken 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 the discharge outlet of an exhaust fan, unless the outlet is 3 feet (914 mm) above the outdoor air inlet.

2. Where there is the presence of objectionable odors, fumes or flammable vapors; 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 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 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 taken from a room or space is less than or equal to the amount of supply air delivered to such room or space.

5. A closet, bathroom, toilet room, kitchen, garage, mechanical room, boiler room, furnace room or unconditioned attic.

Exceptions:

5.1. Where return air intakes are located not less than 10 feet (3048 mm) from cooking appliances, and serve the kitchen area only, taking return air from a kitchen shall not be prohibited.

5.2. Dedicated Forced air heating systems serving only a garage shall not be prohibited 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 fuel-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 discharged 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 located 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 rooms 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:

1. 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: Dedicated forced air systems serving only a garage shall not be prohibited from obtaining return air from the garage.

5. A room or space containing a fuel-burning appliance where such room or space serves as the sole source of return air.

Exceptions:

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 a draft hood in the same room or space or the combustion chamber of any atmospheric burner 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: None
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FG33-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 will result with the installation of these appliances.

Assembly Action: None

FG34-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no reason to disallow the use of these heaters. It would be difficult to enforce this proposed text because of the need to go back and inspect the dwelling after new heaters are added.

Assembly Action: None

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: Approved as Submitted

Analysis: A review of the standard(s) proposed for inclusion in the code, ANSI Z83.19-01 and Z83.20-08, 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: ANSI Z83.19 and Z83.20 are the replacements for Z83.6.

Assembly Action: None

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: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Add new text as follows:

   **SECTION 636 (IFGC)**
   **OUTDOOR DECORATIVE APPLIANCES**

   **636.1 General.** Permanently fixed-in-place outdoor decorative appliances shall be tested in accordance with 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
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 the provision for unlisted appliances 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 any specific requirements that are part of the appliance listing and/or manufacturer's installation instructions in addition to the general ventilation requirements of the current text.

Assembly Action: None
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M1-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None

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

Assembly Action: None

M2-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposed text will end the confusion on how to classify exhaust air from a parking garage. Such air is often erroneously classified as product conveying air. The garage is an occupied space and the air in that space is accurately described by the definition of environmental air.

Assembly Action: None

M3-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: There is no need for two definitions for the same term. The current definitions conflict with regard to screwed joints. A mechanical joint is typically a joint that can be disassembled. Extraneous commentary text does not belong in a definition (i.e. last 3 sentences of “Mechanical joint”)

Assembly Action: None

M4-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval is based upon the action taken on M3-09/10.

Assembly Action: None
**M5-09/10**

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Approval is consistent with the action taken on M14 6-09/10 and M147-09/10. The proposed definition makes a distinction between press joints and push-fit joints and push-fit joint is currently defined in the code.

Assembly Action: None

**M6-09/10**

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

**M7-09/10**

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

**M8-09/10**

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IFC

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

**M9-09/10**

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

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

PART I - IMC

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M10-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M11-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

Exception: This section shall not apply to Group R-3 occupancies.
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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

Assembly Action: None

M12-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

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

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

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

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

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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

Assembly Action: None

M13-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
### M14-09/10

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action</th>
<th>Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason</td>
<td>The proposal provides a product standard which is lacking in current code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M15-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

| Assembly Action | None |

### M16-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

### M17-09/10

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

**Revise as follows:**

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action</th>
<th>Approved as Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason</td>
<td>Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason. The modification more clearly describes how the vertical distance is measured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M18-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

| Assembly Action | None |
M19-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M20-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M21-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M22-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent

M23-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M24-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M25-09/10

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

TABLE 403.3
MINIMUM VENTILATION RATES

(Portions of table not shown remain unchanged)
a. through d. (No change)

e. Rates are per water closet or urinal. The higher rate shall be provided where the exhaust system is designed to operate intermittently. The lower rate shall be permitted only where the exhaust system is designed to operate continuously during occupancy while occupied.

f. Rates are per room unless otherwise indicated. The higher rate shall be provided where the exhaust system is designed to operate intermittently during occupancy while occupied. The lower rate shall be permitted only where the exhaust system is designed to operate continuously during occupancy while occupied.

g through h (No change)

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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

Assembly Action: None

M26-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.1 and 3.6.3.2

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M27-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M28-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M29-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
M30-09/10

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

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

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

Assembly Action: None

M31-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None

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

Assembly Action: None

M32-09/10

This proposal was heard by the IFC committee

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

M33-09/10

This proposal was heard by the IFC committee

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

Assembly Action: None

M34-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Rivets are already covered under the term “fasteners” used in current text.

Assembly Action: None
M35-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II – IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

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

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

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

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Assembly Action: None

M36-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M37-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
M38-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M39-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed standard is not yet available.

Assembly Action: None

M40-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
M41-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M42-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M43-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

M44-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M45-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M46-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
M47-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.
Assembly Action: None

M48-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: UL 1978 applies to factory-built ducts only. Field fabricated ducts cannot be submitted to the performance tests required in UL 1978.
Assembly Action: None

M49-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval is based upon the committee’s preference for the more prescriptive approach in M50-09/10.
Assembly Action: None

M50-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason. Item #1 speaks to the “duct it serves” thereby assuring consistent construction.
Assembly Action: None

M51-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.
Assembly Action: None

M52-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The metal would be subject to corrosion when installed in soil and backfill and exposed to moisture. Ducts need to be tested prior to covering. The backfill is not specified. Concrete encasement is necessary for such ducts.
Assembly Action: None
M53-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The code lacks coverage for such systems the proposed text fills that void. The allowance for black steel as an option to stainless steel provides cost savings.

Assembly Action: None

M54-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The revised list version is easier to read than the original paragraph.

Assembly Action: None

M55-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

M56-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed revision provides no statement as to what causes an enclosure to be required (i.e. where the duct penetrates a ceiling wall or floor)

Assembly Action: None

M57-09/10
Modify the proposal as follows:
Revise as follows:

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

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

Assembly Action: None
M58-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None

M59-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

M60-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None

M61-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

M62-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None

M63-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

M64-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None
M65-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.
Assembly Action: None

M66-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.
Assembly Action: None

M67-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Requiring that the hood label state the required exhaust rate in cfm per linear foot will help code officials verify that the hood system is appropriate for the appliances served.
Assembly Action: None

M68-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The laundry list of exceptions was deleted and replaced with simplified text in the previous code change cycle and the proposed new text would be starting the laundry list again. Current text already allows the HVAC system to be designed to handle the effluent load from the dishwashing machine.
Assembly Action: None

M69-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The requirements of NFPA 58 are irrelevant to this code provision. The proposed revision would exempt all appliances that produce combustion products, not just those appliances of concern to the proponent.
Assembly Action: None

M70-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The ventilation rate required under current text is minimal. Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on M62-09/10.
Assembly Action: None
M71-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

M72-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The current text allows the designer to account for venting and pressure issues. Positive pressure maintenance could cause odor migration from the kitchen. The exception needs to identify the reference space to which the positive pressure is to be measured.

Assembly Action: None

M73-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposed text will prevent the misuse of such materials. ASTM E 2336 does address the application prohibited by the proposed text.

Assembly Action: None

M74-09/10
Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

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

Assembly Action: None

M75-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The expanded version of ASTM E 2336 that will address the proposed application is still under development. As proposed, the grease duct standard would be applied out of context. There is no shaft system that is currently evaluated for this hazardous duct application.

Assembly Action: None

M76-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: No standard exists for the proposed alternate enclosure system. Chapter 1 already allows for approval of alternative designs. Hazardous exhaust systems are potentially dangerous systems. ASTM E2336 is limited to grease duct enclosures and not applicable in the proposed application.

Assembly Action: None
Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exceptions:

1. An approved automatic fire suppression system shall not be required in ducts conveying materials, fumes, mists and vapors that are nonflammable and noncombustible and where flammable contaminants are diluted to below 25% of their lower flammability limit under all conditions and at any concentrations.

2. Automatic fire suppression systems shall not be required in metallic and noncombustible nonmetallic exhaust ducts in semiconductor fabrication facilities.

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).

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 semiconductor fabrication facilities so that other occupancies are not affected. The proposed revision eliminates a conflict with the IFC which currently exempts specific types of ducts in H 5 occupancies from the requirement for fire suppression where the exhaust stream is diluted to below the flammability range, whereas, the IMC would require suppression except where the exhaust gases are fundamentally nonflammable regardless of dilution. There is no fire history for metallic and noncombustible non-metallic ducts.

Assembly Action: None

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

Assembly Action: None

M81-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M82-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M83-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M84-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M85-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M86-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
M87-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M88-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M89-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M90-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M91-09/10

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

Analysis: The standard was not submitted for review.

Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Delete and substitute as follows:

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

2. Add new standards as follows:

   ANSI/UL 2024 Standard for Safety Optical-Fiber and Communications Cable Raceway

   UL 2424 Outline of Investigation for Cable Marked Limited Combustible

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

| M92-09/10 |
|---|---|
| **Committee Action:** | Disapproved |
| **Committee Reason:** | The action taken on M 91-09/10 addresses metal sheathed cables, therefore, the proposed text is redundant and unnecessary. |

| M93-09/10 |
|---|---|
| **Committee Action:** | Disapproved |
| **Committee Reason:** | Disapproval is consistent with the action taken on M90-09/10. |

| M94-09/10 |
|---|---|
| **Committee Action:** | Disapproved |
| **Committee Reason:** | Disapproval is based upon the action taken on M95-09/10. |

| M95-09/10 |
|---|---|
| **Committee Action:** | Approved as Submitted |
| **Committee Reason:** | Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason. |

| M96-09/10 |
|---|---|
| **Committee Action:** | Disapproved |
| **Committee Reason:** | The term “discrete” is subjective. UL 2043 is not equivalent to ASTM E 84 or UL 723. The proposed text is too broad in scope. |

| M97-09/10 |
|---|---|
| **PART I - IMC** |
| **Committee Action:** | Approved as Submitted |
| **Committee Reason:** | Such cavities cannot be properly sealed and will always allow air leakage. The proposal is in harmony with the IECC. |

<p>| <strong>PART II - IRC</strong> |
|---|---|
| <strong>Committee Action:</strong> | Approved as Submitted |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M98-09/10</th>
<th>PART I - IMC</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
<th>Committee Reason: The proposed text conflicts with recognized SMACNA standards.</th>
<th>Assembly Action: None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M99-09/10</td>
<td>PART II - IRC</td>
<td>Committee Action: Disapproved</td>
<td>Committee Reason: The intent of the proposed deletion of 0.0175 inch for aluminum duct is unclear. The SMACNA standards may not recognize 30 gage duct metal.</td>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M100-09/10</td>
<td>Committee Action: Disapproved</td>
<td>Committee Reason: No pass/fail criteria is stated. The words “that are considered discrete” are subjective. There are no definitive limits stated in UL 2043. The words “forced air” used to describe fittings are odd because fittings are fittings regardless of the air type.</td>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M101-09/10</td>
<td>Modify the proposal as follows:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revise as follows:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>603.7 Rigid duct penetrations.</strong> 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.</td>
<td>Committee Action: Approved as Modified</td>
<td>Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason. The modification clarifies that the revised text is applicable to private garages.</td>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M102-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M103-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M104-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M105-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
PART II – IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

M1601.4.1 Joints and seams. Joints of duct systems shall be made substantially airtight by means of tapes, mastics, liquid sealants, gasketing or other approved closure systems. Closure systems used with rigid fibrous glass ducts shall comply with UL181A and shall be marked 181A-P for pressure-sensitive tape, 181A-M for mastic or 181 A-H for heat-sensitive tape. Closure systems used with flexible air ducts and flexible air connectors shall comply with UL181B and shall be marked 181B-FX for pressure-sensitive tape or 181B-M for mastic. Duct connections to flanges of air distribution system equipment or sheet metal fittings shall be mechanically fastened. Mechanical fasteners for use with flexible nonmetallic air ducts shall comply with UL 181B and shall be marked 181B-C. Crimp joints for round metal ducts shall have a contact lap of at least 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:

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

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

Assembly Action: None

M106-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M107-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M108-09/10

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

Analysis: The standard was not submitted for review.

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None
M109-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.2.1, 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M110-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M111-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M112-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval is based on the proponent’s request and the action taken on Part I.
Assembly Action: None

M113-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed revision does not allow the designer to design a system with a “design capacity” based on equipment choices and duct static pressures.
Assembly Action: None

M114-09/10
PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason. Labeling assists the inspection process.
Assembly Action: None
PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent’s printed reason.
Assembly Action: None

M115-09/10
Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:
Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.
Assembly Action: None

M116-09/10
Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:
Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason. Approval is consistent with action taken on M115-09/10. Labeling assists the inspection process.
Assembly Action: None
M117-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

M118-09/10

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

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

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

Assembly Action: None

M119-09/10

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

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

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent's printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

M120-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None
M121-09/10

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

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

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

M122-09/10

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

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

Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Revise as follows:

912.13 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

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

Assembly Action: None

M123-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None
M124-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M125-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standards did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M126-09/10

PART I - IMC

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II – IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

Delete and substitute as follows:

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

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

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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

Assembly Action: None
M127-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent’s printed reason.

