

**2007/2008 INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE
Fire Safety Code Development Committee**

Daniel E. Nichols, PE – Chair
Fire Protection Engineer II
New York State Division of Code
Enforcement and Administration
Albany, NY

Howard Hopper
Manager, Corporate Regulatory Services
Underwriters Laboratories Inc.
San Jose, CA

William J. Hall – Vice Chair
Code Specialist
Portland Cement Association
Mechanicsville, VA

Scott McCormick
Fire Official
Hamilton Township, Fire District 7
Hamilton, NJ

Manuel Anthony Barrero, Jr.
Captain II
Fairfax County Fire & Rescue
Fairfax, VA

Lorin Neyer
Regional Compliance Officer Fire Marshal
Office of Statewide Health, Planning
and Development
Manteca, CA
Rep: California Fire Chief's Association-
Northern California
Fire Prevention Office

Steven "Rusty" Belanger
Assistant State Fire Marshal
State of Alaska
Anchorage, AK
Rep: National Association of State
Fire Marshals (NASFM)

Tim Pate
Plans Analyst
City & County of Broomfield Building
Department
Broomfield, CO

Gene Boecker
Senior Consultant
Code Consultants, Inc.
Saint Louis, MO

Michael Pokorny
Fire Protection Engineer
Montgomery County Department of
Permitting Services
Rockville, MD

Robert J. Davidson
Fire & Life Safety Consultant
Davidson Code Concepts, LLC
Tinton Falls, NJ
Rep: Fire Marshal's Office,
Red Bank, NJ

Michael Shannon, PE
Development Services Engineer
City of San Antonio, Development
Services Department
San Antonio, TX

Sam Francis
Northeast Regional Manager, Building
Codes and Standards
American Forest & Paper Association
West Grove, PA

Staff Secretary:
Edward Wirtschoreck, LA
Manager of Standards
International Code Council

Marcelo M. Hirschler
GBH International
Mill Valley, CA

**INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE
FIRE SAFETY COMMITTEE
HEARING RESULTS**

FS1-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this change was necessary for consistency with the use of "opening protective" elsewhere in the 2006 IBC and 2007 IBC Supplement.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS2-07/08

Errata: FS2-07/08 Part I: Add Section 707.1 and revise the first paragraph of Section 707.2 as follows:

707.1 General. The provisions of this section shall apply to vertical shafts where such shafts are required to protect openings and penetrations through ~~floor/ceiling floor~~ and ~~roof/ceiling roof~~ assemblies. Shaft enclosures shall be constructed as fire barriers in accordance with Section 706 or horizontal assemblies in accordance with Section 711, or both.

707.2 Shaft enclosure required. Openings through a ~~floor/ceiling floor~~ assembly shall be protected by a shaft enclosure complying with this section.

Delete Section 914.3.1 (IBC [F] 403.2) from Part III IFC of the proposed change without substitution:

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that these revisions to floor/ceiling and roof/ceiling did not add clarity to the code and could result in two meanings for the term roof, which could result in confusion. Further, the committee felt that changing the terminology would not be cost effective as it would require industry to re-publish product literature with the revised terminology.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC STRUCTURAL

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the definition of "roof assembly" in Section 1502 is specific to Chapter 15 and this proposal makes that clear.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART III – IFC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed change is not needed. The correct, commonly accepted terms used in the International Codes are floor/ceiling and roof/ceiling assembly. This will also correlate with the disapproval action taken by the IBC-FS Committee.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS3-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that the proposed corridor damper should be activated by smoke rather than by heat as the proposed definition indicates.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS4-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the definition of fireblocking and the actual requirements in the code for fireblocking needed to be consistent. Further, the committee indicated that the added language was required for proper enforcement. Therefore, this proposed change to add “materials approved for use as fireblocking” to the definition of fireblocking was deemed appropriate.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IRC B/E

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change clarifies that fireblocking only needs to be "Approved" and not "Labeled".

Assembly Action:

None

FS5-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASTM E136-04 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed definition of noncombustible material was unclear as to what materials had to be tested for noncombustibility in accordance with ASTM E136.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IEBC

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agrees with the proponent that there is a need for a consistent definition of “noncombustible” in the applicable codes.

Assembly Action:

None

PART III – IFC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The current definition should be retained. It has a long history of accommodating gypsum and other commonly recognized noncombustible materials and has not been shown to be a problem. This will also correlate with the disapproval action taken by the respective committees in Parts I, III, IV, V, VI and VII.

Assembly Action:

None

PART IV – IFGC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed definition uses subjective language and could cause confusion regarding materials such as FRTW and gypsum board.

Assembly Action:

None

PART V – IMC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: There was no indication of how much heat or fire to be applied during testing. This definition could be misconstrued to allow gypsum board to be classified as noncombustible.

Assembly Action:

None

**PART VI – IRC B/E
Committee Action:**

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal would require the Building Official to decide the conditions anticipated in order to evaluate that a product meets the criteria. This is too vague and would cause an enforcement issue.

Assembly Action:

None

**PART VII – IWUIC
Committee Action:**

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The current definition should be retained. It has a long history of accommodating gypsum and other commonly recognized noncombustible materials and has not been shown to be a problem. This will also correlate with the disapproval action taken by the respective committees in Parts I, III, IV, V, VI and VII.

Assembly Action:

None

FS6-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that the language within the proposed definition of “compartmentation” was confusing and therefore would be difficult to interpret and enforce. The confusing language includes “smoke-resistance-rated”, “or other hazards” and “fire to and from buildings.”

Assembly Action:

None

FS7-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASTM F2322-03 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: As written the proposed requirements are too broad as they would apply to all 2-hour (or higher) fire-resistance rated walls in all buildings. The committee indicated that the proposed impact resistance requirements would be better limited to certain facilities such as correctional facilities within Group I-3.

Assembly Action:

None

FS8-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this performance-based language did not belong in a code that this mostly prescriptive. Also, the term “credible worst case design” is subjective and needs to be defined. Lastly, details and requirements for a global structural analysis under design fire conditions would be better developed through the standards process.

Assembly Action:

None

FS9-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposed changes to the non-combustibility requirements of the code did not increase the usability of the code and as with FS5 was unclear as to what materials had to be tested for non-combustibility in accordance with ASTM E136. Further, in Section 703.4.2 the proposal reduces the requirement for flame spread from 50 to 25 without any technical justification.

Assembly Action:

None

FS10-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that marking or signage identifying fire-resistance rated, or smoke, barriers or partitions within Group R-2 occupancies that do not have a removable ceiling was not necessary. Without this exception the marking or signage in a typical hotel room would be required on all interior walls of the room.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS11-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the requirements dealing with marking or signage identifying fire-resistance rated, or smoke, barriers or partitions were appropriate and should remain in the code. These assemblies should be identified for the construction trades to avoid breaching of the assemblies during construction that will occur during alterations, additions or repairs.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS12-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal reduces the amount of information required on the glazing label without justification. Further, the proposal inappropriately deletes the requirement for the label to identify glazing that meets the hose stream test.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS13-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal was identical to FS12 except that this proposal proposed identification of test exceptions to be included on the label. The committee disapproved this change to be consistent with, and for the same reasons as those stated for FS12-07/08

Assembly Action: **None**

FS14-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent in that this proposal adds clarity to the allowable projections requirements by indicating that the location from which projection measurements are to be taken is from the exterior face of the wall.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS15-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: To avoid conflict with the action taken on FS14-07/08. Also, the committee preferred for the projection measurement to be taken from the building wall rather than the property line.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS16-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that a building wall with a fire separation distance of 10 feet or less could be exposed to a significant amount of radiant heat causing ignition of combustible components on the exterior wall or a reduction of strength in noncombustible structural elements within the exterior wall. Therefore, requiring a fire-resistance rating of an exterior wall to be from both sides where the wall has a fire separation distance of 10 feet or less is appropriate.

Assembly Action:

None

FS17-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposed definition of “areas of uninterrupted water supply” was technically flawed and inappropriate. For example, the committee did not feel that all hurricane prone regions would fall under this definition. Further, language in item 4, such as “deemed to be operational or reliable” is too broad and objective and would lead to enforcement problems.

Assembly Action:

None

FS18-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee disagreed with the proposed terminology change from fire door to fire door assembly. Further, the proposed revisions to Table 704.8 are not substantiated by the proponent.

