

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

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

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

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

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



First Printing

Publication Date: December 2009

Copyright © 2009

By

International Code Council, Inc.

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

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

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

# INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Send to:**

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

## **Acronym      ICC Code Name (Code change number prefix)**

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

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

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

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

### **ICC WEBSITE - [WWW.ICCSAFE.ORG](http://www.iccsafe.org)**

While great care has been exercised in the publication of this document, errata may occur. Errata will be posted on the ICC website at [www.iccsafe.org](http://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](http://www.iccsafe.org/gr/Pages/adoptions.aspx) scroll to the bottom of the page and click on one of the jurisdiction maps and review the information as it relates to your jurisdiction. To see state/jurisdiction in chart form (PDF), go to Related Links (right side of screen) and choose the related file. If your jurisdiction is not listed, or is listed with incorrect information, click on the Code Adoption Resources (left side of screen), and click on Submit Adoption Info and provide correct information.

# CP# 28-05 CODE DEVELOPMENT

Approved: 9/24/05

Revised: 2/27/09

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

## 1.0 Introduction

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

## 2.0 Code Development Cycle

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **3.0 Submittal of Code Change Proposals**

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

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



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

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

- 3.4 Number:** One copy of each code change proposal, two copies of each proposed new referenced standard and one copy of all substantiating information shall be submitted. Additional copies may be requested when determined necessary by the Secretariat to allow such information to be distributed to the code development committee. Where such additional copies are requested, it shall be the responsibility of the proponent to send such copies to the respective code development committee. A copy of the code change proposal in electronic form is preferred.
- 3.5 Submittal Deadline:** Each code change proposal shall be received at the office of the Secretariat by the posted deadline. Such posting shall occur no later than 120 days prior to the code change deadline. The submitter of a proposed code change is responsible for the proper and timely receipt of all pertinent materials by the Secretariat.
- 3.6 Referenced Standards:** In order for a standard to be considered for reference or to continue to be referenced by the Codes, a standard shall meet the following criteria:
- 3.6.1 Code References:**
- 3.6.1.1** The standard, including title and date, and the manner in which it is to be utilized shall be specifically referenced in the Code text.
  - 3.6.1.2** The need for the standard to be referenced shall be established.
- 3.6.2 Standard Content:**
- 3.6.2.1** A standard or portions of a standard intended to be enforced shall be written in mandatory language.
  - 3.6.2.2** The standard shall be appropriate for the subject covered.
  - 3.6.2.3** All terms shall be defined when they deviate from an ordinarily accepted meaning or a dictionary definition.
  - 3.6.2.4** The scope or application of a standard shall be clearly described.
  - 3.6.2.5** The standard shall not have the effect of requiring proprietary materials.
  - 3.6.2.6** The standard shall not prescribe a proprietary agency for quality control or testing.
  - 3.6.2.7** The test standard shall describe, in detail, preparation of the test sample, sample selection or both.
  - 3.6.2.8** The test standard shall prescribe the reporting format for the test results. The format shall identify the key performance criteria for the element(s) tested.
  - 3.6.2.9** The measure of performance for which the test is conducted shall be clearly defined in either the test standard or in Code text.
  - 3.6.2.10** The standard shall not state that its provisions shall govern whenever the referenced standard is in conflict with the requirements of the referencing Code.
  - 3.6.2.11** The preface to the standard shall announce that the standard is promulgated according to a consensus procedure.
- 3.6.3 Standard Promulgation:**
- 3.6.3.1** Code change proposals with corresponding changes to the code text which include a reference to a proposed new standard or a proposed update of an existing referenced shall comply with this section. The standard shall be completed and readily available prior to Final Action Consideration based on the cycle of code development which includes the proposed code change proposal. In order for a new standard to be considered for reference by the Code, such standard shall be submitted in at least a consensus draft form in accordance with Section 3.4. Updating of standards without corresponding

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

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

#### **4.0 Processing of Proposals**

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

## 5.0 Public Hearing

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**5.5.1 Discussion Order:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Committee Action	Desired Assembly Action		
	ASF	AMF	DF
AS	--	<sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub> Majority	<sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub> Majority
AM	<sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub> Majority	<sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub> Majority	<sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub> Majority
D	<sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub> Majority	<sup>2</sup> / <sub>3</sub> Majority	--

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

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

## 6.0 Public Comments

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 7.0 Final Action Consideration