M128-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent’s printed reason.

M129-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

M130-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Withdrawn by Proponent

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Withdrawn by Proponent
M131-09/10
PART I - IMC
Withdrawn by Proponent

PART II – IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

Revise as follows:

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

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

Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent’s printed reason. The modification makes the text less restrictive, allowing more options.

Assembly Action: None

M132-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposed revision offers more options to secure the intent to prevent tampering.

Assembly Action: None

M133-09/10
PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Legal action will likely ensue for those cases where the service personnel fail to install the devices. The locking caps are an “honest man’s” lock and if someone is intent on getting refrigerant from the system, they will find a way to overcome the locking caps. Refrigerant can be obtained by making a hole in the coil tubing or connecting piping. The service personnel should not be made responsible for this. The proposed text conflicts with the intent of Section 102.2.

Assembly Action: None

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

Assembly Action: None

M134-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason. The proposed revisions update the table based on the chemicals being used today.

Assembly Action: None
Modify the proposal as follows:

1. Revise as follows:

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

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

\[
F = \sqrt{G}
\]

(Equation 11-1)

For SI:

\[
F = 0.138 \sqrt{G}
\]

where:

- \(F\) = The free opening area in square feet (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:

\[
Q = 100 \times \sqrt{G}
\]

(Equation 11-2)

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: Approved as Modified

Committee Reason: The proposed revision consolidates text into one section to improve usability. The modification deletes references to ammonia and IIAR2 because the revised version of the standard is yet to be completed.

Assembly Action: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M136-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: The proponent asked for disapproval to allow the proposal to be reworked and resubmitted as a public comment. The provisions for the discharge of pressure relief valves are lacking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M137-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M138-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: ASME B3 1.9 is currently an option in the code. Deleting the code text eliminates a prescriptive option to a referenced standard. ASME B31.9 is still an option under current code. The referenced standard is an additional expense and the code would contain nothing but a reference to a standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M139-09/10</th>
<th>Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at <a href="http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf">http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf</a>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action: Disapproved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: Some of the proposed standards allow alloys that promote dezincification. Some of the referenced standards are not currently in Chapter 15. Copper and other materials need to be added.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M140-09/10</th>
<th>Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at <a href="http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf">http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf</a>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART I - IMC Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART II - IRC Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent’s printed reason.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

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

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

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.
Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval was based on the proponent’s printed reason.
Assembly Action: None

M143-09/10
Modify the proposal as follows:
Delete without substitution:

1203.1.1 Joints between different piping materials. Joints between different piping materials shall be made with approved adapter fittings.
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Committee Reason: Dielectric fittings can leak and should not be mandated. The modification retains the first sentence to continue to allow approved adapter fittings.
Assembly Action: None

M144-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Disapproval is based upon the action taken on M143-09/10.
Assembly Action: None
M145-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M146-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M147-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M148-09/10

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: DF

Reason: 

M149-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standards did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
M150-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M151-09/10

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

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

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M152-09/10

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

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

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
M153-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.3.1, 3.6.3.2.

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

M154-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M155-09/10

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

M156-09/10

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

PART II – IBC

Revise as follows:

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

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

PART III – IRC

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

R303.4 Mechanical ventilation. Where the air infiltration rate of a dwelling unit is less than 5 air changes per hour when tested with a blower door at a pressure of 33.5 psf 0.2 inch w.c. (50 Pa) in accordance with Section N1102.4.2.1, the dwelling unit shall be provided with whole-house mechanical ventilation in accordance with Section M1507.3.
Reason: Everyone can agree that when dwelling units become “too” tight, they need mechanical ventilation. The question is, “how tight is too tight?” This code change proposal offers five air changes per hour at 50 Pascal as the “too tight” limit, and directs builders to provide mechanical ventilation at this point.

Why is whole-house mechanical ventilation needed?
Indoor air quality has direct impact on the health of building occupants. Poor indoor air quality is listed by the EPA as being the fourth largest environmental threat to our country. 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. If unchecked, pollutants from cleaning chemicals, finishes, furniture, and occupant activities can cause serious health effects on building occupants. Whole-house mechanical ventilation reduces occupant exposure to such pollutants.

Why 5 ACH 50?
Traditionally, 0.35 natural air changes per hour has been the consensus ventilation rate at which it is believed that sufficient fresh air is being provided to building occupants. This ventilation rate was typically achieved without mechanical ventilation because homes were built without an effective air barrier. As building practices have improved, homes have become tighter, and as homes become tighter, mechanical ventilation must be introduced to provide sufficient levels of ventilation.

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

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

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

What states are now requiring whole-house mechanical ventilation?
Several states now require mechanical ventilation in dwellings, including MN, VT, WA, CA, and ME.

References:

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

PART I - IMC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II – IBC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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

Assembly Action: None
PART III – IRC

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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

Assembly Action: None
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P1-09/10

PART I- IPC
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

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: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Testimony of opponent indicated that ASME A112.19.2 has a better definition.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Agreed with proponent’s reason statement that the definition is out of date and doesn’t include waterless urinals.

Assembly Action: Disapproved

P3-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Provides greater clarification between the definition of appliances and fixtures.

Assembly Action: None

P4-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

P5-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Revised definition is too restrictive and leads to only specific types of products being acceptable. Wording is awkward.

Assembly Action: 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 be 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 shall be listed by a third-party certification agency as complying with the referenced standards specifications and performance criteria of this code. Products and materials shall be identified in accordance with Section P2608.1.

Committee Reason: Modification made to clarify that products must be certified to referenced standards. Provides for a more uniform method 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 Reason: Breakage protection of piping is already specifically covered by Sections 305.3 and 305.9 and doesn’t need to be in this section.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
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:** Approved as Submitted

**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.

**Assembly Action:** None

**PART II- IRC-P**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The footing acts as a relieving arch and therefore, requiring a pipe sleeve under a footer is redundant and unnecessary.

**Assembly Action:** None

### P11-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** It is logical not to want hot water piping transferring heat to cold water piping in a piping bundle.

**Assembly Action:** None

### P12-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** Based upon committee’s action of disapproval of P13 and P14.

**Assembly Action:** None

### P13-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**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 valves and plastic piping that are commonly found in toilet rooms?

**Assembly Action:** None

### P14-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** Based upon committee’s action of disapproval of P13.

**Assembly Action:** None

### 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](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.
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proponent stated that the standard would not be completed in time to be published and available by the ICC deadline.

Assembly Action: None

P16-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 sealant is also a viable material to be used for sealing these types of spaces and is commonly available. Proposed language 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: None

P17-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed language does not require tests to be performed.

Assembly Action: None

P18-09/10
Withdrawn by Proponent

P19-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Proposed language provides for consistency in terminology throughout the code.
PART II- IRC-P

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Proposed language reads better and is consistent with action taken by the IPC Committee.

Assembly Action: None

P20-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Proposal would not provide enough fixtures for occupancy loads above 60 percent of capacity.

Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Where 1 or 2 water closets are required in a toilet facility, the percentage doesn’t allow urinals. Bottled water should be all or nothing. Requirements in footnotes are not good format.

Assembly Action: None

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: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: A single user toilet room per gender for up to 250 persons is not adequate when one considers that single user toilet rooms can be locked by the occupant for significant periods of time leaving no available facilities for up to 249 other persons.

Assembly Action: None

P23-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Service sinks are very important to the occupancies regardless of the number of occupants.

Assembly Action: None

P24-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Proponent’s reason stated that she and other restroom availability advocates have seen occasional queuing at toilet facilities when there are more than 50 persons in a restaurant. The proposal will adjust the required fixtures at these low occupant numbers.

Assembly Action: None
P25-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Provides greater flexibility for smaller establishments.

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 Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Restrooms are necessary for customers regardless of the space that the customers will occupy.

Assembly Action: None

P28-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Different tenants don’t share toilet facilities and the route to facilities is not assured to be accessible.

Assembly Action: None

P29-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Increases the understanding by the code official and installer as to what the building code already requires.

Assembly Action: None

P30-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:

403.3.5 ([P]2902.3.5) Door locking. Where a toilet room is designed for the use of 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 Reason: Modification was made to replace “designed” as this might create conflict with the last sentence of the section. Toilet rooms having that are lockable from the inside provide too much availability for misuse and inappropriate 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
P31-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proposed language does not include “floor above or below” or the requirement for an accessible route.
Assembly Action: None

P32-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

P33-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proponent indicated that he wanted to rework language in public comment phase.
Assembly Action: None

P34-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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).
Committee Reason: The modification was made because the committee did not want the new information shown in a diagram. The proposal was approved as modification because if a 56 inch deep compartment for a wall hung water closet is adequate for accessibility, then it should be sufficient for standard applications.
Assembly Action: None

P35-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: An outdoor travel distance of up to 500 feet in winter or rainy conditions is too difficult for employees or the public to travel.
Assembly Action: None
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: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent’s reason statement that stated that 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: None

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: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Consistent with the action of the IPC committee. Agreed with the proponent’s reason statement that stated that 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: None

P37-09/10

PART I- IPC

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Consistent with action on P47 because no manufacturers are known to be listing their products to this standard.

Assembly Action: None

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: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: It is unnecessary to keep standards in the code when manufacturers are not having their equipment listed to the standard.

Assembly Action: None

P38-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Increasing pipe size before a connection would require a type of fitting that is not currently made.

Assembly Action: None
P39-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The term "branch drain" was confusing. The term "fixture drain" 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

Committee Reason: An overflow is a safeguard. The proposed language clarifies the intent of the code to provide protection against overflow of bathtubs.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed language clarifies the intent of the code to provide protection against overflow of bathtubs.

Assembly Action: None

P42-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This standard is already referenced for other temperature limiting devices required by the code.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This standard is already referenced for other temperature limiting devices required by the code.

Assembly Action: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Committee Action</th>
<th>Committee Reason</th>
<th>Assembly Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P43-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>The requirements would be unenforceable.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P44-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Consistent with action on P43.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P45-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P46-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Encourages a general distrust of public water supplies.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P47-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>Manufacturers are not listing their products to the standard. No need for code officials to be trying to verify product meets a standard.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P48-09/10</td>
<td>Withdrawn by Proponent</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P49-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P50-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Whether or not a fixture is a public hand washing facility is a design decision that the inspector does not need to approve.

Assembly Action: None

P51-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

P53-09/10

PART I- IPC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Gang showers is not defined and multiple discharge devices is not defined. The requirements are too specific and overly restrictive.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Unnecessarily limits the type of shower components, such as body sprays and multiple showerheads that can be installed.

Assembly Action: None

P54-09/10

PART I- IPC

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent’s reason which states that if the liner material meets the puncture testing of the referenced standards, the thickness of the material is not important.
PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action:

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent’s reason which states that if the liner material meets the puncture testing of the referenced standards, the thickness of the material is not important.

Assembly Action: None

P55-09/10
PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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.

Assembly Action: None

P56-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Updates the code to the proper standard designation.

Assembly Action: None

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 proposed new standard IGC 161-2007 indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: IGC 161 is not a standard.

Assembly Action: None
P58-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Addition of new standards allows for use of more available products.
Assembly Action: None

P59-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Addition of new standards allows for use of more available products.
Assembly Action: None

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: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Provides for appropriate testing of and performance requirement for these products.
Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Standard proposed is viable for this type of product and consistency with action of the IPC committee.
Assembly Action: None

P61-09/10
PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None
PART I- IPC  Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent’s reason statement which states that both storage type water heaters and unfired hot water storage tanks will be properly protected against excessive temperature and pressure in case and isolation valve is installed between the two.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P  Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed requirements are already covered in Sections P2803.1 and P2803.2.

Assembly Action: None

PART I- IPC  Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Appears to be supporting a proprietary product.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P  Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Such a device would be dangerous to bystanders when it comes apart in an emergency condition.

Assembly Action: None

PART I- IPC  Committee Action: Disapproved

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There needs to be an observable point near the water heater before the piping goes outside the room where the water heater is located. Proposed text conflict with the 24 inches in Section P2803.5.2.

Assembly Action: None

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 1-06 US indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.
P65-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Proposed text clarifies that the pans are not required under tankless water heaters or connections to tankless water heaters.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

P66-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proposal P65 clarifies the intent. Tankless water heaters are not required to have pans.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proposal P65 clarifies the intent. Tankless water heaters are not required to have pans.