Assembly Action:

None

FS19-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent in that this proposal cleans up inconsistencies between the provisions for buildings on the same lot with an imaginary line for fire separation distance and the lack of the same provision for buildings on adjacent lots with real property lines.

Assembly Action:

None

FS20-07/08

Errata: FS20-07/08, PART II: Revise Sections 711.3.3, 711.4 and 909.20.2 as follows:

711.3.3 Unusable space. In 1-hour fire-resistance-rated floor ~~construction assemblies~~, the ceiling membrane is not required to be installed over unusable crawl spaces. In 1-hour fire-resistance-rated roof ~~construction assemblies~~, the floor membrane is not required to be installed where unusable attic space occurs above.

711.4 (Supp) Continuity. Assemblies shall be continuous without openings, penetrations or joints except as permitted by this section and Sections 707.2, 712.4, 713 and 1020.1. Skylights and other penetrations through a fire-resistance-rated roof deck or slab are permitted to be unprotected, provided that the structural integrity of the fire-resistance-rated roof ~~construction assembly~~ is maintained. Unprotected skylights shall not be permitted in roof ~~construction assemblies~~ required to be fire-resistance rated in accordance with Section 704.10. The supporting construction shall protected to afford the required fire-resistance rating of the horizontal assembly supported.

909.20.2 Construction. The smokeproof enclosure shall be separated from the remainder of the building by not less than a 2-hour fire barrier without openings other than the required means of egress doors. The vestibule shall be separated from the stairway by not less than a 2-hour fire barrier. The open exterior balcony shall be constructed in accordance with the fire-resistance-rating requirements for floor ~~construction assemblies~~.

PART I – IBC GENERAL

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Clarifies that the terms “floor construction” and “roof construction” are intended to mean “floor assembly” and “roof assembly”, respectively. This provides consistency of terms throughout the code.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the intent of the revised sections is to specify or reference fire-resistance-rated floor assemblies or roof assemblies for the purpose of providing fire containment in addition to the fire endurance provided by being listed in Table 601. The proposal appropriately changes floor construction to floor assembly(ies) and roof construction to roof assembly(ies) in these code sections.

Assembly Action:

None

PART III – IFC

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The change will provide correct and properly correlated terminology between the IBC and the IFC for fire-resistance-rated floor and roof construction. This action is also consistent with the action taken by the IBC-G and IBC-FS Committees.

Assembly Action:

None

FS21-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that reference to the same section (705) was potentially confusing and unnecessary. Further, the committee agreed that there was not enough substantiation provided to warrant deletion of the second sentence regarding the “extent and location” of the fire wall.

Assembly Action:

None

FS22-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

705.1.1 Party walls. Any wall located on a lot line between adjacent buildings, which is used or adapted for joint service between the two buildings, shall be constructed as a firewall in accordance with Section 705. Party walls shall be constructed without openings and shall create separate buildings.

Exception: Openings in a party wall separating an anchor building and a ~~covered mall building~~ shall be in accordance with Section 402.7.3.1.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that based on the unique situation regarding ownership of anchor buildings in typical malls this exception was appropriate to include. Further, the modification appropriately clarifies that the separation requirements are intended to address the pedestrian way within the mall building.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IBC GENERAL

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The definition of covered mall would already address the concern of differing ownership.

Assembly Action:

None

FS23-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was unclear on how compliance with these requirements for openings in fire walls would be determined. For example, how would a code official determine when collapse of construction would cause loss of protection from any given number of opening protectives? Further, as written the language seems to imply that the required fire test (ASTM E119) determines these criteria, which the committee indicated, does not.

Assembly Action:

None

FS24-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard NFPA 221-06 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee thought this proposed exception was too broad in that it would allow any NFPA 221 fire wall design to be exempt from the structural stability requirements of Section 705.2. Further, "High Challenge Fire Walls" should be defined in the I-codes to compliment, and coordinate with, provisions for the same.

Assembly Action:

None

FS25-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on conflicts with directories of fire resistance rated assemblies, such as Underwriters Laboratories that allow certain components to be part of fire resistance rated assemblies, the committee agreed to disapprove this proposal.

Assembly Action:

None

FS26-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent that current footnote "a" to Table 705.4 is confusing and often misinterpreted. The revised wording clarifies the footnote by indicated what is permitted rather than a minimum requirement.

Assembly Action:

None

FS27-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposed language did not clarify the termination allowance to the horizontal continuity requirements in exception 3 to Section 707.5.

Assembly Action:

None

FS28-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that the termination allowance to the horizontal continuity requirements in exception 3 to Section 707.5 did address situations that were different than the other exceptions to Section 707.5, and therefore were appropriate and should not be deleted.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS29-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent in that consistency with the changes approved by Proposal G153-06/07 with respect to the terms "fire-rated" and "horizontal separation" was needed. G153-06/07 changed the term from horizontal separation to horizontal assembly and substantiated that all of these assemblies were by definition fire-resistance rated, therefore calling them fire-rated was not necessary in other text locations. These terms are appropriately replaced with "horizontal assembly."

Assembly Action: **None**

FS30-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the intent of exception #5 to Section 705.6 does change with the language proposed by the proponent, and as this was not the intent of the proponent, the committee disapproved this item for lack of substantiation.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS31-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that the addition of prescriptive floor ceiling assembly penetrations through fire walls was unnecessary and that Section 705.2 was adequate to address these issues on a performance level.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS32-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed language permitting a structural frame to support a fire wall under certain conditions could weaken the structural integrity of the fire wall. Further, the deflection of the structural frame supporting the fire wall under fire conditions could cause damage to the supported wall. This concern was not addressed in the proposal or supporting statement.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS33-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that Table 706.3.9 is limited to single occupancy separation and therefore it is not appropriate to reference that table for multiple occupancy separations. If multiple occupancies were to be additionally covered by Table 706.3.9 the committee preferred the language in FS34-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS34-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent in that this proposal will increase consistency in the application of fire area provisions by addressing fire area provisions that apply to mixed occupancy buildings, about which, the IBC is currently silent.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS35-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that Section 706.5 currently does not read clearly because it contains an exception within it. Removing the exception from the body and adding it as the 3rd exception is appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS36-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred action on FS35-07/08 as it relates to removing the exception from the text of Section 706.5. Further, the committee thought the new exception for supporting construction of nonbearing shaft walls was too broad based on the emphasis of the code on restricting smoke migration from floor to floor.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS37-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this was an appropriate reorganization of Section 706.5 to separate the supporting construction requirements from the continuity requirements as well as to clarify the that the fire-resistant joint installed at the intersection of the top of a rated vertical fire barrier and a horizontal roof, floor, or roof slab is required in order to provide the continuity of fire barriers.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS38-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent in that the proposal clarifies that shafts may be installed horizontally, as well as vertically.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS39-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval and indicated that more development of the proposal was necessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS40-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarified the term "construction" with respect to exception 7 to Section 707.2. This clarification is required because in some locations in the code concealed refers to cavities within an assembly or beneath a floor or in an attic; however in other portions of the code "concealed spaces" is used in reference to small closet or storage areas.

Assembly Action:

None

FS41-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent. Since Section 707.2 Exception 8 does not require a shaft enclosure at automobile ramps in open or enclosed parking garages, and Section 716.5.3, exceptions 1.4 and 3 do not require fire or smoke dampers at supply or exhaust ducts of shafts enclosures serving parking garages, a fire resistance shaft enclosure for mechanical exhaust and supply ducts, or the elevator hoistways in garages where ramps are open at all levels should not be required.

Assembly Action:

None

FS42-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on a lack of technical justification to allow this additional prescriptive allowance for a floor opening.

Assembly Action:

None

FS43-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this revision clarifies that shafts are intended to be symmetrical assemblies, or are to be assigned the rating of the least fire-resistance rated side.

Assembly Action:

None

FS44-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The provisions of Chapter 4 are specific requirements and are applicable over the general requirements of the code; therefore reference to Chapter 4 from this section in Chapter 7 is unnecessary.