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **8.0 Appeals**

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

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

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

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

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

# CODE CHANGE PROPOSALS FOR FINAL ACTION:

**MAY 14 – 23, 2010  
DALLAS, TEXAS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2009/2010 INTERNATIONAL  
FIRE/WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE CODE  
COMMITTEE**

**John Mueller, Chair**

Rep: National Assoc. of State Fire Marshals  
Deputy State Fire Administrator  
NY State Office of Fire Prevention & Control  
Albany, NY

**Robert Geislinger, Vice Chair**

Fire Marshal  
South Metro Fire Rescue Authority  
Centennial, CO

**Frank Castelvechi, III, PE**

Senior Plans Review Engineer  
County of Henrico, Building Inspections  
Henrico, VA

**Larry Christy**

Fire Marshal  
Butler Township  
Butler, PA

**Rolland Crawford**

Principal  
The Crawford Specialty Group  
Loma Linda, CA

**Sean DeCrane**

Battalion Chief  
Cleveland (OH) Fire Department  
Cleveland, OH

**Tonya Hoover**

Assistant State Fire Marshal  
CALFIRE - Office of the State Fire Marshal  
Sacramento, CA

**Angie Leitner, EIT**

Fire Protection Engineer  
City of Saint Paul Department of Safety and Inspections  
Saint Paul, MN

**Michael Love**

Rep: International Association of Fire Chiefs  
Division Chief  
Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service  
Rockville, MD

**Joe McElvaney, Jr.**

Fire Protection Engineer  
City of Phoenix  
Phoenix, AZ

**Peter Merrill**

Rep: National Association of Home Builders  
President & CEO, Construction Dispute Resolution  
Construction Dispute Resolution Services, LLC  
Santa Fe, NM

**Richard Soltis, Jr.**

Fire Sub Code Official  
Lawrence Township  
Lawrence, NJ 08648

**Mark S. Wassom, PE**

Rep: National Association of State Fire Marshals  
Fire Protection Engineer/Fire Prevention Section  
State of Colorado - Division of Fire Safety  
Centennial, CO

**Gilbert Watt**

Assistant Fire Marshal  
City of San Marcos, TX  
New Braunfels, TX

**Staff Secretariat:**

**Bill Rehr**

Senior Technical Staff  
International Code Council

# INTERNATIONAL FIRE CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS- FIRE PORTION

## F1-09/10

**Committee Action:** **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<sup>2</sup> (1,450 m<sup>2</sup>) in size for any single area with a maximum dimension of 125 ft (39 m) in length or width. A minimum ~~3-ft (0.9 m)~~ 6 ft (1.8 m) wide clearance consisting of a Class A-rated roof system complying with ASTM E108 or UL790 shall be provided between adjacent rooftop garden or landscaped roof areas.

**316.3 Rooftop structure and equipment clearance.** For all vegetated roofing systems abutting combustible vertical surfaces, a Class A-rated roof system complying with ASTM E108 or UL790 shall be achieved for a A minimum ~~3-ft (0.9 m)~~ 6 ft (1.8 m) wide continuous border placed around rooftop structures and all rooftop equipment clearance shall be provided between the rooftop garden or landscaped roof and rooftop structures, including, but not limited to, mechanical and machine rooms, penthouses, skylights, roof vents, solar panels, antenna supports, and building service equipment.

**316.4 Vegetation.** Vegetation shall be maintained as described in Sections 316.4.1 and 316.4.2

**316.4.1 Irrigation.** Supplemental irrigation shall be provided as necessary to maintain levels of hydration necessary to keep green roof plants alive and to keep dry foliage to a minimum.

**316.4.2 Dead foliage.** ~~Dead foliage and Excess biomass, such as overgrown vegetation, leaves and other dead and decaying material,~~ shall be removed at regular intervals not less than two times per year immediately.

**905.3.8 (IBC [F] 905.3.8) Ro of gardens and landscaped roofs.** Buildings or structures with roof gardens or landscaped roofs that are equipped with a stand pipe shall extend the stand pipe to the roof level on which the roof 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**

---

## F9-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Modified**

**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 needed 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, if any, 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 plan documents for adequate fire apparatus access. It was suggested that it might be more effective to revise current Section 503.2.2 to give the fire code official the 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 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 come to understand and respect one another's

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 cooperation 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.