Assembly Action: None

P67-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: An “approved pan” is sufficient. There is not a need to specify a pan 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: None

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 proposed new standard AWWA C901-08 indicated 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 type of pipe already in the code.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Reason: Adds another standard for type of pipe already in the code.
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

PART I- IPC
Committee Reason: Adds another standard for pipe already in the code.
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Reason: Adds another standard for pipe already in the code.
Committee Action: None

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 AWWA C904-06 indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 605.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIPE FITTINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATERIAL STANDARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fittings for polyethylene of raised temperature (PE-RT) plastic tubing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: None
Modify the proposal as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIAL STANDARD</th>
<th>\text{TABLE P2905.6 PIPE FITTINGS}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fittings for polyethylene of raised temperature (PE-RT) plastic tubing | \begin{itemize}
  \item ASSE 1061
  \item ASTM F 877
  \item ASTM F 1807
  \item ASTM F 2080
  \item ASTM F 2098
  \item ASTM F 2159
  \item ASTM F 2434
  \item ASTM F 2735
  \item CSA B137.5
\end{itemize} |

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: None

P71-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASTM A240/A240M-08a was not performed as the standard 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 \url{http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf}.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard PDI WH201-2006 indicated that in the 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
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 AWWA C210-03 indicated 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: Approved as Modified

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: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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: None

P74-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent’s reason statement which stated that identification of pipes within bundles is very helpful when repairing or doing renovation work.

Assembly Action: None

P75-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Proposed language was in the code before 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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Water heater thermostats appear to control water temperatures just fine.

Assembly Action: None
### P76-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**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:** None

### P77-09/10

**Errata:** The following correction of the monograph is noted: Standard CSA B-125.1 should have been B125.3

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** Master the mostatic valves might require adjustment to temperatures greater than 120 degrees F to account for temperature losses before delivery point.

**Assembly Action:** None

### P78-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** Preferred language of P80.

**Assembly Action:** None

### P79-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

**Committee Reason:** Modification and action consistent with P80.

**Assembly Action:** None

### P80-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** Saves water and improves energy efficiency.

**Assembly Action:** None

### P81-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**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.

**Assembly Action:** None
P82-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Agreed with the proposer'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 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 B64.1.3-07 indicated 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: Allows another standard to be utilized for backflow products.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Corrects terminology to be aligned with product standard.

Assembly Action: None

P84-09/10
PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Blue color appears to be promoting a proprietary product.

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 distribution 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: Disapproved

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: None

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 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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Special joints can be approved by the code official under alternate approval.

Assembly Action: None

P86-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Field testing rarely, if ever, occurs so why require a field testable device?

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

P87-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The safety of drinking water should not be limited to just inside the building.

Assembly Action: None
PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Clarifies where marking of nonpotable water piping is required.
Assembly Action: None

P88-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent’s reason statement which stated that code officials only approve products and methods, not manufacturers.
Assembly Action: None

P89-09/10
Withdrawn by Proponent

P90-09/10
PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proposed text would inhibit designer and may increase head loss. Design of food manufacturing facilities would be problematic with this requirement.
Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The code should not specify what tools are required 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 confusion.
Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Wording is inconsistent and confusing.
Assembly Action: None
P93-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Proponent stated that he wants to clean up table at a later date. There was some concern about “high hazard” being removed from some entries.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Disapproved

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 Standards.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: It is unclear as to whether the terminology aligns with the nationally recognized standards.

Assembly Action: None

P95-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: A survey of ASSE and other backflow industry people revealed that they had no idea what was meant by the device terminology used in the proposal.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent’s reason statement which was to provide for consistent terminology throughout the code.

Assembly Action: None

P96-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Proposed language changes properly address the terminology used in the ASSE Standards.

Assembly Action: None
PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

P99-09/10
PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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. The proposal provides for consistent terminology in the code and with the standards.
Assembly Action: None

P99-09/10
PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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. The proposal provides for consistent terminology in the code and with the standards.
Assembly Action: None

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:
1. 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, 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. The proposal provides for consistent terminology in the code and with the standards.
PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 double check backflow prevention assembly, a double check fire protection backflow prevention assembly, a reduced pressure principle backflow prevention assembly 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 a reduced pressure principle backflow prevention assembly or 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: None

P100-09/10
PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Proposed language makes the terminology of the code consistent with the standards.

Assembly Action: None

P101-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Proposed language makes the terminology of the code consistent with the standards.

Assembly Action: None

P102-09/10
PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Eliminates cloudy wording and clearly specifies that a backflow device is needed where cross connections are made.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Proposed language makes the terminology of the code consistent with the standards.

Assembly Action: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P103-09/10</td>
<td>Withdrawn by Proponent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P104-09/10</td>
<td>Withdrawn by Proponent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P105-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>Agreed with the proponent’s reason statement which stated that the change was needed for consistency in terminology throughout the code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P106-09/10</td>
<td>Withdrawn by Proponent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P107-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>A backflow preventer will not work under these conditions. There are other ways to isolate dead ends such as valve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P108-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>Additional standard is needed in the code for these products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf):

**Analysis:** Review of proposed new standard CSA B483.1-07 indicated that in the opinion of ICC 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:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** Additional standard is needed in the code for these products

**Assembly Action:** None

**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:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** Additional standard is needed in the code for these products.

**Assembly Action:** None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P109-09/10</th>
<th>PART I- IPC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>Other types of nonmetallic piping are not addressed. There are other methods of tracing pipelines that do not require a tracer wire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P110-09/10</th>
<th>PART I- IPC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>There are not any hazards in a sewer line to be avoided. One can locate a sewer line by line of sight between cleanouts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P110-09/10</th>
<th>PART I- IPC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>A primed joint works best and many manufacturers require priming before solvent cementing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P111-09/10</th>
<th>PART I- IPC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>Clears up a gray area concerning tubular waste fittings and eliminates a code conflict.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P112-09/10</th>
<th>PART I- IPC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>Agreed with the proponent’s reason statement which stated that the language clears up a conflict in this section when considering the special fittings used in tubular waste systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P113-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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 adequately covered in Section P3007.3.2

Assembly Action: None

P115-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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 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 include the term “approved” in the proposed new Section 712.3.3.2. The term “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: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 suitable for burial.

Committee Reason: Eliminates ambiguity about what is required for force main pipe and fittings.

Assembly Action: None
PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Good proposal except last line of added text needs to be changed to say 10 pipe diameters instead of 10 feet.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent’s reason statement which stated that soil stacks, waste stacks and horizontal branch drains are also acceptable points of termination of an ejector discharge line.

Assembly Action: None

P117-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proposal goes against what was accomplished 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 was made because some equipment might require a trap. Agreed with the proponent’s reason statement which indicated that the distances are aligned with the same distances allowed for waste piping from a combination sink before connection to a trap.

Assembly Action: Approved as Submitted
P121-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

P122-09/10
Withdrawn by Proponent

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 A SSE 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: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Past committees have turned this same proposal because no standard existed for chemical air admittance valves. Now that the standard is in place, it is time that the proposal is approved.

Assembly Action: None

P124-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

P125-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None
**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** Combination drain and vent systems are used extensively in commercial kitchens. Proposal would eliminate that type venting system to be used in commercial kitchens.

**Assembly Action:** None

**P127-09/10**

**PART I - IPC**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

912.3.912.2.2.2 Size. The minimum size of a combination drain and vent pipe shall be in accordance with Table 912.2.2. The horizontal length of a combination drain and vent system shall be unlimited.

(Renumber Table 912.3 to Table 912.2.2)

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 matter of Section 912.3. Proposal eliminates the question about whether there is a limit to the maximum length of the combination drain and vent system.

**Assembly Action:** None

**PART II - IRC-P**

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: No limit allows for greater design possibilities. There doesn’t appear to be any downside to allowing unlimited length.

**Assembly Action:** None

**P128-09/10**

**PART I - IPC**

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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:** None

**PART II - IRC-P**

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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:** None

**P129-09/10**

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Single stack venting has been used successfully for years.

**Assembly Action:** None
P130-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The requirement is already covered in Section 916.2.

P131-09/10
PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Wording is more concise and clear.

P132-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent’s reason statement which stated that the section is redundant because Section 917.3.2 already indicates what to do when greater than 4 branch intervals from the top of the stack.

P133-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent’s reason statement which stated that the new language makes the section easier to read and understand.

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.

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: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Elastomeric traps are not as reliable as a liquid seal trap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Action:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PART II- IRC-P**

Committee Reason: Elastomeric traps would violate all other rules concerning traps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Action:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf):

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASE 1072-06 indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART I- IPC Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Committee Reason: There is concern that the floor drain strainer already restricts flow into the drain so installation of another device that would further restrict the flow would create problems. New text “shall be connected to the trap” is not accurate. There is a potential for device to be installed for the wrong application due to device identification issues that could be encountered at a later time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Action:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**P137-09/10**

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Action:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**P138-09/10**

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Action:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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](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
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: Approved as Submitted
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: None

P140-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

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, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: New terms and definitions are in alignment with product standards and industry terminology.

Assembly Action: None

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 indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standards did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:


Committee Reason: Modification made because installers should have the flexibility to install to any of the available standards should the manufacturer not provide instructions. Addition of CSA standard increases product availability.

Assembly Action: None
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: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The UL outline provides a needed method for sizing criteria for oil separators.

Assembly Action: None

P144-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Not every interceptor or separator has a “trap seal” or acts like a trap so the requirement for venting the outlet of every interceptor or separator is questionable. Installing two o-way cleanouts on interceptor and separator outlets might introduce problems of damage to internal separator and interceptor components.

Assembly Action: None

P145-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: There is no standard for hair interceptors so it is not known what constitutes a hair interceptor.

Assembly Action: None

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 standard CSA B481.4-07 indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Maintenance issues are not the responsibility of this code.

Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved
Committee Reason: P148 is more favorable as siphonic roof drain standard does not meet ICC criteria.

Assembly Action: 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:** Approved as Submitted

**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:** None

P149-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**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:** None

P150-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** Agreed with the proponent’s reason statement which stated that the requirements for roof and secondary drains needed clarification.

**Assembly Action:** None

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 proposed new standard ASPE 45-2007 indicated that in the opinion of ICC staff, the standards did not comply with ICC standards criteria.

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1107.1 General. Siphonic roof drains and drainage systems shall be designed in accordance with ASME A112.6.9 and 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
P152-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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 method that must be used. There are other ways to successfully process gray water.

Assembly Action: None

P153-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Simply editorial corrections that makes the table titles more accurate.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Corrects terminology.

Assembly Action: None

P154-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

P155-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Partitions are associated with water closet and urinals and therefore it is logical for the partition requirements to be located near the requirements for fixture locations.

Assembly Action: None

P156-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Proposed language is already in Section 312.1 but needs to be in this section to reinforce this important safety requirement.

Assembly Action: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: No concrete data provided on failures and injuries. If air testing of plastic piping is performed properly, it is safe.

Assembly Action: None
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](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: **Approved as Submitted**

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: None

**PART II- IRC-P**

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Consistent with previous actions to add more standards for products to allow greater availability of products for an application.

Assembly Action: None

P158-09/10

**PART I- IPC**

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Adding an alarm to a pan would appear to be redundant. The required pan provides sufficient safety for the application.

Assembly Action: None

**PART II- IRC-P**

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

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: None

P159-09/10

**PART I- IPC**

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No need to make this code consistent with IMC or IFGC. If odor is an issue, just make vent pipe taller.

Assembly Action: None

**PART II- IRC-P**

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: No technical justification for the change.

Assembly Action: None
P160-09/10

PART I- IPC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

PART II- IRC-P
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The likelihood 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: None

P161-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Clarifies the code and is congruent with committee action on P16.

Assembly Action: None

P162-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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: None

P163-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Agreed with the proponent’s reason statement which stated that the change provides for consistency throughout the code.

Assembly Action: None
P164-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Change organizes chapter in a logical manner.

Assembly Action: None
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RB1-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB2-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB3-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB4-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB5-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

RB6-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

RB7-09/10

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

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Sections 3.6.3.1. and 3.6.2.11.