Assembly Action:

None

FS45-07/08

Errata: FS45-07/08: Revise proponent's representation as follows:

Proponent: Tony Crimi, AC Consulting Solutions, Inc., representing ~~North American Insulation Manufacturers' Association (NAIMA)~~ International Fire Stop Council

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASTM E2336-04 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This is not an appropriate exception for several reasons. First, the standard referenced is for grease ducts, not refuse and laundry chutes. Second, this standard does not address typical laundry chute access openings at floor levels; the chute may act differently under fire conditions than a grease duct. Third, the grease duct usually is associated with a kitchen hood that is provided with a suppression system.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS46-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval and indicated that more development of the proposal was necessary.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS47-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that stack effect was the basis of the original exception and therefore locations where an elevator opens into a corridor should not be introduced as additional criteria within the exception.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS48-07/08 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

FS49-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

707.14.1 (Supp) Elevator lobby. An enclosed elevator lobby shall be provided at each ~~floor story~~ where an elevator shaft enclosure connects more than three stories. The lobby enclosure shall separate the elevator shaft enclosure doors from each ~~floor story~~ by fire partitions. In addition to the requirements in Section 708 for fire partitions, doors protecting openings in the elevator lobby enclosure walls shall also comply with Section 715.4.3 as required for corridor walls and penetrations of the elevator lobby enclosure by ducts and air transfer openings shall be protected as required for corridors in accordance with Section 716.5.4.1. Elevator lobbies shall have at least one means of egress complying with Chapter 10 and other provisions within this code.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed with the proponent in that this code change proposal clarifies the requirements for the construction of the elevator lobby enclosure when this section requires it; with respect to doors, ducts and air transfer openings. The modification changed "story" back to "floor" which is consistent with current code terminology.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS50-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The original text was intentional to limit the requirement to at least one means of egress from an elevator lobby. Bringing in all of the requirements of Chapter 10 could be too broad for this application.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS51-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponents request for disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS52-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that some of the requirements, such as the air leakage rate, were better off changed in the standard as part of the standard development process rather than placed in the code. It would be difficult for a code official to verify this information.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS53-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee had a concern with the term "buildings" in Items 4.1 and 4.2; they thought "occupancies" was a better fit. Further, there was no technical justification for not allowing buildings in certain seismic design categories from benefiting from this exception.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS54-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that occupancy classification was not the issue, rather it was the migration of smoke through elevator shafts; therefore elevator lobbies should be required for Group B under the conditions specified in the proposal. Further, no technical justification was provided to allow for this exception.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS55-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Similar to the committee's reasons for FS54-07/08, the committee felt that occupancy classification was not the issue, rather it was the migration of smoke through elevator shafts; therefore elevator lobbies should be required under the conditions specified in the proposal. Further, no technical justification was provided to allow for this exception. Lastly, it seems critical to have lobby protection with Group R that is not currently exempted from the exception.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS56-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this code change will incorporate the needed smoke spread protection requirements for door and duct openings in smoke partitions that are allowed as a replacement for fire partitions as elevator lobby enclosures in accordance with exception #5 to Section 707.14.1.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS57-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The additional language would simply allow the code official to approve or not approve the option of using the hoistway pressurization requirements in Section 707.14.2. The committee felt that this was not appropriate; the approval should be based on whether or not the proposed hoistway pressurization meets the intent of Section 707.14.2 as an alternative to the requirement for elevator lobbies.

Assembly Action:

None

FS58-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

707.14.1 (Supp) Elevator lobby. An enclosed elevator lobby shall be provided at each floor where an elevator shaft enclosure connects more than three stories. The lobby shall separate the elevator shaft enclosure doors from each floor by fire partitions equal to the fire-resistance rating of the corridor and the required opening protection. Elevator lobbies shall have at least one means of egress complying with Chapter 10 and other provisions within this code.

Exceptions:

1. Enclosed elevator lobbies are not required at the street floor, provided the entire street floor is equipped with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1.
2. Elevators not required to be located in a shaft in accordance with Section 707.2 are not required to have enclosed elevator lobbies.
3. Where additional doors are provided at the hoistway opening in accordance with Section 3002.6. Such doors shall be tested in accordance with UL 1784 without an artificial bottom seal.
4. In other than Group I-2 and I-3, and buildings having occupied floors located more than 75 feet (22 860 mm) above the lowest level of fire department vehicle access, enclosed elevator lobbies are not required where the building is protected by an automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2.
5. Smoke partitions shall be permitted in lieu of fire partitions to separate the elevator lobby at each floor where the building is equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2.
6. Enclosed elevator lobbies are not required where the elevator hoistway is pressurized in accordance with Section 707.14.2.
7. Enclosed elevator lobbies are not required ~~in~~ where the elevator serves only open parking garages in accordance with Section 406.3.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that since the primary purpose of an elevator lobby is to inhibit the spread of smoke via the elevator hoistway, it is impractical to require an elevator lobby in an open structure that will allow smoke to dissipate outside of the building. Further, the modification makes it clear that the exception is limited to elevators that serve only an open parking garage.

Assembly Action:

None

FS59-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the added exception was too vague and would lead to enforcement problems based on language such as "exterior balcony or similar open space." What criteria does the code official have to determine what would qualify as a "similar open space?" Further, this could conflict with Section 1014.5.1 that in some circumstances require fire-resistance rating at these locations.

Assembly Action:

None

FS60-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies that, although Section 707.14 deals with elevator lobbies and the exceptions for elevator lobbies, areas of refuge are governed by Section 1007, both of which may affect building design.

Assembly Action:

None

FS61-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that a maximum upper positive pressure limit was necessary to achieve results for pressurization to work for different temperature and wind stack effects; therefore it is inappropriate to delete this upper limit.

Assembly Action:

None

FS62-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

707.14.2.1 (Supp) Pressurization requirements. Elevator hoistways shall be pressurized to maintain a minimum positive pressure of 0.04 inches of water (9.96 Pa) and a maximum positive pressure of 0.06 inches of water (14.94 Pa) above the maximum anticipated stack effect pressure with respect to adjacent occupied space on all floors. This pressure shall be measured at the midpoint of each hoistway door, with all elevator cars at the floor of recall and all hoistway doors on the floor of recall open and all other hoistway doors closed. The opening and closing of hoistway doors at each level must be demonstrated during this test. The supply air intake shall be from an outside, uncontaminated source located a minimum distance of 20 feet (6096 mm) from any air exhaust system or outlet.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that without consideration of stack effect, the hoistway can have lower pressure than many of the building floors, which could render the pressurization system ineffective. Without the proposed change, design of hoistway pressurization systems in most climates for high rise buildings would not be feasible. The modification clarifies that the stack effect pressure is to be what is anticipated.

Assembly Action:

None

FS63-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the language in FS62-07/08 and FS67-07/08.

Assembly Action:

None

FS64-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that the proposed text does not look at the pressurization required to stop the migration of smoke. Further, there was no justification provided to substantiate the revised minimum positive pressure of 0.05.

Assembly Action:

None

FS65-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval and indicated that more development of the proposal was necessary.

Assembly Action:

None

FS66-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that verifying that the pressurization does not impede on cables selector tapes, governor ropes, etc. was unrealistic for the code official to do. Further, the committee felt more data was required to substantiate the added requirements, since the referenced elevator standard was not yet published.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS67-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Doors opening at recall should be a part of the pressurization design. Reference to Chapter 9 in exception 6 to Section 707.14.1 could lead to misapplication of the code provisions because the smoke control provisions are not intended to apply to pressurization design. Lastly, Sections 707.14.2.2 through 707.14.2.5 would remain and would need to somehow be coordinated perhaps within Section 909.21.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS68-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies the code requirement for how the elevator pressurization system is activated. If both a fire alarm system and elevator lobby smoke detectors are provided, but only one is capable of activating the hoistway pressurization, there could be a delay in providing that protection from smoke.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS69-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Requiring special inspection for an elevator hoistway pressurization system is consistent with requirements for smoke control systems elsewhere in the code and is appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS70-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The term "tenant spaces" seems to be too inclusive and should be further defined and limited. Also, the committee felt that there may be enforcement problems in a building where the configurations are likely to change often, such as a typical Group B office building.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS71-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: As with FS70-07/08, the committee felt that the term "tenant spaces" seems to be too inclusive and should be further defined and limited. Also, the committee indicated that there may be enforcement problems in a building where the configurations are likely to change often, such as a typical Group B office building.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS72-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Requiring only draftstopping to be installed in the interstitial space between the top of the fire partition and the bottom of the deck or slab in buildings where the floor/ceiling assemblies are not fire-resistance rated is less restrictive than what is currently required. The proponent has not provided justification for this.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS73-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee believes that the corridor ceiling requirements as currently contained in the code are easily understood and disagree with the proponent's reorganization of the requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee had concern about the term 'ceiling in corridors' regarding if this was just the ceiling or if it was the floor/ceiling assembly. Also the proposed language talks about where the ceiling is required to be rated. Neither current text nor the proposed Part I of FS73-07/08 required ceilings to be rated. The reference to Section 711 for requirements would be wrong since Section 711 is for floor/ceiling assemblies, not just ceilings. The driving issue is the separation of the corridor from other parts of the floor, not the enclosure of the corridor.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS74-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that using the term "concealed spaces" in some instances could be confused with very small rooms and spaces where it is not intended that the provisions for draftstopping apply. Also, the proposed revisions may conflict with the requirements of NFPA 13R with respect to sprinkler locations.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS75-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that horizontal sliding doors meeting the provisions of section 1008.1.3.3 and 715 should be acceptable components in a means of egress.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS76-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