*(Portions 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 markings 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>

**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.~~

*(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)*

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement and approved the proposal for consistency with the action taken on code change F20-09/10. The modification will allow the single key box to be used and removes language that offers no guidance to the fire chief.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## 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 t~~ 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**

---

## F33-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**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.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## F34-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee preferred code change F35-09/10.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## F35-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**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.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## F36-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The proposal contains vague language (e.g., "...or for similar reasons...") and includes a "laundry list" 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.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## F37-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposal would leave out the building official and the electrical inspector. The committee also felt that the proposal is redundant since the code already contains provisions for referring electrical hazards to the appropriate code official.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## F38-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the subject matter is adequately addressed in NFPA 70 where it belongs. The committee was also concerned that the proposal would put the fire code official in the role of being an electrical inspector and that these issues are manageable under the building permit process.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## 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, NFP A 265 and ASTM E84 can be used for testing test 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**

**Committee Reason:** The proposal as approved provides a more applicable test. This test focuses specifically on items such as decorative vegetation instead of NFPA 701 which was originally designed for the testing of draperies.

**Assembly Action:** 

---

None

## F57-09/10

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was disapproved as it was unclear how the reference to the building construction type would equate to the rating and construction materials needed for the fabric materials in room dividers.

**Assembly Action:** 

---

None

## F58-09/10

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

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

**Analysis:** Review of the proposed new standard NFPA 289-2009 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

### PART I- IFC

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The approval of the proposal was based upon the fact that this new test is an appropriate testing alternative for the hazard being assessed. The use of the 20 KW ignition source was intended to make the test equivalent to the current standard referenced, UL 1975.

**Assembly Action:** None

### PART II-IBC GENERAL

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** The committee approved the proposal based upon the action taken on Part I of the proposal.

**Assembly Action:** 

---

None

## F59-09/10

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** This proposal adds Group I-1 Occupancies so that this section now regulates all Group I occupancies with regard to the size and material performance for wastebaskets and linen containers. The committee felt that Group I-1 occupants are particularly vulnerable and should have this same level of protection to prevent fires from becoming particularly hazardous due to the type of materials the waste containers are typically constructed of and the combustible waste they contain.

**Assembly Action:** 

---

None

## 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 manufactures have fairly consistent dimensions required for equipment and the size of the room would be fairly easy to plan for early in the design process.

**Assembly Action:**

**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> :

**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**

**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.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## 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 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 m<sup>2</sup>);

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 m<sup>2</sup>).
4. Where a Group F-1 occupancy that is used for the manufacture of upholstered furniture or mattresses exceeds 2,500 square feet (232 m<sup>2</sup>).

**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 m<sup>2</sup>);
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 m<sup>2</sup>). ; or
4. Where a Group M occupancy that is used for the display and sale of upholstered furniture or mattresses exceeds 5,000 square feet (464 m<sup>2</sup>).

**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 m<sup>2</sup>);
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 m<sup>2</sup>).
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 m<sup>2</sup>).
5. A Group S-1 occupancy that is used for the storage of upholstered furniture or mattresses exceeds 2,500 square feet (232 m<sup>2</sup>).

**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 R 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 c~~hapters 23 and 34~~ of this code, as applicable.

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that it was necessary that the code user is 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

**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 third party certification organization,~~ an *approved* governmental agency, or other *approved* organization for the type of system and work performed.

**Committee Reason:** This proposal was approved as it was felt that certification programs are necessary and with this 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 important to clarify 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 F 87-09/10 requiring a certification program.

**Assembly Action:**

**None**

---

## F90-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** The committee preferred the approach taken in code change F 87-09/10 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<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>-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.

**Committee Reason:** The committee approved this proposal to be consistent with the action taken on code change F87-09/10. In addition, it will provide more leeway for the jurisdiction to ask for a certain level of qualifications. The modification was the same as that made for code change F87-09/10 which deleted the phrase "an approved third party certification organization" to provide more control to the jurisdiction.

**Assembly Action:** 

---

None

## **F97-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** This proposal was disapproved in favor of the approach taken in code changes F96-09/10 and F87-09/10 and to be consistent with the actions taken on code changes F89-09/10 and F90-09/10.

**Assembly Action:** 

---

None

## **F98-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** This proposal was disapproved as it removed the ability of the fire code official to ask for more information when reviewing fire alarm designs.

**Assembly Action:** 

---

None

## **F99-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The committee disapproved the code change proposal as it was felt that it would create conflicts and confusion within the code based upon section references such as to Section 907.3 which deals with existing systems. It was suggested that the intent of the proposal needs to be further clarified through the public comment process.

**Assembly Action:** 

---

None

## **F100-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Approved as Submitted

**Committee Reason:** This proposal was felt to be a good attempt to fix the confusion caused in the application of the fire alarm requirements for Assembly occupancies.