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

Assembly Action: None

RB8-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB9-09/10

PART I - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IFC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB10-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB11-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB12-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
**RB13-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

---

**RB14-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

**Revise Chapter 44 as follows:**

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

(Provisions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

**Assembly Action:** None

---

**RB15-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

---

**RB16-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RB17-09/10</strong></th>
<th><strong>Committee Action:</strong></th>
<th>Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>This change updates the code to permit the use of ASCE 24 in Coastal A Zones as stated in the proponent's published reason.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RB18-09/10</strong></th>
<th><strong>Committee Action:</strong></th>
<th>Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>This change improves the code and clarifies Table R301.7, as stated in the proponent's published reason.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RB19-09/10</strong></th>
<th><strong>Committee Action:</strong></th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RB20-09/10</strong></th>
<th><strong>Committee Action:</strong></th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RB21-09/10</strong></th>
<th><strong>Committee Action:</strong></th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RB22-09/10</strong></th>
<th><strong>Committee Action:</strong></th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RB23-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The language of this change is unclear and confusing. The details are not clear how they relate to tested assemblies. There are a lot of terms that are not defined. The figures limit the prescriptive solution to one specific way and there may be many others that would be acceptable. This should be reworked and brought back.
Assembly Action: None

RB24-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: This change would impose severe restrictions on penetration at the roof. This does not mirror the IBC requirement on this issue.
Assembly Action: None

RB25-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: An NFPA 13D sprinkler system will not provide the same protection as the NFPA 13 system. The difference between the NFPA 13 and NFPA 13D is more than 1/2 hour.
Assembly Action: None

RB26-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: There is no data presented to substantiate the need for the door closer. This is a fire-rated door in a non-rated wall assembly and there is no reason for sealing or a closer. Other doors are permitted without a closer. The owner can disable this manually upon the certificate of occupancy.
Assembly Action: Approved as Submitted

RB27-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a good addition as this will make it easier for the building official to verify compliance.
Assembly Action: None

RB28-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The language of this change does not clear up the issue but adds confusion.
Assembly Action: None
RB29-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on the committee’s previous action on RB28-09/10.
Assembly Action: None

RB30-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee feels the term "or equivalent" is sufficient and there is no need to add a list of products.
Assembly Action: None

RB31-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a good start and the proponent should work with the proponents of RB85-09/10 through RB88-09/10 to bring back a solution that protects the firefighters and the occupants. The modification that was ruled out of order would be a good basis to begin for rework and bring back. There should be ways other than fire-rating to achieve the solution. Also, this change would force the use of dimensional lumber.
Assembly Action: None

RB32-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee feels this change would eliminate some options that are very needed. The existing language is sufficient and the use of fire-retardant coatings is controlled by Section R104.11 alternate methods.
Assembly Action: None

RB33-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change aligns the alternate test method with the similar provisions in the IBC and as stated in the proponent's published reason.
Assembly Action: None

RB34-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a needed change and provides a good pointer to the foam plastic insulation requirements. However, it would be better if it were in the body of the section rather than an exception.
Assembly Action: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Committee Action</th>
<th>Committee Reason</th>
<th>Assembly Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RB35-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB36-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB37-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB38-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>The committee feels that this change will cause confusion and would permit a ceiling height that is unusable.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB39-09/10</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>The committee feels this change is unnecessary and it contains a circular reference.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB40-09/10</td>
<td>Approved as Submitted</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RB41-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB42-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB43-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB44-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB45-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB46-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

R311.7.4.2 Treads depth. The minimum tread depth shall be 10 inches (254 mm). The tread depth shall be measured horizontally between the vertical planes of the foremost projection of adjacent treads and at a right
angle to the tread’s leading edge. The greatest tread depth within any flight of stairs shall not exceed the smallest by more than 3/8 inch (9.5 mm). Consistently shaped winders at the walkline shall be allowed within the same flight of stairs as rectangular treads and do not have to be within 3/8 inch (9.5 mm) of the rectangular tread depth.

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

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

Exception:

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

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

Assembly Action: None

RB47-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB48-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB49-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB50-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
RB51-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB52-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB53-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

RB54-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

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

Assembly Action: None

RB55-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB56-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB57-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent
RB58-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB59-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB60-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB61-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB62-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

The above ignition barrier is not required where the foam plastic insulation has been tested in accordance with Section R316.6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></th>
<th>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 &quot;loose-fill&quot;. The committee would like to see a standard for ignition barrier rather than continue to add products to the list.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RB63-09/10</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Note:</strong></th>
<th>The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at <a href="http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf">http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf</a>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis:</strong></td>
<td>Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RB65-09/10</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RB66-09/10</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RB67-09/10</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RB68-09/10</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB69-09/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB70-09/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB71-09/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB72-09/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB73-09/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB74-09/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RB75-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The reference in the proposed new item 4 is for top plates and does not apply to bottom plates.
Assembly Action: None

RB76-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee feels that this proposal is flawed as patio covers and screen enclosures are not the same. This attempts to move parts of Appendix H into the code piece meal.
Assembly Action: None

RB77-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee feels it is inappropriate to add construction document requirements to this section. This belongs in Section R106.1.1 of the code.
Assembly Action: None

RB78-09/10
Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change adds the proper reference standard for flat ICF wall systems.
Assembly Action: None

RB79-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee feels the proponent has misinterpreted the pier and curtain wall figure in the code. It is not appropriate to delete the SDC D0, D1, and D2 requirement without providing a solution.
Assembly Action: None

RB80-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee likes the concept but feels that there is potential for conflict or unintended consequences with Section R606.6. There is a concern about the sill plate bearing on the face shells. The proponent should rework and bring this back later.
Assembly Action: None
RB81-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB82-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB83-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB84-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB85-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
RB86-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request and the committee's previous action on RB85-09/10.
Assembly Action: None

RB87-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request and the committee's previous action on RB85-09/10.
Assembly Action: None

RB88-09/10
Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

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

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request and the committee's previous action on RB85-09/10.
Assembly Action: None

RB89-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change recognizes new technology for end-jointed lumber and provides a means to identify it.
Assembly Action: None

RB90-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change will improve the efficacy of the code by collecting all of the deck requirements into one section and makes the code easier to use.
Assembly Action: None

RB91-09/10
Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change monograph but was published on the ICC website at http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf:

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

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change adds a much needed definition and standard for structural composite lumber as stated in the proponent's published reason.
Assembly Action: None
RB92-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change will clarify the use of the default hold-down device and as stated in the proponent's published reason.
Assembly Action: None

RB93-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee feels the placement description is too confusing and should be presented in tabular form.
Assembly Action: None

RB94-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee feels that a prescriptive method should not be removed from the code but alternate methods should be added. The proponent should work with industry and bring back a solution using other methods.
Assembly Action: None

RB95-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change appropriately adds a reference to the cutting of wood floor members and clarifies Figure R502.8 to insure it implies that wood members 4 inches or greater cannot be notched on the tension side.
Assembly Action: None

RB96-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified
Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

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

R804.3.7 Roof trusses. Cold-formed steel trusses shall be designed and installed in accordance with AISI S100, Section D4. In the absence of specific bracing requirements, trusses shall be braced in accordance with accepted industry practices, such as, the Cold-Formed Steel Building Component Safety Information
(CFSBCSI), Guide to Good Practice for Handling, Installing & Bracing of Cold-Formed Steel Trusses. Trusses shall be connected to the top track of the load-bearing wall in accordance with Table R804.3, either with two No.10 screws applied through the flange of the truss or by using a 54 mil (1.37 mm) clip angle with two No.10 screws in each leg.

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

Assembly Action: None

RB97-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB98-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB99-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB100-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB101-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exceptions:

1. Basement walls.
2. Below grade portion of any wall.
3. Construction where moisture or its freezing will not damage the materials.
**702.7.1** R703.1.3.1 **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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE R702.7.1 R703.4.3.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS III VAPOR RETARDERS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(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.

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

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

| Assembly Action: | None |

**RB102-09/10**

| Committee Action: | Approved as Modified |

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

| Assembly Action: | None |

**RB103-09/10**

| Committee Action: | Approved as Submitted |

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

| Assembly Action: | None |

**RB104-09/10**

| Committee Action: | Approved as Modified |

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADJUSTMENT BASED ON:</th>
<th>STORY/ SUPPORTING</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>ADJUSTMENT FACTOR</th>
<th>APPLICABLE METHODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Story height (Section 301.3)</td>
<td>Any story</td>
<td>≤10 ft</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>All methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;10 ft ≤ 12 ft</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braced wall line spacing, townhouses in SDC C</td>
<td>Any story</td>
<td>≤35 ft</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;35 ft ≤ 50 ft</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braced wall line</td>
<td>Any story</td>
<td>≥25 ft ≤30 ft</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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 plf (57 N/mm) for each full wall above and 60 plf (86 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADJUSTMENT BASED ON:</th>
<th>STORY/ SUPPORTING</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>ADJUSTMENT FACTOR</th>
<th>APPLICABLE METHODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Story height (Section 301.3)</td>
<td>Any story</td>
<td>≤10 ft</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>All methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;10 ft ≤ 12 ft</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braced wall line spacing, townhouses in SDC C</td>
<td>Any story</td>
<td>≤35 ft</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;35 ft ≤ 50 ft</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braced wall line</td>
<td>Any story</td>
<td>≥25 ft ≤30 ft</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### R602.10.11 Cripple wall bracing

In Seismic Design Categories other than D, 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 feet (7620 mm).

(Period of proposal not shown remains unchanged)

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

**Assembly Action:** None

### RB106-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

### RB107-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

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

**Assembly Action:** None
RB108-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB109-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

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

(Portion of proposal not shown remains unchanged)

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

Assembly Action: None

RB110-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

Exceptions:

1. Vertical joints of panel sheathing shall be permitted to occurring over a double stud, fastened in accordance with Table R602.3(1), item 11, shall be permitted to be fastened to the adjoining stud where adjoining panel edges are attached to separate studs with the required panel edge
fastening schedule, and the adjacent studs are attached together with 2 rows of 10d box nails (3" x 0.128") at 10" o.c.

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

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

Assembly Action: None

RB111-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB112-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB113-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB114-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB115-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
RB116-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Based on the committee's previous action on RB80-09/10 and the proponent's request for disapproval with intent to rework and bring back to Final Action.
Assembly Action: None

RB117-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee feels the current table should remain in the code as it is consistent with the table in ASTM C 270. The requirements for mortar cement and masonry cement must remain separate.
Assembly Action: None

RB118-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This change clarifies the requirements for wall ties for hollow masonry units.
Assembly Action: None

RB119-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee feels that this change does not clearly define who is responsible for the instructions, the manufacturer or the code. ASTM E 2112 needs to be brought into compliance and brought into the code and that would resolve these issues. It is not clear that this is adequate for all openings.
Assembly Action: None

RB120-09/10
PART I - IRC Withdrawn by Proponent
PART II - IBC Withdrawn by Proponent

RB121-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee feels this is a good change to relocate these provisions to Chapter 3. This makes it easier to locate and is appropriately located in the Building Planning chapter.
Assembly Action: None

RB122-09/10
PART I - IRC Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee feels the 24 inch height has not been in use long enough to accumulate needed data to justify a change to 36 inches.
Assembly Action: None
PART II - IBC Fire Safety
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB123-09/10

PART I - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IBC Fire Safety
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action: None

RB124-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent

RB125-09/10

PART I - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IBC Fire Safety
Committee Action: Disapproved
| Committee Reason: | Based on the proponents request for disapproval and to be consistent with previous actions. |
| Assembly Action: | None |

**RB126-09/10**

**PART I - IRC**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**PART II - IBC Fire Safety**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**RB127-09/10**

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

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

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**RB128-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

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

**Assembly Action:** None

**RB129-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

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

**Assembly Action:** None
### RB130-09/10

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

**Assembly Action:** None

### RB131-09/10

**Committee Action:** Withdrawn by Proponent

### RB132-09/10

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

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

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted  
**Committee Reason:** This change adds a standard that is needed and to be consistent with the IBC.

**Assembly Action:** None

### RB133-09/10

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

**Assembly Action:** None

### RB134-09/10

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

**Assembly Action:** None

### RB135-09/10

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

**Assembly Action:** None

*Modify the proposal as follows:*

- Nails or staples shall be aluminum, galvanized, or rust-preventative coated and shall be driven into the studs where fiberboard, gypsum, or foam plastic sheathing backing is used. Where wood or wood structural panel sheathing is used, nails fasteners shall be driven into studs unless otherwise permitted to be driven into sheathing in accordance with the siding manufacturer’s installation instructions. (Portions of proposal not shown remains unchanged)

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

**Assembly Action:** None
RB136-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB137-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB138-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB139-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB140-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB141-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
RB142-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB143-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB144-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB145-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB146-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB147-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
RB148-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB149-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB150-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB151-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB152-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB153-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
Errata: Change Table R802.11 to read as shown:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rafter or Truss Spacing</th>
<th>Roof Span (feet)</th>
<th>EXPOSURE B</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basic Wind Speed (MPH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;5:12</td>
<td>≥5:12</td>
<td>&lt;5:12</td>
<td>≥5:12</td>
<td>&lt;5:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafter Pitch</td>
<td>Roof Pitch</td>
<td>Rafter Pitch</td>
<td>Roof Pitch</td>
<td>Rafter Pitch</td>
<td>Roof Pitch</td>
<td>Rafter Pitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot; o.c.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16&quot; o.c.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&quot; o.c.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rafter or Truss Spacing | Roof Span (feet) | EXPOSURE C |          |          |          |          |
|-------------------------|------------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|          |
|                         |                  | Basic Wind Speed (MPH) |            |            |            |          |
|                         |                  | 85         | 90       | 100      | 110      |          |
|                         |                  | <5:12      | ≥5:12    | <5:12    | ≥5:12    | <5:12    | ≥5:12    |
| Rafter Pitch | Roof Pitch | Rafter Pitch | Roof Pitch | Rafter Pitch | Roof Pitch | Rafter Pitch | Roof Pitch |
| 12" o.c. | 12 | 84 | 82 | 114 | 99 | 157 | 137 | 206 | 179 |
| 18 | 120 | 104 | 146 | 127 | 204 | 177 | 268 | 233 |
| 24 | 146 | 127 | 179 | 156 | 251 | 218 | 330 | 287 |
| 28 | 164 | 143 | 201 | 175 | 283 | 246 | 372 | 324 |
| 32 | 182 | 158 | 224 | 195 | 314 | 273 | 414 | 360 |
| 36 | 200 | 174 | 246 | 214 | 346 | 301 | 456 | 397 |
| 42 | 227 | 197 | 279 | 243 | 394 | 343 | 520 | 452 |
| 48 | 254 | 221 | 313 | 272 | 441 | 384 | 583 | 507 |
| 16" o.c. | 12 | 125 | 109 | 152 | 132 | 209 | 182 | 274 | 238 |
| 18 | 160 | 139 | 194 | 169 | 271 | 236 | 356 | 310 |
| 24 | 194 | 169 | 238 | 207 | 334 | 291 | 439 | 382 |
| 28 | 218 | 190 | 267 | 232 | 376 | 327 | 495 | 431 |
| 32 | 242 | 211 | 298 | 259 | 418 | 364 | 551 | 479 |
| 36 | 266 | 231 | 327 | 284 | 460 | 400 | 606 | 527 |
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB155-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB156-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB157-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB158-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
RB159-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB160-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB161-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