710.5.2 Smoke and draft control doors. Where required elsewhere in the code, doors in smoke partitions shall be tested in accordance with UL 1784- with an artificial bottom seal installed across the full width of the bottom of the door assembly during the test. The air leakage rate of the door assembly shall not exceed 3 cubic feet per minute per square foot [ft³/(min · ft²)](0.015424 m³/ s · m²) of door opening at 0.10 inch (24.9Pa) of water for both the ambient temperature test and the elevated temperature exposure test.

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that the undercut tolerance of 3/4 inch for corridor doors in Group I-2 was appropriate and was useful for, and easily verified by, the code official. Also, the committee agreed that it is appropriate to permit the omission of latching hardware where the door manufacturer's listing includes such applications. The modification put the language regarding the artificial bottom seal back into Section 710.5.2 based on the proponent's request; this resulted in no technical changes to Section 710.5.2.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS77-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the removal of the requirement for the artificial bottom seal for smoke and draft control doors clarified a long debated issue. Further the proposal coordinates the language of Section 710.5.2 with the language of Section 715.4.3.1 approved under FS106-06/07. Lastly, reference to NFPA 105 for installation of smoke doors is appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS78-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request for disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS79-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that allowing the roof deck in Types IA, IB and IIB construction to be non-fire-resistance rated under certain conditions was less restrictive than what the code currently requires. The committee disapproved this change for lack of substantiation.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS80-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposed revisions were appropriate for consistency with the definition of "horizontal assembly" in Section 702.1, which is a "fire-resistance-rated floor or roof assembly of materials designed to restrict the spread of fire in which continuity is maintained."

Assembly Action: **None**

FS81-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that sending the code-user to Sections 707.14.1 and 707 would be confusing because it is not clear what provisions in Section 707 are applicable to horizontal assemblies that are required to resist the movement of smoke.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC GENERAL

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposed revisions would not work without the proposed requirements in Part I of the proposal. Part I was heard by the Fire Safety Committee later during the hearings.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS82-07/08 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

FS83-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the provisions for installation details and field installation were too broad and could conflict with prescriptive provisions currently in the code for annular space protection for other construction, such as masonry. Further, the code official should not be approving manufacturer's installation instructions. Lastly, it seems unreasonable that a code official should have to verify that a contractor is certified.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS84-07/08 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

FS85-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the application of the penetration protection requirements to fire-resistance load bearing walls was confusing. Typically, load bearing walls can have any number of penetrations that do not affect the structural integrity of the wall that are not specifically protected in accordance with Section 713.2. If the load bearing wall is not also expected to resist the passage of heat and/or products of combustion, then protection of these penetrations is generally not warranted.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC STRUCTURAL

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The definition of wall in Chapter 21 is specific to masonry and this proposal makes that clear.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS86-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee believes that the exceptions to the through penetration requirements as currently contained in Sections 712.3.1 and 712.4.1.1 of the code are easily understood and disagree with the proponent's reorganization of the requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC B/E

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The proposed language adds clarity while keeping the same technical requirements for through penetrations of fire-resistance-rated wall or floor assemblies.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS87-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Withdrawn by Proponent

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

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The proposed language to allow 144 square inches areas of openings in any wall or floor area measuring 10 feet by 10 feet in height or length could result in the aggregation of penetrating items compromising the fire rated assembly. The committee preferred the language passed in FS86-07/08.

Assembly Action:

None

FS88-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Consistent with FS83-07/08, the committee felt that the provisions were too broad and could conflict with prescriptive provisions currently in the code for annular space protection for other construction, such as masonry. Further, it seems unreasonable for a code official to verify that a contractor is certified.

Assembly Action:

None

FS89-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this was an appropriate clarification with respect to membrane penetration requirements that would be consistent with the requirements of the IRC.

Assembly Action:

None

FS90-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that many electrical boxes have been tested as part of the fire rated assembly; therefore limiting the horizontal distance to that specified by the testing is reasonable.

Assembly Action:

None

FS91-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that the T-rating should be required for membrane penetrations under exception #4 to Section 712.3.2 because there is no size limitation or box type limitation on the penetrating items. Therefore, it is best to be conservative and leave the T-rating requirement in the exception.

Assembly Action:

None

FS92-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the additional language to exception #1 to Section 712.4.1.1 dealing with through penetrations created confusion by lengthening a sentence that is already too long and confusing.

Assembly Action:

None

FS93-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee believed that exception #2 to Section 712.4.1.1 inherently includes a penetration of a horizontal assembly that would be located within a wall cavity; therefore the language is not needed.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS94-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistent with FS83-07/08, the committee felt that it was unreasonable for a code official to verify that a contractor is certified.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS95-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee recognized that if the penetrating item is concealed within a wall, then the conditions that can lead to an unsafe temperature rise in the penetrating item should not exist; therefore removing the requirement for a T-rating at these locations is reasonable.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS96-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that reference to Section 717.2.5 regarding masonry chimneys is not relevant to membrane penetrations by pipes, tubes or vents.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS97-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that it was appropriate to expand the range of materials that are allowed to be used for sealing of penetrations in non-fire-resistance rated floors to include the materials that are already allowed by this code to be used to seal penetrations in fire resistance rated floors.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS98-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request for disapproval, which was based on the committee's actions on FS97-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS99-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that criteria for testing of penetrations through smoke barriers in accordance with UL 1479 were needed and should not simply be deleted; this would create a hole in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS100-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

FS101-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Similar to FS85-07/08, the committee agreed that the application of the membrane penetration protection requirements to fire-resistance rated structural members was confusing and too broad. Typically, structural members that are fire-resistance rated for structural reasons only, such as masonry and concrete walls, can have any number of penetrations that do not affect the structural integrity of the wall that are not specifically protected.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS102-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that since floor openings for ramps are unenclosed in enclosed garages, as allowed in Exception 8 of Section 707.2, there is no logic in requiring fire-resistive joint systems for joints in floors of enclosed garages.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS103-07/08

Errata: FS103-07/08: Revise exception 5 to Section 713.1 (Supp) by removing the strikeout from the word "open." Exception 5 should read as follows:

5. Floors ~~and ramps~~ within open ~~parking structures~~ and enclosed parking garages or structures constructed in accordance with Sections 406.3 and 406.4, respectively.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Consistent with FS102-07/08, the committee agreed that since floor openings for ramps are unenclosed in enclosed garages, as allowed in Exception 8 of Section 707.2, there is no logic in requiring fire-resistive joint systems for joints in floors of enclosed garages.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS104-07/08

Withdrawn by Proponent

FS105-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Consistent with FS83-07/08, the committee felt that it was unreasonable for a code official to verify that a contractor is certified.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS106-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the term "smoke-resistant joint system" was confusing and unnecessary as it is currently not used in the I-codes.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS107-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that the term "curtain" needed to remain in order for this condition to be addressed. Further, without the requirements being applicable to curtain walls, they would be applicable to all exterior walls, which would not be appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS108-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the proposed text of FS110-08/08 over the language in this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS109-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee preferred the proposed text of FS110-08/08 over the language in this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS110-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the single applicable standard to test exterior curtain wall and floor intersections is ASTM E2307. This standard, unlike ASTM E119 and UL 263, addresses the unique construction details associated with exterior curtain wall and floor intersections.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS111-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

713.4.1 Exterior curtain wall & non fire-resistance rated floor assembly intersections. Voids created at the intersection of exterior curtain wall assemblies and non fire-resistance-rated floor or floor/ceiling assemblies shall be sealed with an approved material or system to resist ~~prevent~~ the interior spread of fire and the free passage of heat and hot gases.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this type of protection is commonly provided and a typical construction practice; therefore adding the requirement to the code is appropriate and will be useful for the code official for enforcement purposes. The modification to replace the word “prevent” with “resist” seemed to be more appropriate based on the intent of the requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS112-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that a listed fire-resistant joint system is required at the junction of a horizontal smoke barrier and a curtain wall; therefore the proposed language is appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS113-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that bringing in vertical stability requirements to the primary structural frame was an appropriate technical clarification. The effective length of columns can be increased with proper fire-resistance rated protection provided to the bracing member(s) that are provided to achieve the longer effective length.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS114-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Part I of the proposal was heavily dependant upon the action on Part II, which at the time of the IBC General Committee hearings had not been discussed yet.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that there were too many proposed changes in this proposal that would conflict with the actions the committee has taken on FS113-07/08 and FS115-07/08.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS115-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

714.1 (Supp) Requirements. The fire-resistance ratings of structural members and assemblies shall comply with this section and the requirements for the type of construction as specified in Table 601. The fire-resistance ratings shall not be less than the ratings required for the fire-resistance-rated assemblies supported by the structural members.