**Assembly Action:** 

---

None

## **F101-09/10**

**Committee Action:** Disapproved

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was disapproved as it was too broad in its application. Manual fire alarm boxes can be cause of frequent and unnecessary alarms. The committee suggested that the proponent take a more specific look at in which particular occupancies removal of this exception may be most appropriate.

**Assembly Action:** 

---

None

## 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 to be 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. Pre-recorded 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**

---

## F106-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** 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.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## F107-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that this proposal was necessary as schools are dealing with a host of threats such as fires and mados 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

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## F108-09/10

### PART I- IFC

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** 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.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

### PART II- IRC B/E

**Withdrawn by Proponent**

---

## F109-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** 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.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## F110-09/10

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** 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.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## 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<sup>3</sup>/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<sup>3</sup>/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<sup>3</sup>/s),
4. At each story in return air systems having a design capacity greater than 15,000 cfm (7.1 m<sup>3</sup>/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<sup>3</sup>/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<sup>3</sup>/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 correlates 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.



**Assembly Action:** **None**

**PART II- IMC**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** This proposal was approved to be consistent with the action taken on Part I of this proposal.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**F121-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Disapproved**

**Committee Reason:** 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.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**F122-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** 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.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**F123-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The proposal was approved as the language provides a tool for inspections and provides more direction as to the locations of manual fire alarm boxes. There were some concerns expressed with the use of the term "visible" and how it would be applied.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**F124-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** 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.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

**F125-09/10**

**Committee Action:** **Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee approved the proposal to create consistency with NFPA 72 which addresses minimum sound pressure levels more appropriately and in more detail.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---

## 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

**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 IBC 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 allowed 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, IFB 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-~~2040~~ 2007 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 occupancy classifications. 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 accesses, exits or exit discharges shall be continuously maintained free from obstructions or impediments to full instant use in the case of fire or other emergency when the areas served by such exits are occupied. An exit or exit passageway shall not be used for any purpose that interferes with other ~~than as~~ a means of egress.

*(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)*

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement. The modification removes former exit passage way 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 straight forward 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 straight forward 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.

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement. The modification provides correlation with the action taken on code change F158-09/10.

**Assembly Action:** **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~~ or approved for use without internal fire extinguishing system protection.

(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)

**Committee Reason:** The committee generally agreed with the proponent's reason statement. The proposed revision to Section 1803.10.1.2, Exception 2 would strip the fire code official of the authority to approve unlisted tools however, the modification restores that authority.

**Assembly Action:** **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.
- 2-3. An approved automatic fire suppression system shall not be required in exhaust ducts where the largest cross-sectional diameter of the duct is less than 10 inches (254 mm).
- 3-4. For laboratories, as defined in Section 510.1, automatic fire protection systems shall not be required in laboratory hoods or exhaust systems.

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed with the 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 areas. Service corridors shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the *International Building Code*.

**1805.3.4 Carts and trucks.** Carts and trucks used to transport HPM in corridors and exit enclosures in existing buildings shall comply with Section 2703.10.3.

**IBC [F] 415.8.3 Corridors.** Corridors shall comply with Chapter 10 and shall be separated from fabrication areas as specified in section 415.8.2.2. Corridors shall not contain HPM and shall not be used for transporting such materials ~~in quantities greater than the maximum allowable quantity per control area~~ except through closed piping systems as provided in section 415.8.6.3

**Excepts ons:**

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 existing corridors, subject to the following conditions:
  2. 1. Corridors. Corridors adjacent to the fabrication area where the alteration work is to be done shall comply with Section 1018 for a length determined as follows:
    2. 1.1. The length of the common wall of the corridor and the fabrication area; and
    2. 1.2. For the distance along the corridor to the point of entry of HPM into the corridor serving that fabrication area.
  2. 2. Emergency alarm system. There shall be an emergency telephone system, a local manual alarm station or other approved alarm-initiating device within corridors at not more than 150-foot

(45 720 mm) intervals and at each exit and doorway. The signal shall be relayed to an approved central, proprietary or remote station service or the emergency control station and shall also initiate a local audible alarm.

2.3. Pass-throughs. Self-closing doors having a fire protection rating of not less than 1 hour shall separate pass-throughs from existing corridors. Pass-throughs shall be constructed as required for the corridors and protected by an approved automatic fire-extinguishing system.

**Committee Reason:** The committee generally agreed with the proponent's reason statement but preferred the modified version of the proposal. In response to concerns expressed by the fire service, the modification clarifies that the proposal is applicable to small maintenance, lab and testing quantities of HPM and not production quantities and would allow transport in corridors as within any other Group H occupancy.