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

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

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

Assembly Action: None

RB162-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB163-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB164-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
RB165-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None

RB166-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None

RB167-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None

RB168-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None

RB169-09/10

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

Assembly Action: None

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

Assembly Action: None
RB170-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB171-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB172-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RB173-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB174-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB175-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB176-09/10

PART I - IRC: Withdrawn by Proponent
PART II - IBC: Withdrawn by Proponent
RB177-09/10

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

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

PART I - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IBC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB178-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

RB179-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB180-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB181-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
RB182-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB183-09/10

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

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB184-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB185-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None

RB186-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
RB187-09/10

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

Committee Action: Disapproved

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

Assembly Action: None
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RP1-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Air testing gives the installer a needed alternate method of testing.
Assembly Action: None

RP2-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: An additional product standard will allow greater choices of products to use.
Assembly Action: None

RP3-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: There is no technical justification to prohibit clothes washer standpipes in a residential bathroom.
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 showers in accessibility applications.
Assembly Action: None

RP6-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proposal would prevent the installation of instant hot water dispensers (for coffee, tea & soups making). Dishwasher hot water temperature would also be limited.
Assembly Action: None
RP7-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Additional standard provides more flexibility in selection of products.

Assembly Action: None

RP8-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

RP9-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: Approved as Modified

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 40 50 feet (12 192 15240 mm), 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 15240 mm) in developed pipe length from any fixture.

RP10-09/10
Withdrawn by Proponent

RP11-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

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: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed standard does not meet ICC criteria and the added requirement may conflict with some state backflow prevention programs.

Assembly Action: None
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 distance. Proposed change will provide greater flexibility in locating sprinklers.

Assembly Action: None

RP14-09/10  Withdrawn by Proponent

RP15-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The term of “nonlooped” is undefined and proposal seems to limit the scope of Section P2904.

Assembly Action: None
RM1-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 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 Exterior installations. Equipment and appliances installed outdoors shall be listed and 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 Reason: Approval 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: None

RM2-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

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: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None
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
Committee Reason: The proposed standards do not comply with ICC Council policy # 28.

Assembly Action: None

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.
2. 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 manufacturer’s 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: None

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: Approved as Modified

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: None

RM10-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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

Assembly Action: None

RM11-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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: None

RM12-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: Approved as Submitted

RM13-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text goes beyond minimum code. Recirculating hoods should be allowed as an option. Windows provide adequate ventilation. Grease fires are the result of failure to clean the hood system.

Assembly Action: None
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 overly restrictive. If a range hood is not provided, continuous exhaust would be required.
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: Disapproved
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: None

RM17-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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.
3. Use of sunroom additions and patio covers, as defined in Section R202, shall be permitted for natural ventilation if in excess of 40 percent of the exterior sunroom walls are open, or are enclosed only by insect screening.
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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Unit Floor Area (square feet)</th>
<th>Number of Bedrooms</th>
<th>Airflow in CFM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-1 2-3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1500</td>
<td>30 45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501-3000</td>
<td>45 60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001-4500</td>
<td>60 75</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4501-6000</td>
<td>75 90</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6001-7500</td>
<td>90 105</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;7500</td>
<td>105 120</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE M1507.3.3(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run-Time Percentage In Each 4 Hour Segment</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>33%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>66%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor *4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA TO BE EXHAUSTED</th>
<th>EXHAUST RATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchens</td>
<td>100 cfm intermittent or 25 cfm continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathrooms—Toilet Rooms</td>
<td>Mechanical exhaust capacity of 50 cfm intermittent or 20 cfm continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: None

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: Disapproved

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: None

RM19-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: No justification was provided demonstrating that the 2 foot dimension is improper. Consistency with the IMC is not sufficient justification.

Assembly Action: None

RM20-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed standard may not apply to residential construction.

Assembly Action: None

RM21-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed revision would eliminate 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 proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

RM23-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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
RM24-09/10
Committee Action: *Disapproved*
Committee Reason: Based on the proposed text, air tightness might not be achieved.
Assembly Action: *None*

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](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf).
Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.
Committee Action: *Disapproved*
Committee Reason: 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: *None*

RM26-09/10
Committee Action: *Approved as Submitted*
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.
Assembly Action: *None*

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](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Documents/2009-10cycle/ProposedChanges/Standards-Analysis.pdf).
Analysis: Review of the proposed new standard indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria, Section (3.6.3.2)
Committee Action: *Approved as Submitted*
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.
Assembly Action: *None*

RM28-09/10
Committee Action: *Disapproved*
Committee Reason: The proposed text is redundant with current Section R1005.1.
Assembly Action: *None*

RM29-09/10
Committee Action: *Approved as Submitted*
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.
Assembly Action: *None*
RM30-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason. The proposal collects various provisions and locates them conveniently.

Assembly Action: None

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: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

RM32-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed text is already covered in Chapter 24 and the proposed text in RM31-09/10.

Assembly Action: Approved as Submitted

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: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

RM34-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

RM35-09/10

Withdraw by proponent
RM36-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed reason.

Assembly Action: None

RM37-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Approval is based upon the proponent’s printed 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: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposal adds coverage for PV solar systems and provides the needed standards.

Assembly Action: None
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WUIC1-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee did not feel that the proposal accomplished its stated objectives, especially with respect to sign mounting height.
Assembly Action: None

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: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and felt that it was a needed and logical addition to the code since several references to fire-resistance-rated construction are made in the code but are currently without a testing standard reference.
Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved
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: None

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: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal does not achieve its intent, is inconsistent with the definition of ignition resistant material and is the wrong test posed for the wrong chapter. The lack of an appropriate radiant heat flux incidence was also noted.
Assembly Action: None
WUIC5-09/10

**Note:** This code change was contained in the errata posted on the ICC website on October 19, 2009. Please go to [http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx).

**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](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:** Disapproved

**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 other materials that are currently acceptable. Disapproval is also consistent with the action taken on code change WUIC3-09/10.

**Assembly Action:** None

---

WUIC6-09/10

**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](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx).

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposal has merit but appears to be still in the draft stages. Areas that, in the committee's opinion, 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 what would trigger the implementation of the plans; 3) it is unclear as to whether the requirements would apply to new or existing neighborhoods, or both; 4) the scope should be expanded to include types of facilities that are not buildings and, therefore, are not assigned an occupancy group designation, such as campgrounds, etc. and 5) it was felt that specific employees should be designated in Section I106.1.

**Assembly Action:** None
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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.)
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2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL ICC ADMINISTRATIVE CODE COMMITTEE
ADM1-09/10

PART I-IBC  Withdrawn by Proponent

Committee Action:  Disapproved*

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:  None

*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:  None

*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:  Approved as Submitted

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:  None
ADM3-09/10
PART I-IBC, IMC; IFGC; IPC; IPSDC; IECC; IEBC; IPMC; IWUIC; IZC

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

ADM4-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

102.4.1 Differences Conflicts. Where differences conflicts 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: None

ADM5-09/10

Errata: For errata to this code change proposal, please see the errata posted at www.iccsafe.org

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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, unless a determination has been made that:

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.
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.

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:

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.
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: None

ADM6-09/10

PART I-IBC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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: None

PART II – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

ADM7-09/10

PART I-IBC; IEBC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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
re-analysis and possible re-design.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

ADM8-09/10

PART I- IMC; IPC; IFGC
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

PART II - IBC
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

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.

Assembly Action: None

ADM9-09/10

PART I-IBC; IEBC; IECC; IFC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The code already allows the use of electronic documents.

Assembly Action: None

PART II – IRC-B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None
ADM10-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

ADM11-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

ADM12-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: 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: None

ADM13-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: 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: None

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: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposal provides for a necessary as-built verification of the building floors with relation to flood elevations.
Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None
ADM15-09/10

PART I-IBC; IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The need to approve glazing goes far beyond just the need to deal with energy use.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: This change would effectively exempt all glazing from the glazing requirements in the code and CPSC 16 CFR 1201.

Assembly Action: None

ADM16-09/10

PART I-IBC; IFC; IMC; IPC; IFGC; IWUIC; IECC; IEBC; IPMC; IZC
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee feels that this would have the effect of limiting the Building Official to allow normal construction tolerances.

Assembly Action: None

ADM17-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

ADM18-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: 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: None

ADM19-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: 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: None
ADM20-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

ADM21-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Based upon the proponent’s reason statement.

Assembly Action: None

ADM22-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:


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: None

ADM23-09/10

PART I-IBC FIRE SAFETY Withdrawn by Proponent

Committee Action:

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action:

PART II-IEBC Withdrawn by Proponent

Committee Action:

Committee Reason:

Assembly Action: None
ADM24-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

ADM25-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

ADM26-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

ADM27-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed language would change the entire intent of the code, to require application of the code for lighting only.

Assembly Action: None

ADM28-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed language is not necessary in understanding the intent of the code with regard to above code programs.

Assembly Action: None
ADM29-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

ADM30-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed energy usage levels are too aggressive and would severely limit the available options in building design.

Assembly Action: None

ADM31-09/10
This code change proposal was heard by the IECC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

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 \( R, \Omega, \) 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 I or 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 I or 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Approved As Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>This change is necessary to all attention to the limits on applicability in each of the IEBC Appendix chapters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADM33-09/10**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADM34-09/10**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Approved as Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modify the proposal as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.6.27 LP-gas. An operational permit is required for:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Storage and use of LP-gas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operation of cargo tankers that transport LP-gas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADM35-09/10**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADM36-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IMC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 Standard 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: None

ADM37-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IMC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

ADM38-09/10

This code change proposal was heard by the IPMC Code Development Committee.

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

ADM39-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

Add ANSI Standard as follows:
A137.1 – 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: None
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EC1-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proponent requested changes in a technical map based upon administrative issues in a local state. Maps should not be changed based upon administrative issues.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

EC2-09/10

PART I-IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed requirements are redundant. The code already requires the installed insulated sheathing R-value to be provided.

Assembly Action: None

PART II-IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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 R-value 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 inspectors, 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 R-values on the insulation itself could create unnecessary conflicts with industry practice.

Assembly Action: None

EC3-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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.
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: None

EC4-09/10

PART I-IECC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would add language from Federal law. This is unnecessary in the text of the code. Manufacturers are required to meet Federal law. Therefore this is essentially a redundant requirement.

Assembly Action: None

PART II-IRC B/E

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would add language from Federal law. This is unnecessary in the text of the code. Manufacturers are required to meet Federal law. Therefore this is essentially a redundant requirement.

Assembly Action: None

EC5-09/10 Withdrawn by Proponent

EC6-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The energy conservation code does not distinguish what source of energy is being conserved. Therefore this change in the definition of building envelope to refer to fossil fuels is inappropriate.

Assembly Action: None

EC7-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The definition conflicts with the IBC and therefore could cause confusion in the enforcement of the code.

Assembly Action: None

EC8-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The definition excludes slabs on grade. Therefore this appears to be a definition that changes the scope of the code requirements, or, at best, confuses the understanding of the code requirements.

Assembly Action: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC9-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong> Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong> None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC10-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong> Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> The proposal would create an inconsistency with ASHRAE 90.1 for R-2 buildings above 4 stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong> None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC11-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part I – IECC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong> Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> The committee disapproved the change because 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 EC13-09/10. It appears that some energy saving measures have been reduced. Finally, the standard referenced in the proposal does not comply with ICC policy for referenced documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong> None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART II-IRC B/E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong> Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong> None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC12-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong> Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> Consistent with action taken on ADM28 and ADM31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong> None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC13-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART I-IECC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong> Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong> The proposal accomplishes a needed increase in stringency. The proposal is the result of work done with many stakeholders to accomplish a reasonable and workable approach to reaching a necessary level of energy conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong> None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II-IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would revise requirements in EC13 to exempt testing of duct leakage for ducts contained within 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: None

EC15-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Blower door testing is an important aspect of energy conservation for all dwellings. The fact that there are practical difficulties for multi-family dwellings is not a compelling argument for providing an exception.