(Portions of the proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the reorganization of Section 714 orders the requirements to create a more user-friendly code, for both the designer and the code official. The modification put back the words “and assemblies” to cover items other than structural members.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IBC GENERAL

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Part II of the proposal was heavily dependant upon the action on Part I, which at the time of the IBC General Committee hearings had not been discussed yet.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS116-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the structural integrity of a concrete column supporting a parking garage is sufficiently robust so as not to require impact protection (corner guards).

Assembly Action: **None**

FS117-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this type of performance related to fire modeling did not belong in this code; perhaps the Performance Code was more appropriate. Further, language such as "approved reduced fire rating" is subjective and difficult for a code official to determine.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS118-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the requirements contained in Section 714 Fire-resistance Rating of Structural Members are applicable to all types of fire rated assemblies; therefore it's relocation to the beginning of Chapter 7 seems appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS119-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request for disapproval in order for the proponent to work with other proponent's of similar changes to submit a coordinated public comment.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS120-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

715.4 Fire door and shutter assemblies. Approved fire door and fire shutter assemblies shall be constructed of any material or assembly of component materials that conforms to the test requirements of Section 715.4.1, 715.4.2 or 715.4.3 and the fire-protection rating indicated in Table 715.4. Fire door frames with transom lights, sidelights or both shall empty be permitted in accordance with Section 715.4.5. Fire door assemblies and shutters shall be installed in accordance with the provisions of this section and NFPA 80.

Exceptions:

1. Labeled protective assemblies that conform to the requirements of this section or UL 10A, UL 14B and UL 14C for tin-clad fire door assemblies.
2. Floor fire door assemblies in accordance with Section 711.8.

715.4.5 Fire door frames with transom lights and sidelights. Door frames with transom lights, sidelights, or both shall be permitted where a ¾-hour fire protection rating or less is required in accordance with Table 715.4. Where a fire protection rating exceeding ¾-hour is required in accordance with Table 715.4, fire door frames with transom lights, sidelights, or both, shall be permitted where installed with fire-resistance rated glazing tested as an assembly in accordance with ASTM E119 or UL 263.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that requirements specific to fire door frames with transom lights and sidelights needed to be addressed in the code. Further, the committee agreed that the technical requirements were appropriate and based on NFPA 80. The modifications were to opt for more appropriate code language, language consistencies with NFPA 80 and to add an appropriate referenced to an alternative standard (UL 263) referenced elsewhere in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS121-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that horizontal sliding doors are allowed in Group I-3 by Section 1008.1.2 and are an integral part of maintaining the security in buildings of this type. This exception will allow proper levels of security to be maintained in these types of buildings without compromising occupant life safety.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS122-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on lack of data to substantiate the addition of UL 9, the deletion of the hose stream test and the heat flux values, the committee disapproved this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS123-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on lack of data to substantiate the deletion of the hose stream test, the committee disapproved this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS124-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on inconsistencies between the labeling requirements of this proposal and of Chapter 24 for safety glazing, the committee disapproved this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS125-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the reduction in fire rating for fire windows in corridors was not substantiated. One of the committee's concerns was that windows could have a fuel load directly adjacent to them, unlike a door.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS126-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt there was not sufficient justification to exempt the hose stream test from the requirements for ¾ hour fire-resistance rated glazing in corridor walls. One concern was the performance of tempered glazing when exposed to the hose stream test.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS127-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: As with FS126-07/08, the committee felt there was not sufficient justification to exempt the hose stream test from the requirements for ¾ hour fire-resistance rated glazing in corridor walls. Further, the committee indicated that there was insufficient data provided to substantiate the radiant heat flux values.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS128-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that there was insufficient data provided to substantiate the proposed radiant heat flux values.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS129-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt there was not sufficient justification to exempt the hose stream test from the requirements for ¾ hour fire-resistance rated glazing in corridor walls in buildings equipped throughout with an automatic sprinkler system.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS130-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the ¼ inch thick fire protection-rated glazing should be tested. Further, the code official should not be responsible for verifying what size was tested to determine what the maximum size should be on a job by job basis.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS131-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that it was important for the limiting sizes of wired glass to stay in the I-code. Code officials use this frequently to enforce the requirements of, and determine compliance of, wired glass installations.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS132-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: As with FS125-07/08, the committee felt that the reduction in fire rating for fire windows in corridors was not substantiated. One of the committee's concerns was that windows could have a fuel load directly adjacent to them, unlike a door.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS133-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that deleting the requirements for opening protectives for exterior walls with a fire-resistance rating of greater than 1 hour would result in no prescriptive requirements for this condition; therefore the committee recommended disapproval to maintain the requirement in Table 715.5.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS134-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: As with FS133-07/08, the committee agreed that deleting the requirements for opening protectives for exterior walls with a fire-resistance rating of greater than 1 hour would result in no prescriptive requirements for this condition; therefore the committee recommended disapproval to maintain the requirement in Table 715.5.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS135-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Based on the fact that ASTM E119 does not require the hose stream test for partitions qualifying for a 30 minute fire rating and Section 715.4.3 allows 20 minute rated fire doors to be tested without the hose stream test, the committee agreed that the hose stream test was not required for a 20 minute rated fire protection window.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS136-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal clarifies the code by specifically addressing the rating requirements for interior windows by providing a specific reference to Table 715.5.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS137-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

716.2.1 (IMC [B] 607.2.1) Smoke control system. Where the installation of a fire damper will interfere with the operation of a required smoke control system ~~designed~~ in accordance with Section 909, approved alternative protection shall be utilized. Where mechanical systems including ducts and dampers utilized for normal building ventilation serve as part of the smoke control system, the expected performance of these systems in smoke control mode shall be addressed in the rational analysis required by Section 909.4.

Committee Reason: The added language regarding the performance of mechanical systems used for smoke control is appropriate and will aid in plan review and enforcement. The modification deletes what the committee considered a confusing and unnecessary term.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS138-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that these proposed limitations on smoke/fire dampers used in conjunction with a smoke control system would conflict with other portions of the code that allow this use.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS139-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request for disapproval.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS140-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Requirements for maintenance and testing of fire and smoke dampers do not belong in this code because this code is scoped for new construction. Perhaps this proposal would be better located in the International Fire Code.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS141-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that ceiling dampers do not belong in this section as none of the referenced sections (716.5.1 through 716.5.7) relate to them.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS142-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that this exception for smoke dampers at shaft enclosures was an unsubstantiated sprinkler system trade-off, regardless of the occupancy classification.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS143-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard NFPA 45-04 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee did not receive the proposed referenced standard for their technical review. Further, the committee believed that the standard was not appropriate for this application.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS144-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee believes that the shaft enclosure exceptions within Section 716.5.3 as currently contained in the code are easily understood and disagree with the proponent's reorganization of the requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS145-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that since covered mall buildings are explicitly addressed in 716.5.4, Exception 2, there is a question about what the term 'tenant separation' means in the first exception. Deletion of the first portion of exception 1 allows the corridor exception to remain and does not negatively affect covered malls since they are addressed in exception 2.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS146-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that there was no justification provided to allow Groups I-1 and I-2 to be able to take advantage of these less stringent through penetration requirements. The structures would be less safe without substantiation.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS147-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that these proposed revisions provide good performance language describing how fireblocking needs to perform, which will allow for many products to determine compliance.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC B/E

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: This proposal would eliminate fireblocking that is in use now and will require testing. There is no testing criteria specified. This may require proprietary material.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS148-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASTM E2231-07 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 the proposed requirements for reflective plastic core foil insulation

were not totally appropriate. The referenced standard is applicable to a different component (pipe and duct insulation); therefore its applicability to plastic core foil insulation is not clear. Some of the items seem unnecessary, such as the thermal barrier requirements. Lastly, some of the language in the labeling requirements appears difficult to achieve, such as “information to determine that the end use will comply with the code requirements.”