**Assembly Action:** **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** **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**

---

## F174-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Modified**

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

~~2209.3.1 Location of dispensing devices.~~ Dispensing devices shall be located above ground. In addition to the requirements of Section 2203.1, dispensing shall be located in accordance with the following:

- ~~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 2704.13 and constructed in a manner that prevents the accumulation of hydrogen gas.~~

**Exceptions:**

- ~~1- Compression, storage or dispensing equipment shall be allowed in buildings in accordance with Section 2209.3.2.2.~~
- ~~2- Compression, storage and dispensing equipment shall be allowed in vaults in accordance with Chapter 30.~~

**2209.3.2.5.4 Liquefied Cryogenic fluid hydrogen storage.** Storage of Cryogenic fluid hydrogen shall be in accordance with Chapters 32 and 35.

*(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)*

**Committee Reason:** The committee approved this proposal as modified for consistency with the action taken on code 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:**

**3704.2.2.10.1 Gas detection system components.** Gas detection system control units shall be listed and labeled in accordance with UL 864 or UL 2017, or approved. Gas detectors shall be listed and labeled in accordance with UL 2075 for use with the gases and vapors being detected, or approved.

*(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)*

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed with the proponent's reason statement. The modification provides the fire code official with the ability to approve gas detection system components that may not be listed and labeled.

**Assembly Action:** 

---

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 noted by staff as not complying with the CP28 and ASME MH1 was 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 DOT in 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 dental 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 3.6 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 3304.5.2(3)  
TABLE OF DISTANCES (Q-D) FOR BUILDINGS AND MAGAZINES  
CONTAINING EXPLOSIVES—DIVISION 1.4<sup>c</sup>**

- 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~~ or API 2000 ~~and maintained in accordance with Section 21.8.6 of NFPA 30 or API 2000.~~ Use of in-line 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) ~~4.3-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**

**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.~~
- ~~5.1 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
- ~~5.2 5.3-~~ Dispensers shall be designed and must operate in a manner that ensures accidental or malicious activations of the dispensing device are minimized. At a minimum, all devices subject to or used in accordance with this section shall have the following safety features:
- w ~~5.2.1 5.3.1-~~ Any activations of the dispenser shall only occur when an object is placed within four inches of the sensing device.
- h ~~5.2.2 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.
- Drug ~~5.2.3 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 Varembé, 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 submittal 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

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 ft<sup>3</sup> (scf) (142 m<sup>3</sup>) 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  
NON-BULK FLAMMABLE GASES — DISTANCE TO EXPOSURES<sup>a</sup>**  
(Entire table to be deleted)

~~**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 C GA was attempting to make in this proposal. Since the correct table appears in NFPA 55, Table 3504.2.1 is no longer needed and is therefore being deleted by the modification.

**Assembly Action:** **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 IF C and also felt that the attendant section is not the correct location for such a proposal.

**Assembly Action:** **None**

---



## F218-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Modified**

**Modify the proposal as follows:**

~~**3809.14 Automated LP-gas vending machines.** The use of automated LP-gas vending machines or racks that are not operated by an attendant to purchase or exchange LP-gas containers is prohibited.~~

**3809.15 LP-gas cylinder exchange for resale.** In addition to other applicable requirements of this chapter, facilities operating cylinder exchange stations for LP-gas that are accessible to the public shall comply with the following requirements.

1. Cylinders shall be secured in a lockable, ventilated metal cabinet or other approved enclosure.
2. 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**

## F219-09/10

**Committee Action:**

**Approved as Submitted**

**Committee Reason:** The committee felt that the proposal clarifies that the fire code official does have the authority to require alterations in buildings not built under the building code. The revision to Table 4604.18.2 provides protection to new buildings by correlating the sprinklered building travel distance limitations to make them less restrictive than those for new buildings, thus preventing a new building from being in violation upon issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

**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 F69-09/10 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 helistops and heliports.** Existing buildings with a rooftop helistop or heliport located more than 30 feet above the lowest level of fire department access to the roof level on which the helistop or heliport is located shall be equipped with standpipes in accordance with Section 1107.5.

*(Portions of the proposed code change not shown remain unchanged.)*

**Committee Reason:** The committee agreed with and approved the proposal based on the proponent's reason statement. The modification provides correlation with the action taken on code change F92-09/10.

**Assembly Action:**

**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:**

**Non**

---

## 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 now 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 use 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 technologies, 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**

---

# INTERNATIONAL ZONING CODE COMMITTEE HEARING RESULTS-

## 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**

---