Assembly Action: None

EC16-09/10

PART I-IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee prefers the approach taken in EC13. These proposed provisions would conflict with EC13.

Assembly Action: None

PART II-IRC B/E
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify proposal as follows:

f. First value is cavity insulation, second is continuous insulation, so "xx+yy" means R-xx cavity 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 Reason: The code change proposal provides aggressive energy savings with 4 options that provide different trade-offs to allow a homeowner some flexibility in the design of the energy conservation methods that will allow flexibility in the design of the remainder of the home.

Assembly Action: None
**EC17-09/10**

**PART I - IECC**

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 resistant 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: None

**PART II - IRC**

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Insulated siding is a unique product that requires separate attention in code text.

Assembly Action: None

**EC18-09/10**

**PART I - IECC**

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Continuously burning pilots on gas burning appliances waste energy. Technology is readily available for lighting fuel gas lighting systems. This is an obvious energy conservation measure.

Assembly Action: None

**PART II - IRC**

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Continuously burning pilots on gas burning appliances waste energy. Technology is readily available for lighting fuel gas lighting systems. This is an obvious energy conservation measure.

Assembly Action: None

**EC19-09/10**

**PART I - IECC**

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal would have the effect of eliminating the use of an entire group of appliances in cold climate zones. This proposal reaches an unreasonable level of stringency. The committee prefers the approach taken in EC13.

Assembly Action: None

**PART II - IRC**

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None
EC20-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This fixes an incorrect trade-off for lighting. The lighting provisions of Section 404 have always been intended to be mandatory.

Assembly Action: None

EC21-09/10

PART I - IECC

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed language is vague regarding the meaning of "random sampling." This could lead to unfair application of the requirements.

Assembly Action: None

EC22-09/10

PART I - IECC

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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.

Committee Reason: The certificate is a useful place to record air leakage testing information. The modification is important in that the only information that needs to be memorialized is the required testing.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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
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 Reason: The certificate is a useful place to record air leakage testing information. The modification is important in that the only information that needs to be memorialized is the required testing.

Assembly Action: None

EC23-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal requires too much information to be placed on the certificate. It is impractical to require details of all lamps installed. These could change quickly and often. Therefore, the information on the certificate would be cluttered with incorrect information.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal requires too much information to be placed on the certificate. It is impractical to require details of all lamps installed. These could change quickly and often. Therefore, the information on the certificate would be cluttered with incorrect information.

Assembly Action: None

EC24-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agrees with the proponent that the certificate has little benefit and no impact on energy conservation.

Assembly Action: None

EC25-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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 reasonable 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: None

PART II - IRC B/E
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None
EC26-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the additional definitions could confuse the users of the code rather than clarify the code. The terminology presently in the code is generally what code users are accustomed with.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EC27-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 continuous insulation or insulating sheathing of at least R-2.

Committee Reason: This is a companion change 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: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed change would be inconsistent with EC16, which the committee prefers.

Assembly Action: None

EC28-09/10

PART I - IECC
Withdrawn by Proponent

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EC29-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal would erode the energy conservation levels of the 2009 code.
PART II - IRC

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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: None

EC30-09/10

PART I - IECC

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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 addresses R-19 insulation. This could also occur with other types of insulation.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The revised footnote confuses the issue more, as it does not specifically describe what it means by “actual” r-values.

Assembly Action: None

EC31-09/10

PART I - IECC

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: No technical justification was provided to support the choice of 20% for the limit on glazing. Therefore, the proposal is providing an arbitrary number.

Assembly Action: None

EC32-09/10

PART I - IECC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The trade-off of a high SHGC 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: None

PART II - IRC

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: There is no data supplied on return on investment to justify this code change proposal.

Assembly Action: None

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: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal is not supported by cost data to demonstrate reasonable return on investment for such an aggressive change in stringency.

Assembly Action: None

EC35-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: More product is available that can meet impact requirements and still have the low E values desired. The market will only advance to provide more products.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EC36-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal erodes the energy conservation level of the code. This would represent a rollback from the 2009 levels.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is a reasonable exception to allow skylights to function to supply natural light.

Assembly Action: None
EC37-09/10

Errata: Revise table to reflect the proponent’s intention to change Skylight SHGC values only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIMATE ZONE</th>
<th>WINDOW AND DOOR SKYLIGHT U-FACTOR</th>
<th>SHGC</th>
<th>CEILING R-VALUE</th>
<th>WOOD FRAME WALL R-VALUE</th>
<th>MASS WALL R-VALUE</th>
<th>FLOOR R-VALUE</th>
<th>BASEMENT WALL R-VALUE</th>
<th>SLAB R-VALUE &amp; DEPTH</th>
<th>CRAWL SPACE WALL R-VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5/8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5/13f</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 except Marine</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10/13</td>
<td>10, 2 ft 10/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 and Marine 4</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10/13</td>
<td>10, 2 ft 10/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20 or 13+5°</td>
<td>5/19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15/19</td>
<td>10, 4 ft 10/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and 8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19/21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15/19</td>
<td>10, 4 ft 10/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal erodes the energy conservation level of the code. This would represent a rollback from the 2009 levels.

Assembly Action: None

EC38-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This could have the impact of lowering energy conservation in some circumstances. The committee was also concerned over the claim that Energy Star stated that this is not cost effective without a tax credit.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EC39-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is compatible with EC13 and provides a reasonably achievable level of energy conservation.

Assembly Action: None
PART II - IRC  
Committee Action: Disapproved  
Committee Reason: This proposal would be inconsistent with EC16.  
Assembly Action: None  

EC40-09/10  

PART I - IECC  
Committee Action: Disapproved  
Committee Reason: This proposal would provide requirements inconsistent with EC13.  
Assembly Action: None  

PART II - IRC  
Committee Action: Disapproved  
Committee Reason: This decision is consistent with committee’s action to ease sky light SHGC values in EC36.  
Assembly Action: None  

PART I - IECC  
Committee Action: Disapproved  
Committee Reason: The proposal would cause an undesirable decrease in visual transmittance for skylights, thus would in all probability cause an increase in use of lighting.  
Assembly Action: None  

PART II - IRC  
Committee Action: Disapproved  
Committee Reason: The proposal would cause an undesirable decrease in visual transmittance for skylights, thus would in all probability cause an increase in use of lighting.  
Assembly Action: None  

PART I - IECC  
Committee Action: Disapproved  
Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that this limitation is justified for Climate Zone 4 because of the possibility that this could increase the heating load in some parts of the zone. Therefore, it is not apparent whether this would really save energy.  
Assembly Action: None  

PART II - IRC  
Committee Action: Disapproved  
Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that this limitation is justified for Climate Zone 4 because of the possibility that this could increase the heating load in some parts of the zone. Therefore, it is not apparent whether this would really save energy.  
Assembly Action: None
EC43-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The use of SHGC rating as a standard for glazing in the north is not appropriate, given that in summer, this could cause an increase in peak demand during cooling days. Also, the proposal 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 prohibiting the best low E windows available for very cold areas where they are needed.

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. Opponents provided specific data that the return on investment would be 40 to 50 years.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal does not provide a cost effective change to insulation values. In addition, this would be inconsistent with EC16.

Assembly Action: None

EC46-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee believes that there might be unintended consequences related to this proposal that were not considered. First, extra protection will need to be provided 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
EC47-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action:  Approved as Modified

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 continuous 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:  None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action:  Disapproved

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:  None

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:  Approved as Modified

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 continuous 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
EC50-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This is an achievable increase in stringency that will provide significant energy savings in northern climates.
Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposal would not be cost effective for all types of fuel sources.
Assembly Action: None

EC51-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval.
Assembly Action: None

EC52-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The values would be inconsistent with the values in EC13.
Assembly Action: None

EC53-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: This proposal would have the effect of increasing energy use.
Assembly Action: None

PART II - IBC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: See Part I.
Assembly Action: None

PART III - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: There was no technical justification provided to allow increase in the amount of glazing.
Assembly Action: None
EC54-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This provides builders with additional options to achieve the insulation values required by the code.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 insulating sheathing, or insulated siding, or other continuous insulation. If structural sheathing covers less than 25 percent or less of the exterior, insulated sheathing or 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 Reason: The proposal will conflict with the provisions of the code proposed in EC16. The committee prefers EC16.

Assembly Action: None
EC57-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: This information does not need to be included in the code. It could be provided in commentary, some type of design guide, or in an informational appendix.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: This information does not need to be included in the code. The proper application is not clear. It could be provided in commentary, some type of design guide, or in an informational 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 Reason: Winter design conditions are not defined, so, as written this proposal could require different testing in every jurisdiction. In addition, this deals exclusively with one type of insulation and assumes that similar problems do not exist with other types of insulation.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The intent of the proponent was to deal with the issue of changes in performance of insulation on very cold days. The opponents provided information that this is only a problem on very cold winter days that occur over a short time in northern climate zones.

Assembly Action: None

EC60-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PART II - IRC</td>
<td>Committee Action</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason</td>
<td>These proposed changes in R-Values and U-Factors are not cost effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Action</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC61-09/10**

- **Committee Action:** Disapproved
- **Committee Reason:** The proponent requested disapproval.
- **Assembly Action:** None

**EC62-09/10**

- **Committee Action:** Disapproved
- **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:** None

**EC63-09/10**

**PART I - IECC**

- **Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted
- **Committee Reason:** Baffles serve to keep vents open, insulation in place, and keep wind from blowing through the insulation and reducing the effectiveness.
- **Assembly Action:** None

**PART II - IRC**

- **Committee Action:** Approved as Modified
- **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:** None

**EC64-09/10**

**PART I - IECC**

- **Committee Action:** Disapproved
- **Committee Reason:** The committee was concerned that the approach would not correctly address condensation problems as intended.
- **Assembly Action:** None
PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that the approach would not correctly address condensation problems as intended.

Assembly Action: None

EC65-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed code change would allow ICC400 to be used for energy conservation in log homes. Since ICC400 references the 2003 IECC, this would allow lowering of stringency for log homes. Based upon the statements made by proponents represent atives, the UA alternative in the 2009 code is available as a way to allow compliance of log buildings.

Assembly Action: None

EC66-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that the proposal would actually resolve conflicts with ASHRAE 90.1 as it appears that there would still be conflicts.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that the proposal would actually resolve conflicts with ASHRAE 90.1 as it appears that there would still be conflicts.

Assembly Action: None

EC67-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Definitions in the I-Codes should be consistent in the I-Codes. In this context, consistency with ASHRAE 90.1 is not a concern.

Assembly Action: None

EC68-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 R-1924 in Zones 1 through 4 and R-2430 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.
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 accurately reflect the code requirements and therefore eliminate confusion. The modification revises the R values in the exception back to the present code values.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

EC69-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal failed to consider the possible impact this could have on other code requirements for fire resistance rated assemblies.

Assembly Action: None

EC70-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal would provide consistency in terminology with ASHRAE 9.0.1. In this context, for the application of the energy code, consistency with ASHRAE is useful.

Assembly Action: None

EC71-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The logical construct of the language to allow determination of solar absorptance is confusing. The proposed language is not consistent and not enforceable.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The definition of “white” in the default table is unknown. The default tables should contain more options.

Assembly Action: None
**EC72-09/10**

**PART I - IECC**

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

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, one 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: **None**

**PART II - IRC**

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There is no information provided that correlates the SHGC equivalent values to the orientation of the building.

Assembly Action: **None**

**EC73-09/10**

**PART I - IECC**

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

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: **None**

**PART II - IRC**

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

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: **None**

**EC74-09/10**

**PART I - IECC**

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The use of projection factors are not as reliable as SHGC values given variables in the local climate. In addition, the technical support for projection factors ignore the impact of reflectance of light from the ground.

Assembly Action: **None**

**PART II - IRC**

Committee 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: **None**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC75-09/10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>The proposal would provide exemption for more doors than intended by the code at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC76-09/10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART I - IECC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>This would decrease the energy conservation levels of the code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **PART II - IRC** |  |
| **Committee Action:** | Disapproved |
| **Committee Reason:** | The committee was concerned over the intention of the proponent regarding "assemblies". Does that include sidelights? Also, the proposal eliminates the area restriction on this exemption, which makes the code open ended, and could lead to significant reductions in the integrity of the thermal envelope. |
| **Assembly Action:** | None |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC77-09/10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART I - IECC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>The proponent requested disapproval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **PART II - IRC** |  |
| **Committee Action:** | Disapproved |
| **Committee Reason:** | This proposal would add undesirable dimension to the code that would set a dangerous precedent for future code development. The scope of the code is energy conservation for buildings, not sustainability. At this time, the committee would be remiss in introducing opportunities to reduce energy conservation in favor of green trade-offs given that the true equivalency and true impact on energy conservation has not been established. |
| **Assembly Action:** | None |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC78-09/10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART I - IECC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Action:</strong></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Reason:</strong></td>
<td>The proposal will create problems with flexibility in development design, and possibly have an impact on property values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assembly Action:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **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 development design and house design. |
| **Assembly Action:** | None |
EC79-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal is consistent with EC13. The energy performance of a building is enhanced by tightening air leakage rates.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal is inconsistent with portions of EC16. The language of the proposal uses the phrase "durably sealed"; however, that phrase is not easily defined. This would create an additional expense that is not necessary.