Assembly Action: **None**

FS149-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASTM E2231-07 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: As with FS148-07/08, the committee felt that the proposed requirements for reflective plastic core foil insulation were not totally appropriate. The referenced standard is applicable to a different component (pipe and duct insulation); therefore its applicability to plastic core foil insulation is not clear. Some of the items seem unnecessary, such as the thermal barrier requirements. Lastly, some of the language in the labeling requirements appears difficult to achieve, such as “information to determine that the end use will comply with the code requirements.”

Assembly Action: **None**

FS150-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that the proposed load combination requirements added to the footnote to Table 720.1(2) were not necessary and over-complicated the use of the prescriptive fire-resistance rating Table.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS151-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee believes that footnotes m and q to Table 720.1(2) regarding allowable wood stresses are understandable as currently contained in the code and disagree with the proponent's revisions of the requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS152-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal had too many discrepancies when compared to the UL listing which was to be the basis for this assembly being inserted into the prescriptive fire-resistance rating table.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS153-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the changes in ceiling thickness and terminologies within Table 720.1(3) were appropriate based on industry practices.

Assembly Action:

None

FS154-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal updates the column requirements based on new provisions in ACI 216.1-07/TMS 0216.1-07, *Code Requirements for Determining Fire Resistance of Concrete and Masonry Construction Assemblies*, which is presently referenced in Section 721.1 of the IBC.

Assembly Action:

None

FS155-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the use of the phrase “horizontal separation” in these sections is incorrect and could be confused by users as meaning something other than the fire separation distance; therefore replacing these terms with “fire separation distance” is appropriate.

Assembly Action:

None

FS156-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

**TABLE 721.2.1.4(1)
MULTIPLYING FACTOR FOR FINISHES ON NONFIRE-EXPOSED SIDE OF
CONCRETE OR CONCRETE MASONRY WALLS**

| TYPE OF FINISH APPLIED TO CONCRETE OR CONCRETE MASONRY WALL | TYPE OF AGGREGATE USED IN CONCRETE OR CONCRETE MASONRY | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| | Concrete: siliceous or carbonate Concrete Masonry: siliceous or calcareous gravel | Concrete: sand lightweight concrete Concrete Masonry: limestone, cinders or unexpanded slag | Concrete: lightweight concrete Concrete Masonry: expanded shale, clay or slate | Concrete Masonry: pumice, or expanded slag |
| Portland cement-sand plaster | 1.00 | 0.75 ^a | 0.75 ^a | 0.50 ^a |
| Gypsum-sand plaster | 1.25 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Gypsum-vermiculite or perlite plaster | 1.75 | 1.50 | 1.50 1.25 | 1.25 |
| Gypsum wallboard | 3.00 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 2.25 |

For SI: 1 inch = 25.4 mm.

- a. For portland cement-sand plaster 5/8 inch or less in thickness and applied directly to the concrete or concrete_masonry on the nonfire-exposed side of the wall, the multiplying factor shall be 1.00.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal appropriately updates the multiplying factor for gypsum wallboard based on values in ACI 216-97/TMS 0216-97, *Standard Method for Determining Fire Resistance of Concrete and Masonry Construction Assemblies*, which is referenced in Section 721.1 of the IBC. The modification revised the multiplying factor for lightweight concrete with a gypsum-vermiculite or perlite plaster finish from 1.5 to 1.25 for consistency with ACI 216-97/TMS 0216-97.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS157-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

**TABLE 721.2.1.4(1)
MULTIPLYING FACTOR FOR FINISHES ON NONFIRE-EXPOSED SIDE OF WALL**

| TYPE OF FINISH APPLIED TO WALL | TYPE OF AGGREGATE USED IN CONCRETE OR CONCRETE MASONRY | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | Concrete: siliceous or carbonate Masonry: siliceous or carbonate; solid clay brick | Concrete: sand-lightweight Masonry: clay tile; hollow clay brick; concrete masonry units of expanded shale and <20% sand | Concrete: lightweight Masonry: concrete masonry units of expanded shale, expanded clay, expanded slag, or pumice< 20% sand | Masonry: concrete masonry units of expanded slag, expanded clay, or pumice |
| Portland cement-sand plaster | 1.00 | 0.75 ^a | 0.75 ^a | 0.50 ^a |
| Gypsum-sand plaster | 1.25 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Gypsum-vermiculite or perlite plaster | 1.75 | 1.50 | 1.25 | 1.25 |
| Gypsum wallboard | 3.00 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 2.25 |

For SI: 1 inch = 25.4 mm

- a. For Portland cement-sand plaster 5/8 inch or less in thickness and applied directly to the concrete or concrete masonry on the non-fire-exposed side of the wall, the multiplying factor shall be 1.00.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposal appropriately updates the multiplying factor for gypsum wallboard based on values in ACI 216-97/TMS 0216-97, *Standard Method for Determining Fire Resistance of Concrete and Masonry Construction Assemblies*, which is referenced in Section 721.1 of the IBC, and Tables 2-2 and 4-2 of ASCE/SFPE 29-2005, *Standard Calculation Methods for Structural Fire Protection*. The modification adds clarification to the footnote that it is concrete masonry that is the specified material.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS158-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this change appropriately removes the alternative method of calculating the equivalent thickness provided in Section 721.3.1.1 that may result in a value different than that determined through standardized procedures. Further, footnote c in Table 721.3.2 has been appropriately modified to introduce concrete masonry units complying with the requirements of ASTM C 744, consistent with the reference standard ACI 216.1/TMS 0216.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS159-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that based on the exterior finishes already allowed in Table 721.6.2(3), the addition of vinyl siding would be appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS160-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

CHAPTER 7 FIRE AND SMOKE ~~PROTECTION~~ PROTECTION FEATURES

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposed title better reflects the purpose of Chapter 7. The modification was to correct a spelling error.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IFC

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The current chapter title is preferred and avoids potential confusion with the current title of Chapter 9. Also, a change could be premature since the ICC Code Technology Committee Fire Safety study group is currently working on a re-write of Chapter 7 which could include a title revision.

Assembly Action:

None

FS161-07/08

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee understands that the ICC Code Technology Committee (CTC) is currently studying the reorganization of Chapter 7. The efforts of this proponent should be coordinated with the efforts of the CTC. Lastly, there are some technical changes in the proposal as well, which the committee felt should be dealt with under a separate proposal.

Assembly Action:

None

FS162-07/08

PART I – IBC GENERAL

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The provisions were felt by some of the committee members to best remain in Chapter 4 as the provisions address many non-Chapter 7 related issues such as smoke control and egress. Additionally the title "Atrium" is preferred over what the proponent is proposing in the new section in Chapter 7. There was also concern with deleting the definition of atrium.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee understands that the ICC Code Technology Committee (CTC) is currently studying the reorganization of Chapter 7. The efforts of this proponent should be coordinated with the efforts of the CTC. Further, the committee felt that the technical changes within the proposed Table 715.2 required further technical justification.

Assembly Action:

None

PART III – IBC MEANS OF EGRESS

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The reference in Section 1020.2 should be Section 715.8.2. Some of the current exceptions are not present in the proposed language. This should be brought back after the Code Technologies Committee has completed their work on this issue.

Assembly Action:

None

FS163-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the changes are necessary for consistency with the use of "automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1 or 903.3.1.2 (where applicable)" elsewhere in the 2006 IBC and 2007 IBC Supplement

Assembly Action:

None

FS164-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASTM E2404-06 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 agreed that the proposed test method, ASTM E2404, was the appropriate test method because it deals specifically with textile, paper or vinyl wall or ceiling coverings.

Assembly Action:

None

FS165-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

803.9 High Density Polyethylene (HDPE). Where high density polyethylene is used as an interior finish it shall comply with the requirements of Section 803.1.2. (Supp)

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that these products are being used and their performance is critical to public health and safety; therefore these products should be regulated and this proposal is appropriate. The modification results in more enforceable language.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IFC

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change identifies a known interior finish hazard, provides retroactive regulation of it and is consistent with the action taken by the IBC-FS Committee.

Assembly Action:

None

FS166-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Based on the proponent's request, which was based on the committee's actions taken on FS165-07/08.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IFC

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This change highlights a known interior finish and construction hazard which is often overlooked in the inspection process and provides retroactive regulation of it.

Assembly Action:

None

FS167-07/08

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASTM E2573-07 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 agreed that site-fabricated stretch systems are now being used extensively and that since a standard has been developed to deal with the mounting of such systems to determine surface burning characteristics (ASTM E2573), the systems should be regulated in the code.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS168-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the term "non-combustible" was more appropriate for exception #1 to Section 803.11.4 based on the fact that some materials that can qualify as Class A materials really are not intended to be under the scope of this exception because they may readily burn if not installed on a noncombustible backing.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS169-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that Group I-1 occupancies should be required to have minimum critical radiant flux of Class I for floor finishes and floor coverings in exit enclosures, exit passageways and corridors based on similar levels of hazards associated with other Groups that are currently required to meet Class I (I-2, I-3). This will also provide consistency between the IBC and Federal Regulations.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS170-07/08

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

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: Sprinkler system maintenance is within the scope of the IFC and is adequately regulated there. The building official should not have to be concerned about system maintenance. The current text recognizes the IFC as a referenced standard on this topic, even if it is not specifically adopted in a jurisdiction.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS171-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: Based on recent research on stair pressurization the committee felt that changing the minimum stair pressurization from 0.15 to 0.10 inches of water was appropriate and that the phrase "conditions of stack effect and wind effect" more appropriately describe what stack pressures were.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS172-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the proposed change appropriately addresses control wiring and power wiring serving the pressurization fan that are critical equipment components that should also be protected. Further, the exceptions appropriately allow listed 2 hour rated wiring and/or 2" of concrete coverage as acceptable alternatives to fire rated barriers. This is consistent with requirements currently in the NFPA 70.

Assembly Action:

None

FS173-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the term exterior wall finish system is often associated only with the exterior insulation and finish systems (EIFS) that are commonly used as wall covering materials; therefore replacing "finish system" with "covering" in the definition of Metal Composite Material System is appropriate.

Assembly Action:

None

FS174-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: The committee was concerned that there was no definition of "backed vinyl siding" and that the exception seemed to exempt backed vinyl siding from all code requirements. Lastly, the committee felt that a reference to Chapter 26 should be included assuming that the backing material is typically foam plastic material.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IRC B/E

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: This proposal creates redundancy because the foam plastic backing is already referenced in Section R314. Industry is working on a standard for vinyl siding that includes the backing. The proponent needs to bring this back when the standard is completed.

Assembly Action:

None

FS175-07/08

Note (Part I and Part II): The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASTM E2273-03 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did not comply with ICC standards criteria (Section 3.6.2.9).

Note (Part I and Part II): The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASTM E2568-07 and ASTM E2570-07 indicated that, in the opinion of ICC Staff, the standard did comply with ICC standards criteria.

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

1404.11 Exterior Insulation and finish system. Exterior Insulation and Finish System (EIFS) shall comply with ~~ASTM E 2568~~ and Exterior Insulation and Finish System (EIFS) with Drainage shall comply with Section 1408 ~~ASTM E 2568 and ASTM E 2273.~~

1408.4.1 EIFS with drainage. EIFS with drainage shall have an average minimum drainage efficiency of 90 percent when tested in accordance ~~meet~~ the requirements of ASTM E 2273 and is required on framed walls of Type V Construction, Group R1, R2, R3, and R4 occupancies.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that the proposed requirements for exterior insulation and finish systems with and without drainage are technically accurate and complete and are therefore an appropriate addition to the code. The modification to Section 1404.11 references Section 1408, which contains reference to the standards that have been struck. The modification to Section 1408.4.11 provides appropriate pass/fail criteria for the drainage systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC B/E

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify proposal as follows:

R703.9.2 Exterior Insulation and Finish System (EIFS) with drainage. EIFS with drainage shall comply with ASTM E 2568 and shall have an average minimum drainage efficiency of 90% when tested in accordance with ASTM E 2273.

R703.9.2.2 Installation. The water-resistive barrier shall be applied between the EIFS and the wall sheathing over all building components.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: This change adds a product into the code that has been used many years and has been improved substantially. Also, this establishes the criteria for use by the Building Official for evaluation and installation. The modification adds criteria for drainage efficiency and clarifies the intent.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS176-07/08

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

Note: The following analysis was not in the Code Change Proposal book but was posted on the ICC website.

Analysis: Review of proposed new standard ASTM D7254-07 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 there was a lack of substantiation for the heat release limitations. Further, the committee agreed that these requirements appear to go beyond what is currently be done by industry (flame spread and heat release). Therefore, the committee disapproved this change.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS177-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify the proposal as follows:

**TABLE 1405.3.1
CLASS III VAPOR RETARDERS**

| ZONE | CLASS III VAPOR RETARDERS PERMITTED FOR: ¹ |
|----------|---|
| Marine 4 | Vented cladding over OSB Vented cladding over Plywood Vented cladding over Fiberboard Vented cladding over Gypsum Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq R2.5 over 2x4 wall Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq R3.75 over 2x6 wall |
| 5 | Vented cladding over OSB Vented cladding over Plywood Vented cladding over Fiberboard Vented cladding over Gypsum Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq R5 over 2x4 wall Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq R7.5 over 2x6 wall |
| 6 | Vented cladding over Fiberboard Vented cladding over Gypsum Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq R7.5 over 2x4 wall Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq R11.25 over 2x6 wall |
| 7 and 8 | Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq R10 over 2x4 wall Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq R15 over 2x6 wall |

1. Spray foam with a minimum density of 2 lbs/ft³ applied to the interior cavity side of OSB, plywood, fiberboard, insulating sheathing or gypsum is deemed to meet the insulating sheathing requirement where the spray foam R-value meets or exceeds the specified insulating sheathing R-value.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this change appropriates locates the technical requirements for vapor retarders in the Chapter 14 of the Building Code from the *International Energy Code* because this construction component is a building issue not an energy issue. The modification appropriately adds insulating sheathing to footnote 1 to be consistent with the entries in the Table.

Assembly Action:

None

PART II – IECC

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: Committee agrees with proponent that these requirements for vapor retarders are not energy code issues.

Assembly Action:

None

PART III – IRC B/E

Committee Action:

Approved as Modified

Modify proposal as follows:

**TABLE R602.1.1
CLASS III VAPOR RETARDERS**

| ZONE | CLASS III VAPOR RETARDERS PERMITTED FOR: ¹ |
|----------|---|
| Marine 4 | Vented cladding over OSB Vented cladding over plywood Vented cladding over fiberboard Vented cladding over gypsum Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq 2.5 over 2x4 wall Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq 3.75 over 2x6 wall |
| 5 | Vented cladding over OSB Vented cladding over plywood Vented cladding over fiberboard Vented cladding over gypsum Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq 5 over 2x4 wall Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq 7.5 over 2x6 wall |
| 6 | Vented cladding over fiberboard Vented cladding over gypsum Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq 7.5 over 2x4 wall Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq 11.25 over 2x6 wall |
| 7 and 8 | Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq 10 over 2x4 wall Insulated sheathing with R-value \geq 15 over 2x6 wall |

1. Spray foam with a minimum density of 2 lbs/ft³ applied to the interior cavity side of OSB, plywood, fiberboard, insulating sheathing or gypsum is deemed to meet the insulating sheathing requirement where the spray foam R-value meets or exceeds the specified insulating sheathing R-value.

(Portions of proposal not shown remain unchanged)

Committee Reason: This change moves the vapor retarder requirement into the proper location in the code. The proper location is the wall chapter since vapor retarder requirements are not energy issues. The modification was made to add insulating sheathing to the footnote which was inadvertently omitted.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS178-07/08

Errata: FS178-07/08: Replace Section 1406.2.2 with the following:

1406.2.2 (Supp) Architectural trim. In buildings of Type I, II, III and IV construction, exterior wall coverings shall be permitted to be constructed of wood where permitted by Section 1405.4 or other equivalent combustible material. Combustible exterior wall coverings, other than fire-retardant-treated wood complying with Section 2303.2 for exterior installation, shall not exceed 10 percent of an exterior wall surface area where the fire separation distance is 5 feet (1524 mm) or less. Combustible architectural trim shall be limited to ~~three stories or~~ 40 feet (12 192 mm) in height above grade ~~plane~~. Noncombustible materials shall be permitted to be of any height provided the materials are secured to the wall with metal or other approved noncombustible brackets.