Assembly Action: None

EC80-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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

EC81-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EC82-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval, given that the issue is covered in EC79.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: 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: None

EC83-09/10

PART I - IECC
Withdrawn by Proponent

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action: None

EC84-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: This would eliminate the use of certain types of heating products. If this is an 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.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposed change would require fireplaces to be placed 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: None

EC85-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

EC86-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: 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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal relates to minimum ventilation requirements that should be a mechanical code issue. Furthermore, the provisions are not clear on what would be done when sampling is used for air tightness.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal relates to minimum ventilation requirements that should be a mechanical code issue. Furthermore, the provisions are not clear on what would be done when sampling is used for air tightness.

Assembly Action: None

EC88-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify proposal as follows:

a. In addition, inspection of log walls shall be in accordance with the 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 properly constructed. Therefore, it is appropriate to remind the code user 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: None

EC89-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

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
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal could create potential conflicts with safety issues that the mechanical provisions of the code deal with.

Assembly Action: None
EC90-09/10

PART I - IECC  Withdrawn by Proponent

PART II - IRC  Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The existing standards referenced adequately provide necessary information for application of the code requirements.

Assembly Action: None

EC91-09/10

PART I - IECC  Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The code presently uses the correct terminology (air leakage), consistent with the test standard.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC  Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The fact that a product is listed has no bearing on the technical requirements of the code. In addition this will clean up inconsistent terminology.

Assembly Action: None

EC92-09/10

PART I - IECC  Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed change reorganizes the section appropriately and logically to make the code easier to understand.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC  Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed change reorganizes the section appropriately and logically to make the code easier to understand.

Assembly Action: None

EC93-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

EC94-09/10  Withdrawn by Proponent

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.
EC95-09/10 (Number not used)

EC96-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal makes the area weighted average approach unnecessarily restricted. This limits the flexibility of the code. The technical support provided is insufficient to allow a positive action.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The provisions are unnecessarily restrictive.

Assembly Action: None

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: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The provisions given in this section are artificial constraints on design flexibility. Trade-offs are limited. The proponents claim that the building occupants will always turn up the thermostat are overstated.

Assembly Action: None

EC98-09/10

Part I IECC

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on its approval of EC147-09/10, 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: None

EC99-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: 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: None

EC100-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no evidence provided that heating and cooling zones save energy. This provision would be too far reaching in regulating building heating and cooling system design.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: There is no evidence provided that heating and cooling zones save energy. This provision would be too far reaching in regulating building heating and cooling system design.

Assembly Action: None

EC101-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The thermostat settings do not represent any significant energy savings. We have different lifestyles, with widely varying times that we need the thermostat settings at different levels. This does not address that, and seems to assume that we all sleep, eat, play, and work at the same times.

Assembly Action: Approved as Submitted

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: It is unreasonable to assume that certain temperature setback will help save energy given the fact that people have varying lifestyles and different needs for setting the thermostat. In addition, the definition of heat pump recovery is vague and therefore does not provide useful information as to what the code really requires.

Assembly Action: None

EC102-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agrees with the proponent that factoring in the 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: Disapproved
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC103-09/10</th>
<th>PART I - IECC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART II - IRC</td>
<td>Committee Action:</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC104-09/10</th>
<th>PART I - IECC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>The proposed referenced standard is not available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART II - IRC</td>
<td>Committee Action:</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>The proposed referenced standard is not available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC105-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>The proposed referenced standard does not comply with ICC criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC106-09/10</th>
<th>PART I - IECC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>Proponent requested disapproval given that the referenced standard proposed is not available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART II - IRC</td>
<td>Committee Action:</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Reason: The proposed referenced standard is not available.

Assembly Action: None

EC107-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposed revisions are compatible with (and included in) EC13.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None

EC108-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee had some concerns with technical issues in ACCA Manual J.

Assembly Action: None

EC109-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: This represents good practice to deal with air leakage. The return air should be regulated the same way as supply air.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: This type of requirement dealing with plenums is better placed in the mechanical section of the IRC. In addition, the committee was concerned that this text could be interpreted to mean that crawl spaces cannot be used for supply air.

Assembly Action: None

EC110-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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 shall 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 necessary to assure durable mains to meet the energy code requirements. The modification simply removes the laundry list of possible protections, as the committee felt this was unnecessary.
EC111-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Prefer other code change proposals that better address this, and use more appropriate nomenclature.

Assembly Action: None

EC112-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This proposal is consistent with EC13.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed text should be in the plumbing section of the IRC.

Assembly Action: None

EC113-09/10

Committee Action: 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: None

EC114-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The issues in this proposal have already been dealt with in EC112 and EC13.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is an issue that should be dealt with in the plumbing section of the IRC.

Assembly Action: None

EC115-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Insulation of circulating service hot water piping is covered in EC13. The committee was not sure that, given EC13, this proposed increase is necessary.

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. The committee was not sure that, given EC13, this proposed increase is necessary.
Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: See action taken on EC115. The committee agrees with the increase in R value but maintains that the section should be applicable to circulating hot water systems.
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 insulation on hot water piping and circulating hot water piping. The need for a 1" thick insulation is not supported by technical data. This could provide some level exclusivity for certain types of insulation, without justification as to why others cannot 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

PART IV - IRC Plumbing
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: See part III.

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Proponent requested disapproval to allow him to clean up the language and work with industry on the requirements.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Proponent requested disapproval to allow him to clean up the 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 and listing are not really stated. In addition, requirement for listing is unnecessary.

Assembly Action: None

EC121-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: ACCA Manual J is not the correct standard for the purpose intended in the code change proposal.

Assembly Action: None
PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proponent seeks to reference ACCA Manual J; however, Manual S is the appropriate standard.
Assembly Action: None

EC122-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: This would put an unreasonable burden on the design of plumbing for multi-family housing, with minimal returns on energy savings.
Assembly Action: None

PART II – IRC-P
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The 8 foot distance would be impossible to comply with in the majority of homes.
Assembly Action: None

EC123-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Modified
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.

Committee Reason: This proposal would limit the use of the inefficient resistant heating products and therefore save energy. The modification is to respond to concerns from the HVAC industry regarding supplementary heating for heat pumps.
Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: This proposal would limit a product that is used often in home additions.
Assembly Action: None

EC124-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
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: None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Dimensions: 612.0x792.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 ICC PUBLIC HEARING RESULTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>IRC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>This proposal makes the code clearer in specifying its original intent that hot tubs are part of the products that need to be regulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC125-09/10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>IECC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>IECC</td>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>At this time, there are sufficient products available to allow the code to require pilotless lighters for fireplace systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>IRC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>The committee was concerned that, in some cases, pilots are safety devices, and therefore the proposal would severely hurt some product manufacturers. In addition, this represents minimum savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC126-09/10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>IECC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>IECC</td>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>The proposal would provide a conflict with EC13. The energy recovery ventilator would not be cost effective in cold climates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>IRC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC127-09/10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>IECC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>IECC</td>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>IRC</th>
<th>Committee Action:</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Reason:</td>
<td>The committee believes that energy savings could actually be reduced by only specifying that luminaires be required to be high efficiency type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Action:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EC128-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Changing the requirement from Prescriptive to Mandatory reflects the original intent of the code when this provision was installed.

Assembly Action: None

EC129-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposed change in percentage of high efficiency lamps is consistent with the provisions of EC13.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is a reasonable step toward energy savings.

Assembly Action: None

EC130-09/10

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on prior actions on EC128 and EC129.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based upon prior action on EC129.

Assembly Action: None

EC131-09/10

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 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I - IECC
Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Bans unvented gas heating appliances in northern climates. In addition the proposal would be in violation of Federal law by specifying higher efficiency appliances in building codes.

Assembly Action: None

PART II - IRC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Proponent requested disapproval based on Federal laws that have not yet changed as given in the proponents reason statement.

Committee Reason: See EC140.

Committee Reason: The code change will provide better data regarding relative cost of different fuel sources, which will lead to more accurate application of energy conservation requirements.

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

Committee Reason: Site energy was removed from the code as an option in the 2007/2008 Code 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 want to re-introduce site energy into the code for the same reasons it was removed.

Committee Reason: The proponent provided compelling data that showed that the impact of shade on the SHGC of the fenestration is dependent on the type of glazing used. Therefore, this code change makes sense in relating the two.
EC138-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify proposal as follows:

Footnote i:

i. For a proposed design without a proposed heating system, a heating system with the prevailing federal 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: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is a simple clarification of the performance table, to place duct insulation reference in the proposed design.

Assembly Action: None

EC140-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposed change could possibly reduce the energy conservation levels using the performance path. High efficiency appliances are the norm. Therefore, to take a credit for these in the performance path as an improvement would lower the bar of the standard design.

Assembly Action: None

EC141-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: For the same reasons that the committee disapproved EC140.

Assembly Action: None

EC142-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: This is an unnecessary complication to the determination of the requirements that will yield very little difference in stringency.

Assembly Action: None

EC143-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

EC144-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC145-09/10</th>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: The committee dealt with this issue in their action on EC137.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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](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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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](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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC148-09/10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: The proponent’s concern with the standard should be resolved through the working with ASHRAE to revise the standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC149-09/10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action: Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC150-09/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action: Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: For consistency with the action taken to disapprove EC 149-09/10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC151-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action: Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: Change is unnecessary as the space by space method is already allowed as part of the existing reference to the complete standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC152-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action: Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal because it would have eliminated the option of designing a building to comply with ASHRAE 90.1. The committee believes both options should be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC153-09/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action: Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: The committee felt that the ASME standard should address the allowing escalators and moving walkways to discontinue operation when people are not present. This requirement may be out of places in the IECC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC154-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action: Approved as Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: The change will improve the code’s provisions, encouraging more consistent understanding and interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC155-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: Withdrawn by Proponent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC156-09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Action: Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Reason: The proposal contained errors and it was inconsistent with 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EC157-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The change will significantly improve the energy efficiency of the building envelope 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:** None

EC158-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was disapproved because it was based on a preliminary ASHRAE draft which has already been revised.

**Assembly Action:** None

EC159-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The change allows for better installation practices for multi-layer insulation.

**Assembly Action:** None

EC160-09/10

With withdrawn by Proponent

EC161-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The committee disapproved the change at the proponent’s request. The action of approving EC157-09/10 was preferred.

**Assembly Action:** None

EC162-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proponent requested disapproval in order to work on improving the proposal.

**Assembly Action:** None

EC163-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The committee concluded that this change was not material neutral. It includes some increases in U-factors, thus lessening the energy savings found in the current edition of the code.

**Assembly Action:** None
EC164-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EC165-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change provides a good increase in energy savings from improved fenestration standards. More savings can be easily achieved. The committee felt this change would encourage the use of daylighting controls.

Assembly Action: None

EC166-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change because they felt that it put too many restrictions on design flexibility, that the U-values were too onerous; and that the projection requirement particularly difficult to understand and implement.

Assembly Action: None

EC167-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the change represented by EC165 at this time.

Assembly Action: None

EC168-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EC169-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the reduction in SGC factors were not acceptable. ASHRAE studies and information do not support the values in the proposal.

Assembly Action: None

EC170-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee preferred change approved by the committee in EC174-09/10.

Assembly Action: None
EC171-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The provisions of Section 303.1.3 on the labeling of fenestration products do not allow the procedure in cluded in this proposal. The proposal 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 appropriate person or professional who would be able to sign the proposed certificates.

Assembly Action: None

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)
3. Areas where it is documented that existing structures or natural objects block direct beam 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.
4. 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
EC174-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee approved the change because they felt it was a reasonable approach to incorporating projection factors into the envelop design.
Assembly Action: None

EC175-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change because it moved a prescriptive standard over to being predominately a performance standard. A prescriptive standard is important to maintain.
Assembly Action: None

EC176-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee felt the proposal clarified determination of energy equivalency and corrected an oversight in previous changes to the code.
Assembly Action: None

EC177-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The proposal conflicts with the building code and it is likely to impinge on property line setback requirements. As written it will discriminate against certain existing properties which will be unable to meet the prescriptive requirements.
Assembly Action: None

EC178-09/10
EC179-09/10
Withdrawn by Proponent

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:
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),
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:

1. 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.
2. The minimum fenestration VT shall be 0.60 when determined in accordance with ASTM E972 or NFRC 200.
3. 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 warehouses.
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

Committee Reason: The modification was to simplify the proposal to just address providing the controls systems; the proposed Section 5.02.3.3 conflicted with the approved provisions of EC173. The provision of the controls is essential to making the energy savings incorporated in EC173-09/10 achievable. The committee expects this approval to blend with EC 173.

Assembly Action: None

EC180-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: At the request of the proponent, the committee disapproved this change based on approvals by the committee of related proposals.

Assembly Action: None

EC181-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on its approval of EC147-09/10, and at the request of the proponent, the committee disapproved this proposal.

Assembly Action: None
EC182-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt the proposal 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: None

EC183-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee approved EC147-09/10 which addresses the same issues in a different format. The proponent requested disapproval.

Assembly Action: None

EC184-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The content of this proposal were not consistent with EC147-09/10. Proponent anticipates resolving the differences by a public comment.

Assembly Action: None

EC185-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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:

1. Buildings in climate Zones 1 and 2 as indicated in Figure 301.1 and Table 301.1.
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.
4. Doors that open directly from a space less than 3,000 square feet (298 m²) in area.
5. Revolving doors.
6. Doors used primarily to facilitate vehicular movement or material handling and adjacent personnel doors.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged).

Committee Reason: The proposal was approved because it provides clarity to the vestibule requirement. Although the intent of the section is not to require a vestibule on revolving doors, the committee felt that retaining the exception of revolving doors provided clarity. The definition of building entrance will improve consistency of enforcement.

Assembly Action: None

EC186-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal coordinates with EC147-09/10 and further enhances energy conservation radiant heating systems.

Assembly Action: None
EC187-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: Provides definitions of terms already used on the code.
Assembly Action: None

EC188-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposal is consistent with the approved EC147-09/10. It provides similar improvements in energy savings. If EC147 proved to be fatally flawed and were disapproved at final action hearings, this change will serve the goal of significant energy savings for the 2012 IECC.
Assembly Action: None

EC189-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: Other proposals which were approved are preferred to this proposal. The proponent requested this change be disapproved.
Assembly Action: None

EC190-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposal embodied in EC217-09/10 better addressed the topic of motor efficiency. Although 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 standard does not comply with ICC policy regarding referenced standards.
Assembly Action: None

EC191-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The standards referenced by the change do not comply with ICC policy regarding such references.
Assembly Action: None

EC192-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The proposal is another step in increasing the efficiency standards of the IECC. The changes reflected in this item are consistent with other codes and standards.
Assembly Action: None
EC193-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal deletes equipment types that should remain included in the IEC C requirements.

Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The standards referenced in the proposal do not meet ICC policy for referenced documents. The action taken was consistent with the disapproval of EC191-09/10 and was requested by the proponent.

Assembly Action: None

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: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The proposal adds new categories of equipment, although there are few examples of such equipment being manufactured. These provisions allow the code to anticipate the growth in these equipment markets.

Assembly Action: None

EC196-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Revises equipment efficiencies consistent with the efficiencies found in ASHRAE 90.1.

Assembly Action: None

EC197-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None
EC198-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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.

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: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The code change represents an improved efficiency and will use materials that are readily available on the market.

EC201-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal is not a simple editorial change to the code and was found by the committee to be less clear than the existing code.

EC202-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee approved the change because it corrected the formula to be consistent with the SMACNA source document.

EC203-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee understood that the proposal was coordinated with the IMC 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
EC204-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal 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: None

EC205-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal was disapproved because it would actually reduce the energy efficiency standards already in the code and would result in energy loss to the soils. In addition the proposal includes permissive language which is inappropriate in the codes.

Assembly Action: None

EC206-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change because it represents a significant reduction in energy savings in comparison to the 2006 IECC.

Assembly Action: None

EC207-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 shall provide shielding from solar radiation that can cause degradation of the material. Adhesives Adhesive tape shall not be permitted.

Committee Reason: The committee approved the 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: None

EC208-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the change because there was no technical information which supported the change.

Assembly Action: None
| EC209-09/10 | Committee Action: Disapproved |
| Committee Reason: Consistent with the committee action to disapprove EC206-09/10, this item was also disapproved. It was estimated that the change would actually increase energy usage by 27%. |
| Assembly Action: None |

| EC210-09/10 | Committee Action: Disapproved |
| Committee Reason: The committee preferred the version of this topic that is included and approved in EC147-09/10. Some of the language included in this change would be more suitable to commentary than to code requirements. |
| Assembly Action: None |

| EC211-09/10 | Committee Action: Approved as Submitted |
| 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: None |

| EC212-09/10 | Committee Action: Approved as Modified |
| 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 inch/h x ft² °F (1.53 W 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: None |

| EC213-09/10 | Committee Action: Disapproved |
| Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal to be consistent with previous actions on EC208-09/10. |
| Assembly Action: None |

| EC214-09/10 | Committee Action: Disapproved |
| 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 R-value. The changes do not represent a cost effective strategy. |
| Assembly Action: None |
**EC215-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**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:** None

**EC216-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** Consistent with the action taken on EC1 24-09/10, the committee approved this change. The committee expressed concern about the use of renewable energy sources and whether any exception should be provided.

**Assembly Action:** None

**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](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:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was disapproved because the committee felt that the change was not clearly enforceable as currently written. In addition they felt that energy used for fire pumps should not be regulated by the code. Finally, the proposed referenced standard does not comply with ICC policy for referenced documents.

**Assembly Action:** None

**EC218-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

505.5.3 Lighting within dwelling units. (Mandatory). Lighting within dwelling units shall have a minimum of 75 percent of the permanently installed interior light fixtures fitted with high-efficacy lamps.

**Committee Reason:** The change was approved because it clarifies 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:** None

**EC219-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The committee found the proposal would be difficult to enforce and would create a penalty of requiring significant retrofit of a lighting system when only part of it is being remodeled. The change would act to discourage upgrades rather than the encourage them.

**Assembly Action:** None
EC220-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change exempts equipment rooms from having to have light reduction controls. As these rooms require ample light for staff to be able to adequately see the equipment they are attending, the change exempts rooms where such reductions are rarely used for safety and operation concerns.

Assembly Action: None

EC221-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The language improves the clarity of the provision. Adding the text concern having these things at ready access is a good reminder of other provisions in the International Mechanical Code and this code.

Assembly Action: None

EC222-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the action taken on EC147-09/10 which contains preferred code provisions.

Assembly Action: None

EC223-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: As the section only applies 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: None

EC224-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee found the text of the proposal to be unclear. There were discrepancies in the text. The application of the 50% reduction was not well coordinated. It would require lighting controls in inappropriate locations. The committee was concerned that there may not be much equipment available that can accomplish the 10% level.

Assembly Action: None

EC225-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the proposal because it opened a series of issues, including one of safety in these areas. Parts of the proposal included unclear text. There was a concern regarding the term ‘undeveloped areas’ and whether such ‘areas’ were appropriate to include in the IECC which addresses building construction.

Assembly Action: None
EC226-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EC227-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal actually reduces energy savings compared to the existing IECC. The proponent acknowledged that changes are being made to the source document of this proposal.

Assembly Action: None

EC228-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change at the request of the proponent.

Assembly Action: None

EC229-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved the code change because the requirement would not be consistently applied as it is only required when a building official requests compliance. It is also proposed for the wrong location in the code, it should be in Chapter 1.

Assembly Action: None

EC230-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposal 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: None

EC231-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

EC232-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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 group. The goal probably could not be achieved in an appendix for math because the minimum
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 then incorporate the final standards which the appendix would be pushing past.

Assembly Action: None
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PM1-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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 Reason: The committee agreed that the International Property Maintenance Code covers 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: None

PM2-09/10

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(1), readily available.

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that code officials are typically not qualified to determine when plants are healthy or what constitutes a minimum amount of dry foliage. Further, the proposed language, such as "nominally" and "healthy" are vague and unenforceable. Lastly, these requirements may be better placed in a green code or standard.

Assembly Action: None

PM3-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that although the requirements may be appropriate, they are in the wrong section and would perhaps be better located in Section 304.

Assembly Action: None

PM4-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee felt that requiring door operator systems to be maintained was appropriate and enhanced public safety. Further, this language affords greater 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: None
PM5-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Modified

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. **Locks** **Latches** 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: None

PM6-09/10

Withdrawn by Proponent

PM7-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

PM8-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

PM9-09/10

Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

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 PM8-09/10 as it maintains the requirements for minimum living room area.

Assembly Action: None

PM10-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None
PM11-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that addressing a single-occupant efficiency unit is logical and the proposed minimum square footage is appropriate.

PM12-09/10
This code change was heard by the IPC Code Development Committee.
Committee Action: Approved As Submitted
Committee Reason: Scalding is a real concern and the proposal provides reasonable options for safety.

PM13-09/10
This code change was heard by the IPC Code Development Committee.
Committee Action: Approved As Modified

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 Reason: Modification made because previous cycle committee action removed grease “trap” terminology from code. Proprietor’s reason statement that routine on-going maintenance is required and that records of maintenance need to be available for inspection by the code official.

PM14-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

603.7 Existing HVAC systems. Air conditioning units with a refrigerant circuit access ports located outdoors shall be provided with locking-type tamper-resistant caps or shall be otherwise secured to prevent unauthorized access whenever the system is recharged, modified, serviced, or repaired.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that providing safety 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 the concern is only air conditioning units with refrigerant ports and allows methods other than the safety cap to be utilized.

PM15-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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: None
Assembly Action: None
Assembly Action: None
PM16-09/10
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted
Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the added electrical requirements for outlet covers, pool and spa luminaries and flexible cords are appropriate and bring this code in line with the requirements of the National Electrical Code (NFPA 70).
Assembly Action: None

PM17-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that the provisions for emergency planning should remain in the International Fire Code only. Placing them in this code could lead to ongoing coordination issues between the two codes.
Assembly Action: None

PM18-09/10
Committee Action: Disapproved
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 they should not be part of a property maintenance code. Lastly, many of the issues can be dealt with through the current provisions of Chapter 3.
Assembly Action: None

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: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that typically a code official 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: None

PART II- IEBC
Committee Action: Disapproved
Committee Reason: The committee felt that maintenance provisions did not belong in the alterations portions of this code and perhaps better located in the repairs section. Further, there should be a standard provided to describe the remediation methods that should be followed.
Assembly Action: None

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.
**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 [http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx).

### PART I- IPMC

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that the requirements and methods within the EPS 40 CFR 745 were appropriate and did not place undue burden on code officials or inspectors. Further, no certifications or testing are required to enforce these provisions. Lastly, repainting projects are not affected by these provisions.

**Assembly Action:** None

### PART II- IEBC

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that this proposal was too broad in scope and appeared 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, they should also be in other chapters of this code to be applicable to other than repairs.

**Assembly Action:** None

### PM21-09/10

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](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx).

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the language was not needed and that the determination 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 company being required, should be part of the requirements.

**Assembly Action:** None

### PM22-09/10

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](http://www.iccsafe.org/cs/codes/Pages/09-10ProposedChanges.aspx).

**Committee Action:** Approved as Modified

**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 means, to provide comfort required heating.

**Exception:** In areas where the average monthly temperature is above 30°F(-1°C), a minimum temperature of 65°F(18°C) shall be maintained.

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed that space heaters should not be used for required heating, recognizing the hazards associated with the sustained use of these appliances. The modification clarifies that the concern is that these appliances not be used for any code-required heat, rather than as the primary means.

**Assembly Action:** None
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: Approved as Modified

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.

Exceptions:

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 Reason: The committee agreed that requiring carbon monoxide alarms for existing 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: None

PART II- IEBC
Committee Action: Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that requiring carbon monoxide alarms for existing 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: None

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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Section 10.8.1.5.9 already gives the code official the tools to deal with these hazards. Further, this proposal actually puts limits on the code official’s ability to take action 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 owners to repair elements or components that may otherwise have specific requirements in other codes, simply because it does not pose a threat to public health or safety.

Assembly Action: None
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INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL BUILDING/ENERGY CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS – ENERGY PORTION

RE1-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

RE2-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

RE3-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: None

RE4-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

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: Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

N1101.2 Requirements. Buildings shall be designed and constructed in accordance with Chapter 4 of the International Energy Conservation Code.
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: None

RE5-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: Maximum fenestration U-factors and SHGC values are an unnecessary restriction on energy conservation design. Such an approach limits the flexibility the designer should be given through the UA alternative. The argument that this deals with minimum comfort levels is spurious. The homeowner will remedy that issue.

Assembly Action: None

RE6-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disapproved this proposal to be consistent with action taken on EC92-09/10.

Assembly Action: None

RE7-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that reference to a heat trace system would introduce a system that has not been carefully defined.

Assembly Action: None
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IZC1-09/10

Committee Action: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The provisions for lot orientation would be more appropriate in other codes such as the International Energy Conservation Code and International Residential Code in order to coordinate with other energy requirements.

Assembly Action: None

IZC2-09/10

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 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: Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that specifications on pavement design and construction were beyond the scope of this code.

Assembly Action: None