Exception: Combustible architectural trim of fire-retardant treated wood shall be permitted up to ~~four stories or~~ 60 feet (18.29 m) in height above grade ~~plane~~.

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that based on changes in the thresholds for components of buildings (i.e., veneer, architectural trim and exterior wall coverings) from being based on grade plane to being based on grade, this change is appropriate and will bring consistency among the provisions of the IBC whose limitations are based on their heights above the finished ground surface.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS179-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The testing that would support the proposed removal of the masonry veneer requirement for Seismic Design Category D is only partially complete at this time. The committee prefers to wait until that testing is complete and those results are made available before approving this proposal.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS180-07/08 **NOT USED**

FS181-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1405.13 Vinyl siding. Vinyl siding conforming to the requirements of this section and complying with ASTM D 3679 shall be permitted on exterior walls of buildings of located in areas where the basic wind speed specified in Chapter 16 does not exceed 100 miles per hour (45 m/s) and the building height is less than or equal to 40 feet (12 192 mm) in Exposure C. Where construction is located in areas where the basic wind speed exceeds 100 miles per hour (45 m/s), or building heights are in excess of 40 feet (12 192 mm), tests or calculations indicating compliance with Chapter 16 shall be submitted. Vinyl siding shall be secured to the building so as to provide weather protection for the exterior walls of the building. ~~Vinyl siding on the exterior wall of building of Type I, II, III and IV construction shall meet the requirements of 1406.~~

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this change helps to clarify that the requirements of 1405.13 are applicable to vinyl siding regardless of the type of construction. Therefore it is appropriate to delete the limitation of Type V construction. Further, the modification appropriately deletes reference to Section 1406 because Section 1405.13 is dealing strictly with structural limitations, whereas Section 1406 deals with fire resistive requirements.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS182-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that expanding the technical definitions of panel siding and lap siding was appropriate because they provide for more understandable definitions.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC B/E

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: This change corrects errors and provides additional flashing and fastening options for fiber-cement siding.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS183-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Modified**

Modify the proposal as follows:

1406.2.2 (Supp) Type I, II, III, and IV construction. On buildings of Type I, II, III and IV construction, exterior wall coverings shall be permitted to be constructed of wood in accordance with Section 1405.4, or other equivalent combustible material, complying with the following limitations:

1. Combustible exterior wall coverings, shall not exceed 10 percent of an exterior wall surface area where the fire separation distance is 5 feet (1524 mm) or less.
2. Combustible architectural trim shall be limited to three stories or 40 feet (12 192 mm) in height above grade plane.
3. ~~Exception:~~ Combustible exterior wall coverings constructed of fire-retardant treated wood complying with Section 2303.2 for exterior installation shall not be limited in wall surface area where the fire separation distance is 5 feet (1524 mm) or less and shall be permitted up to four stories or 60 feet in height above grade plane regardless of the fire separation distance.

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the reorganization of Section 1406.2.2 was more understandable and did not change the technical requirements. The modification clarified that the language in the exception was not really an exception and could simply be identified as another item in the list (#3).

Assembly Action: **None**

FS184-07/08

PART I – IBC FIRE SAFETY

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that the proposed language dealing with protection of eaves was confusing, in that it appeared to only address fire exposure from the interior and it appeared also to require 15 minute protection in areas where one could have unlimited vent openings; based on this the committee disapproved the change.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC B/E

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proposal had insufficient documentation to justify the increased protection requirements for eaves. While the horizontal distance requirements are clear the vertical distance requirement for soffit vents is not addressed. The proposal also has a conflict between the terms approved thermal barrier and materials having a 15 minute fire-resistance rating.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS185-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this exception is technically feasible and provides a reasonable option to allow certain applications of metal composite material on fire-resistance rated exterior walls without having to justify to the code official that the rating is maintained.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS186-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this section is only intended to evaluate the surface burning characteristics of the MCM cladding material. Many of the attachment systems are not able to be installed within the space limitations of the ASTM E84 apparatus.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS187-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the term "MCM exterior wall assembly" is not a defined term and changing the term to "MCM system" provides better guidance for the building official of what was tested so that an appropriate comparison can be made to what is being proposed for construction.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS188-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that this proposal appropriately sends the code user to Section 2603 for MCM systems containing foam plastic materials.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS189-07/08

PART I – IFC

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: There was no technical justification provided for deletion of this well-established, long-standing and tested code requirement. This is also consistent with the action taken by the IRC-B/E Committee.

Assembly Action: **None**

PART II – IRC B/E

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The current code text language is preferred. The proponent's reason statement did not have sufficient merit or supporting data to justify removing the existing code text requiring the minimum foam density of 20 pounds per cubic foot for interior trim.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS190-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that wood structural panels, particleboard and hardboard have been performing well as attic ignition barriers; therefore based on the lack of substantiating data to the contrary, the committee disapproved the deletion of these items from Section 2603.4.1.6.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS191-07/08 **Withdrawn by Proponent**

FS192-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that as a point of clarification the code user should be aware that plastic siding is required to meet the requirements of the corresponding standard specifications and not the requirements of light-transmitting plastics shown in 2606.4; therefore reference to Section 1404 and 1405 for plastic siding is appropriate.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS193-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The committee felt that there was a lack of technical justification to substantiate the incidental heat flux values. Further, ASTM E 1354 cone calorimeter testing does not seem to be appropriate for this application.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS194-07/08

Committee Action: **Approved as Submitted**

Committee Reason: The committee agreed that the change was editorial in nature but was required so that ramps, when used as an exit and located in an enclosure were included as part of the requirements for light-diffusing systems.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS195-07/08

Committee Action: **Disapproved**

Committee Reason: The proponent requested disapproval so that necessary revisions could be made as a public comment for the final action hearings.

Assembly Action: **None**

FS196-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: The committee indicated that the proposed requirements for fiber reinforced polymer and fiberglass reinforced polymer are technically accurate and complete. The products are also currently widely in use. Therefore the proposed provisions for fiber reinforced polymer and fiberglass reinforced polymer are an appropriate addition to the code.

Assembly Action:

None

FS197-07/08

Errata: Replace the proposal with the following:

FS197-07/08
905.11, Chapter 35

Proponent: Jeff Hugo, National Fire Sprinkler Association (NFSA)

THIS PROPOSAL IS ON THE AGENDA OF THE IFC CODE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE. SEE THE TENTATIVE HEARING ORDER FOR THIS COMMITTEE.

1. Add new text as follows:

905.11 Testing and maintenance. Standpipe systems shall be tested and maintained in accordance with NFPA 25.

2. Add new standard to Chapter 35 as follows:

National Fire Protection Association

25-07 Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Fire Protection Systems

Reason: This new text will allow the building official or the department to be able to enforce NFPA 25 for standpipes, in the cases where no fire official is present in the jurisdiction. This new text will also point out to designers and building owners their responsibilities by the direct reference to NFPA 25, helping out follow up inspectors such as fire, building, and/or property maintenance.

The need for sprinkler and standpipe maintenance after the installation is imperative. Oftentimes, sprinklers and standpipe systems are combined and standpipe maintenance could be accomplished along with sprinkler system easily. However, this section will cover those standpipes that stand alone, such as dry standpipes in parking garages, marinas, boatyards, etc.

Catastrophic fires involving malfunctioning standpipes have hampered firefighting efforts and have led to several firefighter deaths and injuries. The One Meridian Plaza fire in 1991 and the Deutsche Bank tower at ground zero in 2007 come to mind. The One Meridian Plaza fire claimed three firefighters and the Deutsche Bank killed two firefighters. In both fires, faulty standpipe components contributed to these deaths by not supplying adequate water.

Cost Impact: The code change proposal will not increase the cost of construction.

Committee Action:

Disapproved

Committee Reason: Disapproved for consistency with the action taken on code change FS170-07/08.

Assembly Action:

None

FS198-07/08

Committee Action:

Approved as Submitted

Committee Reason: This is simply an administrative update, therefore the committee recommends approval.

Assembly Action:

None
